

ARTICLE V

De Spiritu Sancto.

Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentie, majestatis, et glorie, verus, ac æternus Deus.

Of the Holy Ghost.

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

THERE was no Article corresponding to this in the series published in 1553. Ten years later (1563) this was added by Archbishop Parker, being taken by him substantially from the Confession of Württemberg. The reason for its insertion was possibly twofold—(1) The spread of false teaching concerning the distinct Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit. That these truths were impugned by some at the time of the Reformation is shown by the first of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, which ends with a condemnation of "*Samosatēnos veteres et neotericos, qui cum tantum unam personam esse contendunt, de Verbo et Spiritu Sancto astute et impie rhetoricantur, quod non sint personæ distinctæ, sed quod verbum significet verbum vocale, et Spiritus motum in rebus creatum*"; while the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* supplies further proof how necessary it was to guard against error on this subject, for after language referring to other heresies it proceeds as follows: "*Sic illorum etiam est execrabilis impudentia, qui cum Macedonio contra Spiritum Sanctum con-*

spiraverunt, illum pro Deo non agnoscentes."¹ But while these quotations witness to the prevalence of error, a recollection of the date to which the documents from which they are drawn belong, shows that they describe the state of things that obtained before the publication of the Articles of Edward's reign; and it may fairly be asked why there was no Article repudiating these errors in that series. The answer may perhaps be found in the supposition that it was considered that they were sufficiently condemned by the terms of Article I. ("Of the Holy Trinity"), the language of which our present Fifth Article partially repeats, adding only a statement on the procession of the Holy Spirit. Since, however, the same would hold good also of the Elizabethan Article, it appears probable that Archbishop Parker's addition was due, not so much to the felt need of more precise and definite language, as (2) to the desire to give the document the character of greater completeness. If there was an Article on the Son of God, it may well have been felt that the lack of a corresponding Article on the Third Person of the Holy Trinity was a deficiency which it would be wise to supply, for the sake of symmetry and proper balance, even though there was no positive necessity for it arising from heresy, which without it would not be excluded.

The subjects which call for attention in connection with this Article are three in number:

1. The Divinity of the Holy Ghost.
2. The distinct Personality.
3. The doctrine of the Procession.

I. *The Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*

It is hard to understand how this can ever have been

¹ *Ref. Leg. Eccl.* "De hæres." ch. 6. Even so late as the middle of the seventeenth century, Bishop Pearson speaks of "the ancient but newly-revived heresy of the Arians and Macedonians."—*On the Creed*, Art. viii.

doubted; and it is probable that but few persons will be found in the present day to question it. The evidence of Scripture upon it is full and complete, and leaves no room whatever for doubt as to its teaching. Not only are divine actions and attributes ascribed to the Spirit, but also He is directly termed God.

(a) *Divine actions and attributes are ascribed to the Spirit.*—In the Old Testament the references to the action of the Spirit of God in creation (Gen. i. 2; Ps. xxxiii. 6), and in inspiring the prophets (Isa. lxi. 1), whatever may be thought of their bearing on the doctrine of His distinct Personality, are manifestly inconsistent with the notion that He is a *κτίσμα*. His work in bringing about the Incarnation can only belong to one who is in the highest sense divine. “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” (S. Luke i. 35). The Spirit dwells in the bodies of men as in a temple. See 1 Cor. iii. 16: “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?” Compare 1 Cor. vi. 19: “Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?” “Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” is an offence of so heinous a character that it is spoken of as a sin which “hath never forgiveness” (S. Mark iii. 29), whereas all other blasphemies may be forgiven—a fact which it is impossible to reconcile with any other supposition but that of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

(b) But, besides this, the Spirit is directly termed God. In Acts v. 3, 4, Peter says to Ananias, “Why hath Satan filled thine heart to *lie to the Holy Ghost?* . . . thou hast not lied unto men, but *unto God.*” Thus to lie to the Holy Ghost is to lie to God.

2 Cor. iii. 15–18: “Unto this day, whensoever Moses

is read, a veil lieth upon their hearts. But whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit.” “The Spirit is here so plainly said to be *the Lord*, that is *Jehovah*, the one eternal God, that the adversaries of this truth must either deny that the Lord is here to be taken for God, or that the *Spirit* is to be taken for the Spirit of God: either of which denials must seem very strange to any person which considereth the force and plainness of the apostle’s discourse.”¹

Again, whereas in one Gospel we read: “If I by *the finger of God* cast out devils” (S. Luke xi. 20), in the parallel passage in another we read, “If I by *the Spirit of God* cast out devils” (S. Matt. xii. 28), and whereas Isaiah describes a divine utterance that came to him, and says, “I heard the voice of the Lord” (Isa. vi. 8), St. Paul quotes the words as an utterance of the Holy Spirit (Acts xxviii. 25 *seq.*), thereby identifying Him with the Jehovah of the Old Covenant.

II. *The Distinct Personality.*

If it is difficult to understand how the doctrine of the Spirit’s Divinity could ever be doubted, with the doctrine of His distinct personality the case is very different. It is not hard to see how error would be likely to grow up on this subject. The same term, *πνεῦμα*, is used in Holy Scripture both for the *Person*, and for the *spiritual gifts*. It is largely owing to this that men have sometimes failed to see the truth of the distinct Personality, and have imagined that wher-

¹ Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. viii.

ever the "Spirit of God" is mentioned, it is an impersonal attribute or quality, or an endowment granted to man as a divine gift. Careful consideration, however, of the language used in Holy Scripture makes it quite clear that such a view is wholly inadequate. It will be seen that, throughout the New Testament, *personal actions* are ascribed to the Spirit, and such actions as cannot be predicated of the Father or the Son. Our Lord's discourses in the upper chamber on the eve of His passion (S. John xiii.-xvi.) deal largely with the subject of the Holy Spirit, whom He would send from the Father, or whom the Father would send in His name (xiv. 26, xv. 26), as "another Comforter" or "Advocate" (*ἄλλον παράκλητον*). The use of this term seems of itself decisive. Whatever be the exact translation of *παράκλητος* the title is certainly a personal one. It is applied to our Lord in 1 John ii. 1, and if the Spirit is to be "another Paraclete," He must not only be distinct from the Son, and from the Father, by whom He is "sent," but must equally be a Person. Further, the masculine pronoun is used, "*He* (*ἐκεῖνος*) shall teach you all things" (S. John xiv. 26), and such personal actions are ascribed to Him as teaching, reminding, bearing witness, convicting of sin, guiding into truth, declaring things to come, glorifying Christ, taking of the things of Christ, and declaring them to the disciples (xiv. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 8-14). But the proof of the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost is not confined to these chapters of S. John's Gospel. The apostolic epistles are full of passages which testify to the same truth. "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself (*αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα*) maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered; and He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh

intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. viii. 26, 27). The Spirit here can only be thought of as distinct from the Father with whom He intercedes, nor can there be any personification of, or confusion with, the human spirit, since the Spirit "helpeth our infirmities," and "maketh intercession for us." And though, undoubtedly, such attributes as love are personified in Scripture, and personal actions ascribed to them, which are really done by the men in whom they reside (see *e.g.* 1 Cor. xiii.), yet such a passage as 1 Cor. xii. 4 *seq.* is decisive against the notion that the language of the apostle concerning the Spirit may be explained in the same way. Here the Spirit of God is spoken of as apportioning the gifts of grace. He is expressly distinguished from the gifts which He assigns to men, and personal action is markedly attributed to Him. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit . . . But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit; to another faith, in the same Spirit; to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; and to another discernings of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; and to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as He will." The Personality of the Holy Spirit is evident throughout this passage. "Even as He will" could be said of no influence or attribute. Many other passages to the same effect might be quoted. Elsewhere we read of the Spirit being "grieved" (Eph. iv. 30), of men being "led by the Spirit" (Gal. v. 18). It is possible to "lie to the Holy Ghost" (Acts v. 4), and to "blaspheme against Him" (S. Matt. xii. 31). Language

such as this is surely conclusive. It would be inexplicable and misleading if the Spirit were only an attribute, influence, gift, or operation. He is plainly revealed in the Holy Scripture as a divine Hypostasis, distinct from both the Father and the Son—the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity.

It may be added, with reference to the use of the same term, *πνεῦμα*, both for the Person and the gift, that a comparison of passages will show that as a rule where the gift, operation, or communication of the Spirit is spoken of in Scripture, the word *πνεῦμα* is without the article. Where the word is definite, *τὸ πνεῦμα*, it will generally, if not always, be found that the divine Person is designated.¹

Before passing on to the subject of the procession, it will be well to notice briefly the history of the doctrine of the Divinity and Personality of the Holy Spirit in the Church.

In the earliest ages comparatively little attention was paid to the subject. The doctrine was held, so to speak, in an *informal* manner. The witness of hymns, doxologies, and professions of faith, as well as the incidental statements of early Fathers, all combine to convince us that the Church had no real doubts on the Divinity or Personality of the Holy Ghost, although the doctrine was not formally and dogmatically stated, and occasionally there are traces of a confusion of thought and language, so that not only are acts and operations ascribed to the Son which would be properly assigned to the Spirit, but the Spirit is actually identified with the Son.² Such passages are, however, rare; and against

¹ See Dean Vaughan, *Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 103, and cf. Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. viii.

² See Ps. Clement, *2 Cor.* ix. and xiv. Hermas, *Pastor. Sim.* v. ix.; *Theoph. ad Autolyc.* ii. 23; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 33, where the Incarnation is said to have been wrought by the Word Himself, though

them may be set the witness of many others, which show that the doctrine was recognised from the beginning.¹ "The Catholic doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Ghost," it has been truly said, "found a place from the first in the life and worship of the Church; in her worship because in her life. Yet the dogmatic expression of this truth will be sought in vain among the outpourings of Christian devotion. Until heresy attacked one by one the treasures of the traditional creed, they were held firmly indeed, yet with a scarcely conscious grasp: the faithful were content to believe and to adore."²

The first recognition in any form of the fact that the doctrine had not hitherto received the attention due to it may be found in the outbreak of Montanism in the latter half of the second century. It has been said that Montanus claimed himself to be the Paraclete, but this assertion probably arises from a misunderstanding of his claim to be the inspired organ of the Spirit. According to the express statement of Epiphanius,³ his views were sound on the subject of the Holy Trinity, and therefore the prominence which he gave to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit may be taken as "the first expression of a need already beginning to make itself felt—the need of a fuller recognition of the Person and work of the Holy Ghost."⁴

In the early days of the Sabellian heresy the subject

elsewhere Justin clearly distinguishes the Spirit from the Word, placing "in the third order" (*ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει*) the Spirit of prophecy "for we honour Him with the Word," *Apol.* i. 13.

¹ See Clement of Rome, *1 Cor.* ii. xlv. xlvii. lviii.; Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* xiii.; *Philad.* vii.; *Eph.* ix. xviii.; *Mart. Polyc.* xiv. xxii.; *Theoph. ad Autol.* ii. 15; Athenagoras, *Legat.* x.; Irenæus, *IV.* xiv.; xxxiv. etc.

² Swete, *On the Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 8.

³ *Hær.* xlviii.

⁴ Swete, *op. cit.* p. 12.

of the Holy Spirit was not prominently brought forward, but as the controversy proceeded there were indications that the Sabellians were prepared to extend to the Third Person of the Trinity the principle of explanation which they applied to the Second, and to regard the Spirit merely as a manifestation or character of the one Person whom they admitted as God. The subject, however, still remained in the background, nor was the attention of churchmen specially directed to it for some time yet. Indeed, it is not till a considerable time after the outbreak of the Arian heresy in the fourth century that it receives due consideration. The creed which received the sanction of the Fathers assembled at Nicæa (A.D. 325), being drawn up expressly to guard against Arianism, ended abruptly with the clause, "And in the Holy Ghost." All the clauses which follow this in our present (so-called) Nicene Creed were wanting, and the reason why this article of the faith was so brief and free from all elaboration was, if we may believe the express statement of S. Basil of Cæsarea, "because no question had as yet arisen on this subject."¹

At the same time, it is necessary to remember that the denial of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit was logically involved in the position of the Arians. If the Son is not "very and eternal God," but a "creature" (*κτίσμα*), what can be thought of the nature of the Spirit who is "sent" by Him, and is actually called in Scripture "the Spirit of Christ?" It is clear that on the Arian hypothesis the Spirit cannot be truly divine, or else He would be superior to the Son who "sends" Him. For a while, however, this inference remained in the background. The main question at stake was that

¹ Διὰ τὸ μὴδέπω τότε τοῦτο κινεῖσθαι τὸ ζήτημα, *Ep.* lxxviii. (*al.* cxxv., *cf.* cccxxv.; *al.* cclviii.).

of the Divinity of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. It required time for the full issues and results that flowed from the Arian position to become manifest. Not till about the middle of the fourth century does the question of the nature and position of the Holy Spirit begin to assume importance in the controversy. The *Catechetical Lectures* of S. Cyril of Jerusalem were delivered in the year 347 or 348. In the creed on which S. Cyril commented, the article on the Holy Spirit, though slightly fuller than that in the Nicene Creed, was still lacking in crucial and decisive terms. It simply consisted of the words, "And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who spake by the prophets"; and S. Cyril's lecture upon it¹ makes it perfectly clear that he was aware of no recent development of heretical speculation upon the subject, for the only heresies against which he thinks it necessary to caution the catechumens whom he is instructing, are those of older days and of long standing, such as those of the Gnostics and the Montanists. But a very few years later, among the anathemas appended to the first Sirmian Creed (A.D. 351) are several which mark the rise of controversy on the Person of the Spirit. Those are condemned who speak of Him as the "ingenerate God," or as "one Person" with the Father and the Son, or as "a part of the Father or of the Son."² From this time onwards the battle rages round the subject, and the heresy associated with the name of Macedonius is developed by some among the semi-Arians, who shrank from the blasphemy of attributing a created nature to the Eternal Son. "Unable to grasp the Catholic conception of the Holy Trinity, unwilling to accept the Arian position as a whole, they fall back upon the middle course of giving up the Deity of the Spirit, while they confessed the Son

¹ S. Cyril, *Cat. Lect.* xvi.

² Athan. *De Synodis*, 27.

to be of like essence with the Father."¹ In this way there arose the heresy of the Pneumatomachi (πνευματομάχοι), or Macedonians,² as they were also called, after Macedonius, the deposed Patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 360). Its essence consists in the denial of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. For a time it must have been most formidable. One Council after another condemns it,³ and creeds are enlarged with fuller statements in order to exclude it. So in the (so-called) Nicene Creed we find the brief statement of the original creed expanded in the following manner:—"I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life (τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν), who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets." These additions are found for the first time in the creed as given by Epiphanius in his *Ancoratus* which was written in 373 or 374.⁴ They were perhaps ratified

¹ Swete, *Early History*, p. 45.

² "Macedoniani sunt a Macedonio Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae Episcopo, quos et πνευματομάχους Graeci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu Sancto litigent. Nam de Patre et Filio recte sentiant, quod unius sint ejusdemque substantiae vel essentiae; sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes."—Augustine, *Haeres.* 52. Of the share of Macedonius in propagating this heresy, but little is known. "His name makes no figure in the history of the controversy beyond its use in designating the sect."—Swete, p. 53.

³ *E.g.* The four Synods at Rome under Damasus, between 368 and 381. See Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 287 *seq.*

⁴ Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, §. 118. Compare also the other form of the creed given immediately afterwards by Epiphanius (§ 119) as that current since the days of Valens and Valentinian. In this the article on the Holy Ghost is still fuller. "And we believe in the Holy Ghost, who spake by the law and preached by the prophets, and came down at the Jordan, speaking by the apostles, dwelling in the saints. Thus we believe in Him that He is Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, perfect Spirit, the Spirit the Paraclete, uncreated, proceeding from the Father, and receiving of the Son, and believed on." There are also appended to this

and sanctioned by the Council of Constantinople in 381, a question which will have to be considered in connection with Article VIII. But however this may be, the Council in its first canon emphatically condemned and anathematised the heresy of the Macedonians, which from this time found place only without the Church; and henceforth the Divinity of the Holy Spirit and His place in the Godhead as the Third Person of the blessed Trinity was fully recognised and acknowledged as that which had been the implicit faith of the Church from the beginning, and which was now distinctly expressed in her formal and dogmatic decisions.

III. *The Doctrine of the Procession.*

In treating of the procession of the Holy Spirit, it will be convenient to consider—(a) the scriptural grounds for the doctrine, and its meaning; and (b) the history of its expression in the creed.

(a) *The Scripture grounds for the doctrine, and its meaning.*—The term "proceeding" is used by the Church to denote the manner in which the Holy Spirit derives His eternal Being from the Father, who is alone unoriginate (ἀναρχος).¹ As the property of the Son is "to be begotten," so the property of the Spirit is "to proceed." *What* the word ultimately denotes must ever remain a mystery in this life. But we cannot doubt that there is some real truth, and an eternal fact in the divine nature, indicated by the way in which Holy Scripture, while speaking of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity as God's *Son*, and *begotten*, never makes use of these terms when speaking of the Third Person in the Godhead.

creed, anathemas of those who say that the Spirit once was not, or that He is of a different substance from the Father, or is liable to change or alteration.

¹ See Greg. Naz. *Ora.* xxix.

Consequently the Church, following the guidance of Holy Scripture, has never ventured to employ them. Some word, however, was required to express the scriptural truth that the Spirit is not unoriginate, but issues forth from the Father. Early in the second century, Ignatius had spoken of the Spirit as being from God (*ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὄν*),¹ but it was impossible to avoid the use of some definite term. In the course of the fourth century we meet with various ones, especially *ἐκπεμφσις*, *πρόσδος*, and *ἐκπόρευσις*, all of which are employed by writers of repute to describe the property of the Holy Spirit. The first of these terms, however, is open to the objection that it may lead to some confusion between the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit, who is "sent" in time by the Father and the Son, and His eternal procession as the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. Accordingly the term which finally obtained widest acceptance and found a place in the creeds was "proceeding," *ἐκπορευόμενον*.² It was evidently suggested by the use of the expression in our Lord's discourse in S. John xv. 26. "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, *which proceedeth from the Father* (*ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται*), He shall testify of Me." It is, however, not at all certain that in this passage our Lord intends to indicate the eternal relation of the Spirit to the Father by His use of the expression. It is possible that the phrase applies to His temporal mission to men, which is certainly the main subject of the discourse. But however this may be (and divines are not all

¹ Ignatius, *Ad Philad.* vii.

² For *ἐκπεμφσις*, see S. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* xxiii., *Ἰδιον πατρὸς μὲν ἢ ἀγεννησία, υἱοῦ δὲ ἢ γέννησις, πνεύματος δὲ ἢ ἐκπεμφσις*. *Πρόσδος* occurs in *Orat.* xiii. and *πνεῦμα πρόσδος* in *Orat.* i. Elsewhere in *Orat.* xxxix we read: *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθῶς τὸ πνεῦμα, προῖδον μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐχ ὑϊκῶς δὲ· οὐδὲ γὰρ γεννητῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκπορευτῶς*.

agreed on the point¹) the selection of the term by the Church was a wise one, for it is entirely free from any associations of *Sonship*, and leaves the manner in which the Spirit "proceeds" or "issues forth" from the Eternal Fount of Deity unexplained. The Church makes no attempt to be wise above what is written, but is content to leave the mystery where Scripture leaves it.

But it may be urged that the creed as used in the Western Church, while borrowing our Lord's phrase to express this eternal fact, *does* attempt to be wise above what is written, and is not content to take the phrase as it stands in S. John's Gospel, but adds an important word to it, repeating it in the form "proceeding from the Father *and the Son*." How this last word (*Filioque*), which has never been received by the Eastern Church, came into the creed of the West will be explained later on. For the present we are concerned with the doctrine rather than the history. It must be admitted that the exact phrase is nowhere found in Scripture. But it is maintained that the doctrine which the phrase is intended to express is abundantly taught in Scripture.² One passage, indeed, approaches very near to being a verbal expression of it. In Rev. xxii. 1, we are told that S. John saw "a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal,

¹ Bishop Westcott, who takes it of the temporal mission, lays stress on the fact that the preposition used in the Gospel is not (as in the creed) *ἐκ*, which would naturally be required to define the source, but *παρὰ*, "from the side of," which is habitually used of the mission of the Son. *Godet*, however, points out that it is difficult to refer the words, *who proceedeth from the Father* to the same fact as the former, *whom I will send to you from the Father*, as this would be mere tautology. Besides the future, *πέμψω*, *I will send*, refers to an historical fact to take place at an undefined period, while the present, *ἐκπορεύεται*, *proceedeth*, seems to refer to a permanent, divine, and therefore eternal relation.

² "The procession of the Spirit in reference to the Father is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son is contained virtually in the Scriptures." Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. viii.

proceeding out of (ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ) the throne of God and of the Lamb." And that the "river of water of life" is intended to symbolise the Holy Spirit is shown by the evangelist's comment on the very similar phrase used in the Gospel by our Lord himself. "He that believeth on Me . . . out of his belly shall flow *rivers of living water*. But this spake He *of the Spirit*, which they that believe on Him should receive" (S. John vii. 38, 39). If the "rivers of living water" in the one passage symbolise the Spirit, we can scarcely doubt that the "river of water of life" in the other has the same significance. And, if so, "proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb," forms a complete justification of the language of the creed. But, apart from this text, there is ample proof in Holy Scripture of the doctrine, for the relation of the Spirit towards the Son is habitually set forth in the very same terms that are used of His relation to the Father. Our Lord speaks of the Spirit as "sent" now by Himself, and now by the Father (compare S. John xiv. 26 with xv. 26). So clear is this, that the Greeks have never denied the *mission* of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son. Again we find that the Spirit is spoken of sometimes as the "Spirit of God" (1 Cor. ii. 11), or the "Spirit of the Father" (S. Matt. x. 20), sometimes as the "Spirit of Christ" (Rom. viii. 9), the "Spirit of Jesus Christ" (Phil. i. 19), the "Spirit of God's Son" (Gal. iv. 6). Christ also said of the Spirit "He shall receive of Mine" (S. John xvi. 14), and when He imparted the gift of the Spirit to His apostles after the resurrection He "breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (S. John xx. 22), apparently thus signifying that the Spirit proceeds from Him as the breath from man.

From all these passages, and from the use of similar language elsewhere, it may be gathered that even though

the procession from the Son be not expressly stated in the Scriptures, it may yet be reasonably inferred from them. Only, care must be taken in order to avoid a misunderstanding of the article in the creed. Much of the objection which has been taken to the doctrine of the "double procession" has arisen from the notion that the phrase gives a sort of sanction to the idea of there being two *ἀρχαί*, or sources of the Godhead, as if the Spirit were said to proceed from the Father and the Son in the same manner. Any such notion is an entire mistake. The Western Church, which alone makes use of the formula, "proceeding from the Father and the Son" has always disclaimed such an interpretation of it, and has been careful to explain that its meaning is precisely the same as that of the formula, which many among the Greeks have been willing to adopt, namely, "proceeding *from* (ἐκ) the Father *through* (διὰ) the Son." Some words of the late Archdeacon Freeman may be cited here to illustrate this and make it clear.

"It is commonly and widely imagined that there was direct and irreconcilable opposition between East and West; the Greeks holding that the Holy Spirit does not come forth, in any sense, from all eternity from the Son; the Latins, that He comes forth from both in the same sense and way. Whereas Greeks and Latins held alike, that the Spirit came forth from the Son as well as from the Father, only in a different sense and way. Tertullian, who is early enough and central enough to be counted neither Greek nor Latin, in any strict sense, states the whole relation with admirable clearness, so far as human language and earthly types can shadow forth a mystery: 'Tertius est Spiritus a Deo et Filio; *sicut tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine*: ita Trinitas per connectos gradus a Patri decurrens monarchiæ nihil obstrepit.' The Holy

Land furnishes us with a magnificent illustration of what is meant. Not far from Cæsarea Philippi the primary spring of the Jordan rushes forth with great violence, and immediately forms a deep and large fount; the largest, probably, says Mr. Tristram, in the world. From this fount or well the Jordan proper flows. It issues forth, that is, from the spring, and from that alone, as its primary source; but it proceeds also, in strictest truth, from the fount or well, only *not* as its primary source. In this most real sense the Holy Ghost "proceedeth from the Father and the Son." And the ancient Greek Fathers, while stedfastly maintaining that God the Father is the only original fountain of Deity, did not hesitate (so S. Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, John Damascene) to acknowledge that God the Son, as being eternally consubstantial with the Father, is mediately a fountain (πηγή) of the Holy Spirit; that He flows to us eternally *through* God the Son (δι' αὐτοῦ), although not *out* of Him in the sense in which He does flow out of the Father."¹

Any illustration is capable of misleading if pressed too far. And this one is no exception to the rule. But if all thought of *time* and *separation* be excluded, the type of the stream is perhaps the best that can be found to shadow forth the heavenly mystery,² and will probably convey to the reader's mind the clearest notion of what is intended to be expressed by the clause in the creed which we have been considering.

(b) From the explanation of the doctrine we pass to the history of its expression in the creed.

¹ Letter to the *Guardian*, Nov. 6, 1872. The statement in the text about the ancient Greeks is strictly true. The modern Greeks, however, appear to hesitate to admit anything more than a temporal mission from the Son.

² Πῶς ἐκπορεύεται τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς; ὡς ἀπὸ πηγῆς ὕδαρ. Chrysostom Hom. lxxii. quoted in Suicer's *Thesaurus*, vol. i. p. col. 1069.

The Creed of Nicæa, it will be remembered, contained no statement whatever on the subject of the procession, for it ended abruptly with the words, "And in the Holy Ghost." It has been commonly stated that all the clauses which follow these words were added at the Council of Constantinople, in 381. This, however, is certainly erroneous. The Council cannot have "added" what was there already, and we know that the additional clauses were in existence and had found a place in the creed some years before the Council of Constantinople was held. More will be said on this subject later on, in connection with the Eighth Article. In this place it will be sufficient to point out that the words, "the Lord and Giver of Life, proceeding from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets," are found for the first time in the year 373 or 374, when they are given by Epiphanius in his *Ancoratus*. Whatever be the truth concerning the acceptance of the enlarged creed containing them at Constantinople there is no doubt that it was accepted at Chalcedon in 451, under the impression that it had been previously sanctioned at Constantinople, and henceforward it is known for some centuries as the "Constantinopolitan Creed." But previous to the date of the Council of Chalcedon there is no trace of a knowledge of it—as distinct from the original Nicene Creed—in the West, nor do we find notices of its *use* there for some time to come. In 589, however, was held the famous Third Council of Toledo, at which Spain publicly proclaimed its catholicity. The Visigoths in Spain had up to this time professed an Arian Creed. But now under King Reccared the heresy was renounced, and the Catholic faith was formally accepted. The Council was called by Reccared shortly after his conversion for the purpose of publicly proclaim-

ing the orthodoxy of the Gothic Church in Spain. Accordingly, the assembled bishops, to testify their adhesion to the Catholic faith, recited (1) "the Creed published at the Council of Nicæa" [*i.e.* the original Nicene Creed of 325], and (2) "the holy faith which the hundred and fifty fathers of the Council of Constantinople explained, consonant with the great Council of Nicæa" [*i.e.* the Creed in our Communion service, which is commonly termed Nicene]. But in this latter form, as recited at Toledo, there occur two variations from the true text as current in the Greek Church then and at the present day—(1) The words *Deum de Deo* are inserted. These correspond to the $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ of the original Creed of Nicæa, but they are wanting in the larger Constantinopolitan Creed. (2) *Et Filio* is added in the article on the Holy Ghost after the words *a patre* in the clause *a patre procedentem*. Thus there appears for the first time in a formal creed of the Church the expression which has since been the subject of so much controversy. The question at once arises: To what cause was the addition of the words "And the Son" due? To this it is believed that the only answer that can be returned is that the insertion was *purely accidental*, that is, that it was made without the slightest intention of "adding" anything, and in the full belief that the words formed part of the creed as generally received by the Catholic Church. There was at the time of the Council no controversy whatever on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit,¹ and no good reason has ever been assigned

¹ Some controversy on the subject there had been previously in the far East during the fifth century, when Theodoret had objected to S. Cyril's statement that the Spirit is ἰδιον τοῦ υἱοῦ , saying that it was blasphemy if it meant that the Spirit was $\epsilon\acute{\xi} \text{ υἱοῦ ἢ δι' υἱοῦ τῆν ὑπαρξίν ἔχον}$. The Council of Ephesus (431) not only approved Cyril's language, but had also condemned a creed ascribed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, which denied to the Spirit a $\text{ὑπαρξίς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ}$. But the controversy had proceeded no

why the words *Et Filio* should have been of deliberate purpose added to the creed. Moreover, the language of the bishops assembled at Toledo on the decrees of the General Councils, as well as on the Creed the use of which they adopted, is such as to preclude any idea of their having made any conscious alteration of its terms. They anathematise any who believe "that there is any other Catholic faith and communion besides that of the universal Church, that Church, to wit, which holds and honours the decrees of the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, the first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon." Again, after confessing the error of their past belief, they anathematise, among others, those who despise the faith of the Nicene Council, those who say "that the faith of the hundred and fifty bishops of the Council of Constantinople is not true," and those who do not receive "all the Councils of orthodox bishops consonant to the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, the first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon." After which they proceed as follows: "The constitutions of the holy Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, which we have heard with well-pleased ear, and have approved as true by our confession, we have subscribed with our whole heart and our whole soul and our whole mind: *thinking that nothing can be more lucid for the knowledge of the truth than what the authorities of the aforesaid Councils contain. Of the Trinity and the Unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, nothing can ever be shown to be clearer or more lucid than these.*"

And as if this was not sufficient, they order that in future, "for reverence of the most holy faith, and for the strengthening of the weak minds of men . . . throughout all the churches of Spain and Galicia, the

further, and it is quite impossible that the assertion of the double procession at Toledo in 589 can have had the slightest connection with it.

symbol of faith of the Council of Constantinople, *i.e.* of the hundred and fifty bishops, should be recited, *according to the form of the Eastern Church.*"

In the face of these very precise and definite statements it appears inconceivable that they could have set themselves deliberately to make material alteration in the form of one article of the creed, and, as Dr. Pusey says, "the only solution seems to be that the Spanish bishops knew of no other expression of doctrine, and that accordingly it [*i.e.* the *Filioque* clause] had in some way found its way into their Latin translation of the creed. For the liturgical use of the creed, which by the multiplication of copies and its universal use, made variation impossible, dated from this Council."¹

There is really no sort of difficulty in this supposition. The creed is so familiar to us, its exact words are so jealously guarded, and copies of it are so numerous, that it is hard to throw ourselves back into the position of the Spanish bishops to whom, as coming over from Arianism, the form was probably novel. But the ease with which such an insertion might be made is shown by the parallel case of the clause *Deum de Deo*. This was evidently the result of accident. But the clause has since then been adopted universally by the Western Church, although it is still wanting in the form of the Constantinopolitan Creed in use in the East. Nor must it be forgotten that the whole Catholic Church of the West, at least since the days of Augustine, had been accustomed to speak of the Holy Ghost as "proceeding from the Father and the Son."² More particularly was the phrase a familiar one

¹ "Letter to the Rev. H. P. Liddon on the clause 'And the Son,' p. 49, where much information will be found on the Council of Toledo. Compare also Mansi, ix. p. 977, and Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, p. 158 *seq.*

² The double procession had been asserted by Western writers even before Augustine. Hilary of Poitiers had spoken of the Spirit as *ex Patre*

to the orthodox in Spain, since it had been definitely adopted in a profession of faith set forth at a previous Council held at Toledo, under the influence of Leo the Great, in 447. "We believe"—so runs the "rule of the Catholic Faith against all heresies, and especially against the Priscillianists"—"in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one Trinity of Divine Essence . . . The Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but *proceeding from the Father and the Son*. The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Paraclete *proceeding from the Father and the Son*."¹ Thus the doctrine of the double procession would appear to those who had but just abjured the Arian heresy as an acknowledged part of that Catholic faith to which they had given in their adherence. They would naturally give expression to it, and when the creed was translated into Latin for their use, the translator would almost inevitably insert it either by inadvertence, not noticing its absence from the Greek, or else in perfect simplicity and good faith, believing that it *ought* to be in the creed, and that its omission from his copy must have been an accident.² Anyhow *there* the phrase is for the *per Filium* (*De Trinit.* xii. 55, 57). S. Ambrose had said that the Spirit proceeds from (*ex*) the Son, as well as from the Father; though he apparently intended by this the *temporal* mission as distinct from the *eternal* procession. (See Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto*, i. 11). Augustine, however, is very clear on the subject (see especially *De Trinitate* xv. 47): "Filius de Patre natus est, et Spiritus Sanctus de Patre principaliter, et ipso sine ullo temporis intervallo dante, communiter de utroque procedit." Other passages from Augustine may be seen in Pusey ("On the Clause, 'And the Son'"), p. 142 *seq.*, and earlier in the same work (pp. 53–59) quotations are given from a number of other Western writers, previous to Toledo, who had given expression to the doctrine, *e.g.* Eucherius of Lyons (434), S. Leo the Great (440), Vigilius, Fulgentius, and others. Compare also Swete's *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, ch. vii.

¹ See *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. p. 129, and cf. Hahn, p. 130. The profession has been assigned to the year 400. It is now generally believed to belong to the Council of 447.

² Dr. Pusey writes as follows: "It seems to me morally certain that

first time in the creed, and there it has remained ever since, although it only made its way gradually from Spain into the other churches of Western Christendom. It is most remarkable how long the addition remained unnoticed. During the seventh century there are one or two faint murmurs of controversy between Easterns and Westerns, concerning the *doctrine* of the procession,¹ but no hint is given that the interpolation of the creed in Spain has been discovered. In the Lateran Council of A.D. 649 the Constantinopolitan Creed was recited without the *Filioque*, as it was also at the Sixth General Council at Constantinople in 680; although curiously enough, we find that the year before this the doctrine of the double procession had been distinctly asserted at our own English Council of Hatfield, held under Archbishop Theodore, a fact which is all the more remarkable, as Theodore, who was himself a Greek from Tarsus, seems to have accepted it without the slightest difficulty.² After this we hear of nothing further which bears upon the subject until the latter half of the eighth

whoever inserted it supposed that the *Filioque* had dropped by mistake out of the Latin translation of the Nicene Creed, to which alone they probably had access in Spain at that time. Anyone in the least familiar with the collation of MSS., will be aware of this cause of change in the text of a Father, that a scribe, *bona fide*, inserts what he thinks has been accidentally omitted. Thus, when the whole context relates to some contrast between the Father and the Son, a scribe will insert '*et Spiritu Sancto*' to complete the confession of the Trinity; the insertion has sometimes found its way into the printed text. In like way, I doubt not, the *Filioque* came into the translation, which was before the bishops of the third Council of Toledo, under a misapprehension that it *must* be there."—*Op. cit.* p. 64.

¹ See Swete, *History*, etc. p. 183.

² See Bæda, *H. E.* IV. xvii.: "Glorificantes Deum Patrem sine initio, et Filium ejus unigenitum ex Patre generatum ante sæcula, et Spiritum Sanctum procedentem ex Patre et Filio inenarrabiliter, sicut prædicaverunt hi quos memoravimus supra, sancti apostoli et prophetæ et doctores." Whether the interpolated creed was already accepted in this country is a matter on which we have no evidence whatever.

century, and even then the question is only with regard to the *doctrine*, and no notice is taken of the interpolation of the creed. In A.D. 767 a Council (of which the records have perished) was held at Gentilly, near Paris; and at this, according to a writer of the following century, Ado of Vienne (†874), the question was discussed between the Greeks and Romans concerning the Trinity, and whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son in the same way as He proceeds from the Father (*utrum Spiritus Sanctus sicut procedit a Patre ita procedit a Filio*). This notice, however, stands by itself, and of the details of the discussion we have no knowledge. Twenty years later (A.D. 787) was held a great Council at Nicæa in connection with the Iconoclastic Controversy. At the third session of the Council a letter was read from Tarasius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, containing the words, "I believe . . . in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father through the Son."¹ This, which had been previously approved by the Pope Hadrian, was formally accepted by the Council, which was closed by the recitation of the *uninterpolated* Constantinopolitan Creed. The proceedings of the Council were then communicated to the West. With Rome there was no difficulty. Not so with Gaul, and under the influence of Charlemagne, a capitular was sent to Rome objecting strongly to various statements made or permitted by the Council, and among other matters calling attention to the doctrine of Tarasius upon the procession, and pointing out that it was not in agreement with the Nicene Creed,² by which is

¹ πιστεύω . . . εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ Κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον.—Swete, p. 206; Mansi, xii. 122.

² "Quod Tarasius non recte sentiat qui Spiritum Sanctum non ex Patre et Filio Secundum Nicenum Symbolum, sed ex Patre per Filium procedentem in sue credulitatis lectione profiteatur."—*Migne*, vol. xviii. p. 1257.

evidently intended the Constantinopolitan Creed, which Charles only knew with the interpolated clause, *Filioque*. This is the first indication that we have that the interpolation has spread from Spain. The Franks, we thus discover, were already using the creed with the *Filioque* clause, and since about this time the creed appears, also under the influence of Charles, to have been adopted in the liturgy of the Gallican Church, its use rapidly spread.¹ Hadrian, in his reply to the capitular, contents himself with defending the doctrinal orthodoxy of the statements of Tarasius, but does not touch on the question of the clause in the creed. This was not enough for Charles, and we find the doctrine of the double procession strongly affirmed by the third of the Caroline books,² and also by the Council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), at which Charles brought together bishops from Italy, Gaul, Aquitaine, and Britain. Two years later at Friuli (A.D. 796) "the interpolation of the creed was for the first time openly defended before a Synod of the Church."³ The Council, however, was merely a provincial one of the suffragans of Aquileia, by whom the doctrine and the interpolation of the creed was accepted without difficulty, and as yet, although the clause has been adopted by the whole Western Church except Rome, the Easterns have apparently not discovered the fact. It came out, however, early in the next century. In A.D. 809 Charles assembled a Council at Aachen, for the express purpose of considering the doctrine of the procession. This was rendered necessary by a dispute which had arisen at Jerusalem between the Greeks and a colony of Latin monks residing there. The former accused the latter of heresy, alleging among other matters, that they chanted the creed with *Filioque*. The Latin monks appealed to the Pope, Leo III., urging

¹ See Walafrid Strabo, *De rebus Eccles.* ch. 21.

² *Migne*, vol. xviii.

³ Swete, *History*, etc., p. 213.

in justification of their practice — (1) that the creed as sung in the Emperor's chapel contained the clause in question; (2) that it was also contained in the *fidēs Athanasii*, as well as in books which they had received from the Emperor. The reply of the Pope to this appeal is lost, but there is still extant a profession of faith sent by him to the East, containing no allusion to the interpolation of the creed, but strongly asserting the *doctrine* of the double procession. Shortly after this the above mentioned Council was held at Aachen. At this, as might have been expected, the doctrine was steadily maintained by the Franks, and legates were appointed to confer with the Pope concerning the interpolation of the creed. To the doctrine as asserted by the Council Leo readily agreed. Indeed he denounced the wilful rejection of the belief of the Western Church on this subject as heresy. But when he came to discuss with the legates the interpolation of the creed he drew back, and steadily refused to admit the clause. The Roman Church had never received it, and he could not consent to it. The legates urged that if it was now cut out of the creed used in the mass, the doctrine would naturally be thought to be erroneous. With the words the truth itself would be lost. Leo admitted the danger, and in order to avoid it advised the discontinuance of the custom of chanting the creed in the mass. It was not so used at Rome; why should it be in Gaul? If its public use was thus dropped, then after a time the excision might be made without danger, and the correct text of the creed restored. Of this advice Charles appears to have taken no notice whatever. The use of the creed was certainly not discontinued by the Franks, nor was the excision of the clause made. But so resolute was the Pope to guard against the unauthorised addition in his own Church that "for the love which he bore to the orthodox faith, and

out of his care for its preservation" he caused two silver shields to be made, on which was engraved the creed in Latin and in Greek; and these were set up on either side of the confession in S. Peter's. This plan appears to have succeeded for a time, and "it has been thought that the interpolated symbol obtained no recognised footing at Rome until, exactly two hundred years after the death of Charlemagne, the Emperor Henry II. prevailed upon Benedict VIII. (A.D. 1014), to adopt the German use of chanting the symbol at the holy mysteries."¹ It was, however, long before this that the controversy which led to the final schism between East and West had broken out, and among the subjects of dispute the interpolation of the creed occupied a prominent position, although by no means the only matter of controversy, nor indeed the real cause of the schism.

This brief sketch of the history will serve to show—(1) how the doctrine of the double procession has always been held by the Latins, and (2) how the interpolated creed gradually made its way from Spain till it was accepted in every part of the Western Church. Into the history of the dispute between the East and West, which originated in the quarrels of Photius of Constantinople with Pope Nicholas the First, it is unnecessary to enter here. But something must be said, in conclusion, on the objections which have been raised in both ancient and modern times to the insertion of the additional phrase, "And the Son" in the creed.

(1) The principal objection raised by Photius (A.D. 850) was that it implied the existence of two sources (*ἀρχαί*) of divinity, and thus destroyed the unity of the Godhead.

To this it is replied that such an interpretation of the phrase has always been rejected by the Westerns, who have consistently maintained that it is intended to

¹ Swete, p. 225.

express the very same doctrine taught by the formula "from the Father through the Son," which, as has been already shown, many Greeks have been willing to admit.

(2) A second objection sometimes raised is, that it is contrary to the seventh canon of the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), which, we are told, forbade any addition to be made to the creed in future.

An obvious answer to this is, that if the canon in question forbids the words "and the Son," it equally forbids "proceeding from the Father," because the only creed recognised at Ephesus was the original creed of Nicæa, which ended with the words "and in the Holy Ghost." Both parts of the following clause, "proceeding from the Father and the Son," are equally "additions" to this, and therefore both fall equally under the condemnation of the canon, if it was really intended to forbid any addition to be made to the creed. But a reference to the terms of the canon, and the circumstances under which it was drawn up, is enough to render this interpretation of it extremely questionable. The circumstances were these: A Nestorian Creed, attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, had been pressed upon some Christians of the East, and Charisius, a presbyter of Philadelphia, who had refused to accept it, had been excommunicated in consequence. He now appealed to the Council against his excommunicators. The Nestorian Creed was produced and read before the assembled Fathers, as well as the original creed of Nicæa, after which the canon in question was passed. It runs as follows:—

"These things having been read [namely, the two creeds, the heretical Nestorian and the orthodox Nicene], the holy Synod has determined that no person shall be allowed to bring forward or to write or to compose another creed beside that defined by the holy Fathers who were assembled at the city of Nicæa with the Holy Spirit

(ἐτέραν πίστιν . . . παρὰ τὴν ὀρισθεῖσαν κ.τ.λ.). But those who shall dare to compose any other creed (ἐτέραν πίστιν), or to exhibit or to produce any such to those who wish to turn to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from heathenism or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatever, if they are bishops or clergy, shall be deposed, the bishops from the episcopate, the clergy from their office (ἀλλοτριούς εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ τοὺς κληρικούς τοῦ κλήρου), but if they are of the laity, they shall be anathematised. In like manner if any, whether bishops or clergy, shall be discovered either holding or teaching the things contained in the exposition (ἐκθέσις) exhibited by the presbyter Charisius concerning the Incarnation of the only begotten Son of God, or the impious and profane doctrines of Nestorius, which have been put down, let them be subject to the sentence of this most holy and Œcumenical Synod; so that if it be a bishop who does so, he shall be removed from his bishopric and be deposed: and in like manner, if he belong to the clergy, he shall forfeit his clerical rank; but if he be a layman, he shall be anathematised, as has been before said."

From this two things are clear—*first*, that the canon simply refers to the private action on the part of *individuals*. It forbids any *person* to bring forward another creed. It was not intended to refer to any possible action of the Church in future, or to bind it for all time to make no addition to the terms of the creed. Indeed, *secondly*, it is clear that the object of the canon was simply to prohibit the substitution of a different, that is, a heretical creed for the Nicene. It was with a definite reference to the attempt to force a Nestorian Creed on some Christians that the canon was passed, and it may safely be said that the thought of forbidding any addition to be made to the Nicene Creed in future cannot possibly

have been present to the minds of those who are responsible for it. It does not touch the case of the *Filioque* clause at all, and it is to be hoped that we have heard the last of this objection, which was due to an entire misconception of the terms and purpose of the canon, but which has been raised not only to the addition to the Constantinopolitan Creed, but also to the use made by the English Church of the (so-called) Athanasian Creed.

(3) One more objection remains. It may be urged that the clause was inserted in the creed irregularly, without any proper ecclesiastical authority, and that it is beyond the competence of any one branch of the Church to add in this manner to a creed of the universal Church.

There is some force in this objection, and considerable weight might be attached to it, had the clause been in the first instance an *intentional* addition, though even so, its insertion might plausibly be defended by the treatment which the original Nicene Creed received after its acceptance by the whole Church at Nicæa. Local branches of the Church certainly *did* add to it without incurring censure, or having fault found with their action, for additional clauses on the Incarnation, as well as those in the latter part of the creed, were current for a considerable time before they could claim any proper and regular ecclesiastical sanction,¹ and any objection to the *Filioque* on the score of irregularity would at one time have equally applied to them. But in the case of the *Filioque* the objection is still more effectually removed by the further consideration that the "addition" was *unintentional*, and that it was not discovered to be an addition, nor called in question for more than two centuries after the Council of Toledo, to which it has

¹ See below on Article VIII. p. 320.

been traced. The Western Church does not seem ever to have made any public use—at least on a wide scale—of the creed without the clause; and to have omitted it at a comparatively late date would have looked very much like a repudiation of the doctrine contained in it. The clause, when rightly understood, as has been already shown, expresses a real truth of Scripture, which the Western Church had been for centuries accustomed to teach in the formula now found in the creed. It was impossible for her to alter the form which she publicly used without thereby endangering the doctrine. It was clearly an act of unwarrantable tyranny on the part of the Latins to attempt to force the acceptance of the clause on the Greeks, as was actually done by Pope Nicholas III. (A.D. 1277).¹ The Greeks had never received it, and were accustomed to express the doctrine by a different formula. To *them* its adoption would have seemed a change of doctrine in the direction of heresy. But it is too much to ask the Latins to give up the use of the clause, since they would thereby practically disown the doctrine which it contains. A parallel case is afforded by the difficulty connected with the word *hypostasis* in the fourth century, and the treatment which this received at the Council of Alexandria indicates the proper solution of the difficulty connected with the varying forms of the creed in the East and the West. There was a difference of phraseology between different portions of the Church as regards an important matter of faith. But so soon as it was discovered that, in spite of varying language, the meaning of both parties was identical, it was felt that a difference of phraseology was, after all, but a minor inconvenience, which might well be endured without causing any schism in the Church, and it was agreed that both parties might keep to their own traditional mode of

¹ See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. vi. p. 412.

expressing the doctrine which they both held in common. So also, if Greeks and Latins are really at one in the doctrine, it is possible to look forward to the day when similar wise counsels may prevail, and the acceptance of the Constantinopolitan Creed, either with or without the *Filioque*, may be admitted as a basis for intercommunion between the long-estranged branches of the Church in the East and West.

ARTICLE VI

De Divinis Scripturis, quod sufficiunt ad salutem.

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

Sacræ Scripturæ nomine eos Canonicos libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum autoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.

De nominibus et numero librorum Sacræ Canonice Scripturæ Veteris Testamenti.

Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

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

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

Of the names and number of the canonical books.

Genesis.	Prior Liber Paralipom.	Genesis.	The First Book of Chronicles.
Exodus.	Secundus Liber Paralipom.	Exodus.	The Second Book of Chronicles.
Leviticus.	Primus Liber Esdræ.	Leviticus.	The First Book of Esdras.
Numeri.	Secundus Liber Esdræ.	Numbers.	The Second Book of Esdras.
Deuteron.	Liber Hester.	Deuteronomy.	The Book of Esther.
Josue.	Liber Job.	Joshua.	The Book of Job.
Judicum.	Psalmi.	Judges.	The Psalms.
Ruth.	Proverbia.	Ruth.	The Proverbs.
Prior Liber Samuelis.	Ecclesiastes vel Canticionator.	The First Book of Samuel.	Ecclesiastes or the Preacher.
Secundus Liber Samuelis.	Cantica Salomonis.	The Second Book of Samuel.	Cantica or Songs of Solomon.
Prior Liber Regum.	IV Prophetæ Majores.	The First Book of Kings.	Four Prophets the Greater.
Secundus Liber Regum.	XII Prophetæ Minores.	The Second Book of Kings.	Twelve Prophets the Less.

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

And the other books, (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners: but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following:—

Tertius Liber Esdræ.	Baruch Propheta	The Third Book of Esdras.	Baruch the Prophet.
Quartus Liber Esdræ.	Canticum trium Puerorum.	The Fourth Book of Esdras.	The Song of the Three Children.
Liber Tobie.	Historia Susannæ.	The Book of Tobias.	The Story of Susanna.
Liber Judith.	De Bel et Dracone.	The Book of Judith.	Of Bel and the Dragon.
Reliquum Libri Hester.	Oratio Manasses.	The rest of the Book of Esther.	The Prayer of Manasses.
Liber Sapientie.	Prior Liber Machabæorum.	The Book of Wisdom.	The First Book of Maccabees.
Liber Jesu Sirach.	Secundus Liber Machabæorum.	Jesus the Son of Sirach.	The Second Book of Maccabees.

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

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

The original Article of 1553 contained only the *first* paragraph of our present one, and that in a slightly different form: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, *although it be some time received of the faithful as godly, and profitable for an order and comeliness*: yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it as an article of faith or repute it requisite to the necessity of salvation." The words in italics were omitted in 1563, and the language of the following sentence slightly changed. At the same time Archbishop Parker added the remaining part of the Article, with the exception of the *complete* list of the books of the Apocrypha, which was only added at the final revision in 1571, when the present title was

prefixed, and one or two trifling verbal changes introduced into the Article itself.¹

Very similar language to that employed in the first paragraph of the Article is found in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which, after a list of the canonical books of both Testaments, we read as follows: "Hæc igitur generatim est sancta Scriptura, qua omnia creditu ad salutem necessaria, plene et perfecte contineri credimus, usque adeo ut quicquid in ea non legitur nec reperitur, nec denique ex eadem aut consequitur, aut convincitur, a nemine sit exigendum ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur."²

The wording of the second paragraph on the canonical books is traced entirely to the Confession of Würtemberg, while that on "the other books" follows very closely the statement of St. Jerome to which it expressly refers us:

"Sicut ergo Judith, et Machabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non receipt: sic et hæc duo volumina [*sc.* Ecclesiasticus et Sapientia] legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam."³

The object of this Article is to state the exact position taken up by the Church of England with regard to the *use* and *extent* of Holy Scripture, in the face of two opposite errors which she was called upon in the sixteenth century to oppose.

1. The opinion of some among the Anabaptists or "Anti-book religionists," who were described in the

¹ The only books of the Apocrypha mentioned in 1563 were 3 and 4 Esdras, Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Tobit, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees. In 1553 and 1563 the title was, *Divinæ Scripturæ doctrina sufficit ad salutem*—"The doctrine of Holy Scripture is sufficient to salvation."

² *De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica*, ch. ix.

³ Prologus in *Libros Salom.*

Nineteenth Article of 1553 as those who "affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom (they say) they have learnt such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture."¹

2. The teaching of the Church of Rome, which places tradition on a level with Holy Scripture as a source of doctrine, and regards as canonical all those books which the Church of England relegates to an inferior position in the Apocrypha, with the exception of the Third and Fourth Books of Esdras,² and the Prayer of Manasses.

The principal subjects which require consideration in connection with this article are the following:—

1. The position of Holy Scripture as the sole source of necessary doctrine.
2. The canon of Scripture.
3. The position of "the other books."

I. *The Position of Holy Scripture as the Sole Source of Necessary Doctrine.*

On this subject the statement of the Article is, so far as it goes, clear enough. **Holy Scripture**

¹ To much the same effect we read in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*: "In quo genere teterrimi illi sunt (itaque a nobis primum nominabuntur) qui sacras Scripturas ad infirmorum tantum hominum debilitatem ablegant et detrudunt, sibi sic ipsi interim præfidentes, ut earum auctoritate se teneri non putent, sed peculiarem quandam spiritum jactant, a quo sibi omnia suppeditari aiunt, quæcunque decet et faciunt."—*De Hæres.* ch. iii.

² Or, as they are called in our Bibles "the First and Second Books of Esdras." The titles given to the books in the Sixth Article are mainly drawn from the Vulgate, in which Ezra and Nehemiah appear as the "First and Second Books of Esdras," and the apocryphal books are consequently enumerated as the "Third and Fourth." In our English Bibles the titles are drawn from the Hebrew, and so Ezra and Nehemiah appear under their own names, and consequently the apocryphal books of Esdras become the "First and Second."

contains all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation. The meaning of this statement is perfectly plain. It "only implies the historical fact that the same body of saving truths which the apostles first preached orally, they afterwards, under the inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, wrote in Holy Scripture, God ordering in His providence that, in the unsystematic teaching of Holy Scripture, all should be embodied which is essential to establish the faith."¹ It equally condemns any theory which would regard Holy Scripture as given "only to the weak," and as unnecessary for the "enlightened Christian," and, on the other hand, any view which would base necessary doctrine not ultimately on the written word, but on the traditions or teaching of the Church.

The statements of the Article may be illustrated from the promise required from all the clergy before their ordination to the priesthood.

The bishop.—Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?

Answer.—I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.

The statement of the Article, like the question addressed to the clergy, refers only to *necessary* doctrine; and it will

¹ Pusey, *The Truth and Office of the English Church*, p. 40.

be noticed that the Article is absolutely silent on the question who is to decide what may be proved from Holy Scripture, and fails to state with whom the power resides to enforce *anything* to be believed as an article of faith. For the teaching of the Church of England on these very important subjects we must turn to Article XX., where we are expressly told that 'the Church . . . hath authority in controversies of faith,' and where it is evidently implied that it rests with the Church to decide what may be proved from Scripture, and thus be required to be believed as an article of faith. The consideration of this subject is therefore postponed, and will be taken later on in connection with Article XX. It will be sufficient here to have thus reminded the reader that the teaching of this Sixth Article requires to be supplemented by the later one, if the position taken up by the Church of England is to be properly understood and appreciated.

The subject of the authority to be assigned to the Holy Scriptures was considered by the Church of Rome at the fourth session of the Council of Trent, which was held in April 1546, some years before the Anglican Articles were drawn up. The decree was, therefore, before the compilers of the Edwardian as well as the Elizabethan series. It runs as follows:—

"The sacred and holy Œcumenical and General Synod of Trent . . . keeping this always in view that, errors being removed, the purity itself of the gospel should be preserved in the Church, which (gospel) before promised through the prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth and then commanded to be preached by His apostles to every creature, as the fountain both of every saving truth and also of the discipline of morals; and perceiving that *this truth and discipline is contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions* which,

received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; (the Synod) following the example of the orthodox Fathers, *receives and venerates, with equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and also of the New Testament*—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, both those appertaining to faith as well as those appertaining to morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by a continuous succession in the Catholic Church.”¹

The terms of this decree are not altogether free from ambiguity, for the assertion that the “truth and discipline are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions” is capable of bearing two widely different interpretations. It may be taken to mean that the whole faith is contained in the Scriptures, and is also taught by tradition; and if it be taken in this way, there is nothing in it to which any Anglican need take exception. But, on the other hand, it may mean that Scripture alone is the source of some part of the faith, and tradi-

¹ “Sacrosancta Œcumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus . . . hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens ut sublatis erroribus puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur; quod promissum ante per prophetas in Scripturis Sanctis Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit; deinde per suos Apostolos, tanquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinæ, omni creaturæ prædicari jussit; perspicuensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt, orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.”—*Conc. Trident. Sessio Quarta. Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis.*

tion alone the source of some other part, and this, of course, is a position to which an Anglican could by no means subscribe. This ambiguity is not altogether removed when we turn from the decree of Trent to the writings of representative divines of the Roman communion, for while Cardinal Wiseman asserts that “there is no other groundwork whatever for faith except the written word of God,”¹ and Cardinal Newman uses language to much the same effect;² on the other hand, Moehler tells us that “it is asserted by the Catholic Church that many things have been delivered to her by the apostles which Holy Writ either does not at all comprise or at most only alludes to,”³ and Perrone is equally emphatic in laying down that there are some dogmatic traditions which are *a Scriptura plane distinctæ*, as well as those explanatory and interpretative traditions which he calls *inhesivæ et declarativæ*.⁴ These quotations may serve to show the real difficulty that there is in stating precisely what the Church of Rome stands committed to. But we shall not probably be wrong if we assert that though the majority of Roman divines would welcome support and illustration from Scripture for all articles of faith, including the most recent developments, namely, the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary, and that of the papal infallibility, yet they would make the basis on which these doctrines rest the teaching of the Church. Anglicans, on the other hand, while always looking for support and illustration from “hermeneutical tradition,” maintain that in the last resort Scripture is the sole source of the faith. The Church of England has most certainly never

¹ *Lectures*, ch. iii. p. 60.

² “Letter to Dr. Pusey on the *Eirenicon*,” p. 14, quoted in Bp. Forbes on the *Articles*, p. 97. Cf. *Development*, ch. vii. 1, sec. 4.

³ *Symbolism*, p. 286. (Ed. 1).

⁴ *Prælectiones*, vol. ii., p. 148 seq.

underrated the importance of the appeal to antiquity. The very same canon of the Convocation of 1571, which imposes subscription to the Articles on the clergy, requires all preachers to "see that they never teach aught in a sermon, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from the same doctrine."¹ But it is one thing to use tradition as a help towards arriving at the true sense of Scripture, and quite another thing to make it a source of Christian doctrine. All the articles of faith are not expressly set down in Scripture in so many words, but there can be no hesitation in asserting that they "may be proved thereby." This, however, immediately opens out the question, How are we to know in what sense the words of Scripture are to be understood? And here, without anticipating what must be said on this subject under the Twentieth Article, it may be pointed out that the value of tradition, where it can be ascertained, is enormous, as showing how the words of Scripture have ever been understood by the Church. So much it seemed necessary to say here, in order to make it clear that the Sixth Article is not meant in any way to cast a slight upon tradition and the appeal to antiquity. It is only designed to protect jealously the rightful position of the Scriptures, as containing, though in an informal way, the "faith once for all delivered to the saints,"² and to guard against any additions or accretions to the original deposit committed to the care of the Catholic Church.

¹ The Canon *Concionatores*. "Imprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici patres, et veteres Episcopi collegerunt."—Cardwell's *Synodalia*, vol. i. p. 126.

² S. Jude, ver. 3, τῆ ἀπαξ παραδοθεισῇ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει.

We have next to consider the arguments in favour of the position thus maintained in the Article.

(a) And, first, *how far can it be proved from Scripture?* It must be confessed that the texts which are sometimes quoted in support of the "sufficiency of Holy Scripture" are in themselves extremely inconclusive, e.g. "the law of the Lord is perfect" (Ps. xix. 7); "the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation" (2 Tim. iii. 15); "if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book" (Rev. xxii. 18). Of these passages the first, if it were (as it manifestly is not) capable of being used as formal proof, would prove too much, for "the law," if taken of the written word, could not be strained to mean more than the Pentateuch. The second obviously refers only to the Old Testament, with which alone Timothy could have been familiar from his childhood; while the third has no reference to any portion of Holy Scripture, except the Apocalypse, to which it is appended. It will be wise, therefore, not to rely on isolated and detached passages in endeavouring to establish the statement of the Article, but to be content with an indirect rather than a direct scriptural proof. That Holy Scripture "contains all things necessary to salvation" is nowhere laid down directly in the Bible, but it appears to be a fair and reasonable inference from the general teaching of Scripture with regard to the final character of the revelation made in the New Testament, as well as from the fact that the Scriptures were in the providence of God committed to writing.

There are frequent indications in Scripture that the written law has a *security* which is wanting in the case of oral tradition. S. Luke's Gospel was written expressly in order that Theophilus might know *the certainty* of the things in which he had previously been orally instructed

(S. Luke i. 4). S. John's Gospel was also written for Christians who must have received much oral teaching, and yet he gives this as his reason for writing: "That ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in His name" (S. John xx. 31).

Again, the severity with which our Lord denounces the Jews for "making the word of God of none effect through their traditions," and the way in which He sets aside the accretions which they had allowed to grow up around the written law (see especially S. Mark vii. 1-13) supply us with a warning against trusting to oral tradition; while, on the other hand, the constant habit of our Lord Himself, and His apostles after Him, of appealing to the written Scriptures of the Old Covenant, using these as "proof," and commending those who "searched" them (*e.g.* the Bereans, Acts xvii. 11), leads us to conclude that, in the absence of express statement to the contrary, the same method is to be followed, now that there is committed to the care of the Church a "New Testament" corresponding to the Old.

That the revelation made in Christ was final is assumed throughout the New Testament. Had it not been so, it is hard to understand how the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews could have written the opening verses of his epistle as he did (Heb. i. 1-3), or how S. Jude could have employed the striking phrase already quoted, and have spoken of "the faith" as "*once for all* committed to the saints" (ver. 3). No writer of the New Testament ever gives us the slightest ground for looking for any further revelation. And if the final revelation was made in Christ, and the Scriptures were written for the purpose of preserving an authentic record of that revelation, it seems impossible to believe that any necessary doctrine can be omitted from them. It

has been pertinently remarked, in illustration of this, that "if a legislator desires to commit his laws to writing, in order that an authentic record of them may remain to all future times, it is not to be supposed that he will omit a portion of them. He will indeed provide some mode of interpreting and executing those laws, but he will not designedly leave any portion of them out of the record."¹

(b) Thus the teaching of the Article rests ultimately on the Scriptures themselves. But in support of it an appeal may safely be made to *the general consent of Christians and the authority of the Fathers*. That the Fathers appeal freely to tradition is undeniable, but it will be found that their appeals to it are of two kinds—(1) referring to matters of custom and ritual, where they appeal to it precisely as an Anglican would do, independently of Scripture, and (2) referring to *doctrine*, where they appeal to it not as teaching truths which are nowhere contained in Scripture, but as illustrating and determining the sense of Scripture.² While on the other hand, they constantly appeal to Scripture in such a way as to show that they regarded it as the sole ultimate source of all necessary doctrine.

Catenæ of passages from patristic writings, asserting the sufficiency of the Scriptures have been so frequently compiled, and are so easily accessible, that it is not pro-

¹ Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, pt. iii. ch. i.

² In the passages of Irenæus and Tertullian referring to the *κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*, or *regula fidei*, the allusion is not to any authority independent of Scripture, but to the Creed, which summarises the principal doctrines of Scripture (see Irenæus, I. i. III. ii-iv; Tertullian, *De Præscript.* xiii. xiv.), while the famous passage, in which Tertullian rhetorically maintains that "no appeal must be made to the Scriptures, on them no contest should be instituted," is easily explained by the fact that he was writing against heretics who perverted the Scriptures, nor does it in any way imply that tradition handed down matters of faith not contained in the Scriptures.—See *Præscript.* xix.

posed to add another to the number here. Reference is made in the footnote to standard works on the subject,¹ and it will accordingly be sufficient here to quote but two passages from representative writers of the East and West, and to add to them a striking passage from a third writer of repute, which admirably sets forth the true relation of tradition to Scripture.

Of the views of the Eastern Fathers S. Athanasius (c. A.D. 318) may be taken as the exponent, and he tells us distinctly that "the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient of themselves to the declaration of the truth."² For the West no better spokesman can be found than S. Augustine (A.D. 430). In his work *On Nature and Grace* he is compelled to reply to objections to his teaching drawn by Pelagius from quotations out of "certain treatises of Catholic writers," and in answer to this he says boldly that in writings of such authors he feels himself free to use his own judgment, "*owing unhesitating assent to nothing but the canonical Scriptures.*"³ The third quotation shall be drawn from the writings of S. Vincent of Lerins (A.D. 450), himself the author of the famous canon of truth, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.*

At the beginning of his *Commonitorium* he writes as follows: "Inquiring often with great earnestness and attention of very many excellent, holy, and learned men, how and by what means I might assuredly, and as it

¹ Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. ii. Taylor's *Dissuasive from Popery*, pt. ii. bk. i. § 2. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, pt. iii. ch. i. Browne on the *Articles*, p. 140 seq.; and cf. Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 60.

² *Adv. Gentes*, § 1: 'Ανάρκεις μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ ἀγίαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γράφαι πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.

³ *De Natura et Gratia*, ch. lxi: "Maxime quoniam me, in hujusmodi quorum libet hominum scriptis liberum (quia solis Canonicis debeo sine ulla recusatione consensum) nihil movet quod de illius scriptis, cujus nomen non ibi inveni, ille posuit," etc.

were by some general and regular way, discern the true Catholic faith from false and wicked heresy, to this question I had usually received this answer from them all, namely, that whether I or any other desired to find out the fraud of heretics daily springing up, and to escape their snares, and willingly would continue in a sound faith, himself safe and sound, he ought in two ways by God's assistance to defend and preserve his faith, namely, *by the authority of the law of God*, and secondly, *by the tradition of the Catholic Church.*

"Here some one, perhaps, may ask, seeing the canon of Scripture is perfect, and of itself most abundantly sufficient for all things, what need is there to join to it the authority of the ecclesiastical interpretation? The reason is this, that the Scripture being of itself so deep and profound, all men do not understand it in one and the same sense, but divers men diversely, this man and that man, this way and that way, expound and interpret the sayings thereof, so that to one's thinking, so many men, so many opinions almost may be gathered out of it . . . and therefore it is most necessary, because of the vagaries of errors so various, that the line of expounding the prophets and apostles be drawn according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and Catholic sense."¹

Again, at the end of the same treatise he sums up its teaching: "We said above that this has always been, and even at this day is, the custom of Catholics to try and examine the true faith by these two methods: first, by the authority of the divine canon; secondly, by the tradition of the Catholic Church; not because the canonical Scripture is not as to itself sufficient for all things, but because very many, expounding God's word at their own will, do thereby conceive divers opinions and errors. And for this cause it is necessary that the

¹ *Commonitorium*, ch. ii.

interpretation of the heavenly Scripture be directed according to the one only rule of the Church's understanding; only, be it observed, especially in those questions upon which the foundations of the whole Catholic doctrine depend."¹

These two arguments—(a) the general teaching of Scripture, its nature and end, and (b) the general consent of the Church and the authority of the Fathers are, it is believed, fully sufficient, when carefully considered and weighed, to establish the truth of the statement made in the first part of the Article, that "Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation." A few words may, however, be added on the argument, sometimes alleged, that Scripture proves its own insufficiency by its statements in the following passages:²

2 Thess. ii. 15: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions (*παράδοσεις*, Vulg. *traditiones*) which ye have been taught whether by word or our epistle."

1 Tim. vi. 20: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust" (*τὴν παραθήκην*).

2 Tim. i. 13: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me."

Acts i. 3: "Christ showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."

¹ *Commonitorium*, ch. xxix.

² Other arguments such as these, that "tradition was the original rule," and that "Scripture is obscure and liable to be misunderstood," are plainly beside the mark when the Anglican position is rightly understood. Answers to them may, however, be found in Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, pt. iii. ch. i., and Browne on the *Articles*, p. 136 seq.

St. John xxi. 25: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

In answer to the argument drawn from the occurrence of these passages in the New Testament it may be observed that the last two cited might equally well be urged on behalf of the insufficiency of tradition; since no one has ever pretended that tradition has handed down every word which our Lord uttered, or even all that He uttered during the great forty days. The passages, however, plainly do not touch the question whether the whole of revealed truth necessary to salvation has or has not been committed to writing.

With regard to the passages from the epistles, it is sufficient to point out that the short epistle in which the first of them occurs, certainly does not contain the whole truth, and the "traditions" to which the apostle refers may perfectly well be understood as comprising the main articles of faith which are committed to writing in other parts of the Scripture; while the two passages in the Epistles to Timothy evidently refer to some definite form of words or summary of the articles of faith, such as that found at a later date in the creed of the Church, but it does not in the very least follow that the doctrines contained in it are not also comprised in Holy Scripture.

There is, then, no valid argument to be drawn from Scripture itself against the position maintained in our Article; nor have any other satisfactory arguments been put forward by Romanists on behalf of the view that tradition is, apart from Scripture, a source of necessary doctrine. The following weighty words from two of the ablest Anglican divines of the first half of the present century seem to put the whole matter on its right footing, and will form a suitable close to this discussion.

1. *On the sufficiency of Scripture.*—"While it is certainly true that it was not by Scripture that these Christian truths were delivered to the churches by the apostles, nor are they ordinarily thus learnt in the first instance by any; yet in that sole inspired record, of which the Church was the early recipient and constant guardian, it is her belief and affirmation that the whole body of life-giving doctrine is essentially contained; that the Spirit of God has provided that no saving truth should be there wanting. And however some important accessory facts may have been left to be proved altogether from minor ecclesiastical sources (such as the determination of the canon of Scripture itself, the apostolic observance of Sunday as the Lord's Day, that of the Christian Pascha and Pentecost, etc.), yet with matters of doctrine, properly so called, this has never been the case; whatever claiming to be such an integral part of the faith once delivered to the saints, cannot be proved by sure warranty of the Christian Scriptures is by that circumstance alone convicted of novelty and error."¹

2. *On tradition.*—"If we mistake not the signs of the times, the period is not far distant when the whole controversy between the English and Romish Churches will be revived, and all the points in dispute again brought under review. Of these points none is more important than the question respecting tradition; and it is, therefore, most essential that they who stand forth as the defenders of the Church of England should take a correct and rational view of the subject—the view, in short, which was taken by our divines at the Reformation. Nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all tradition. They knew that in strictness of speech Scripture is tradition, written tradition. They knew that, as far as external evidence

¹ W. H. Mill, *Five Sermons on the Temptation*, Sermon i. p. 16.

is concerned, the tradition preserved in the Church is the only ground on which the genuineness of the books of Scripture can be established. . . . What our reformers opposed was the notion that men must, upon the mere authority of tradition, receive as necessary to salvation doctrines not contained in Scripture. Against this notion in general, they urged the incredibility of the supposition that the apostles, when unfolding in their writings the principles of the gospel, should have entirely omitted any doctrines essential to man's salvation. The whole tenor, indeed, of those writings, as well as of our blessed Lord's discourses, runs counter to the supposition that any truths of fundamental importance would be suffered long to rest upon so precarious a foundation as that of oral tradition. With respect to the particular doctrines, in defence of which the Roman Catholics appeal to tradition, our reformers contended that some were directly at variance with Scripture; and that others, far from being supported by an unbroken chain of tradition from the apostolic age, were of very recent origin, and utterly unknown to the early Fathers. Such was the view of this important question taken by our reformers. In this, as in other instances, they wisely adopted a middle course; they neither bowed submissively to the authority of tradition, nor yet rejected it altogether. We in the present day must tread in their footsteps, and imitate their moderation, if we intend to combat our Roman Catholic adversaries with success. We must be careful that, in our anxiety to avoid one extreme, we run not into the other, by adopting the extravagant language of those who, not content with ascribing a paramount authority to the written word on all points pertaining to eternal salvation, talk as if the Bible—and that, too, the Bible in our English translation—were, independently of all external aids and evidence, sufficient to prove its

own genuineness and inspiration, and to be its own interpreter."¹

II. *The Canon of Holy Scripture.*

There are so many different topics claiming attention under this head that it will be convenient to subdivide it and consider the following points separately:—

- (a) The meaning of the terms canon and canonical.
- (b) The method of determining what books are canonical.
- (c) The question at issue between England and Rome concerning the canon of the Old Testament.
- (d) The canon of the New Testament.

(a) *The meaning of the terms canon and canonical.*—The Greek word *κάνων* means primarily a straight rod, and so generally a carpenter's rule. Hence it is applied metaphorically, like the Latin *regula* and *norma* to anything which serves to regulate or determine other things, *i.e.* a rule or standard. In this sense it is used by S. Paul in 2 Cor. x. 13, 15, 16 and Gal. vi. 16,² as by other early Christian writers, such as S. Clement of Rome.³ But it very soon came to have a definite meaning stamped upon it in the Church as the "rule of truth or faith" (*ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, τῆς πίστεως*),⁴ *i.e.* that by which the faith of Christians was regulated, the standard by which their orthodoxy was measured; and so it is applied especially to the creed as containing this rule or standard. From this the transition is natural to that use of the word which is very familiar to us in the expression

¹ Bishop Kaye, *Tertullian*, pp. 299–304.

² In Phil. iii. 16 it is an interpolation. In the Septuagint the word is only found three times, namely, in Micah vii. 4; Judith xiii. 6; 4 Maccabees, vii. 21; Aquila has it also in Job xxxviii. 5; Ps. xviii. (xix.) 5.

³ Clem. Rom. *Ad Cor.* i. i. vii. xli.

⁴ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. p. 676; Tertullian, *regula* (= *κάνων*); *De Monog.* ii.; *Apol.* xlvi. etc.

"Canons of Councils," namely, decisions on particular points which were thus ruled by the Church. The substantive *κάνων* being so used, the adjective *κανονικός* and the verb *κανονίζειν* also came into familiar use in connection with what was so ruled. And it is in these derivatives that we meet with the earliest application of the word to the Scriptures, the books of which are spoken of by so early a writer as Origen, if we may trust the Latin translation of his works, as *Scripturæ Canonice*, *Canonizatae Scripturæ*, and *Libri Canonizati*,¹ *i.e.* the books which have been admitted by rule. Not till towards the close of the fourth century does the substantive "canon" occur of the Holy Scriptures, but from its appearance then, in a number of different writers, it must already have been a recognised term for some little time. The earliest instance of its occurrence that has been traced is in the catalogue of the Scriptures by Amphilochius (*circa* 380). After giving a list of the books this writer proceeds to say, "This would be the most unerring rule (*κάνων*) of the inspired Scriptures,"² *i.e.* the standard or measure by which all books claiming divine authority might be tested. Hence the word came to be used of the whole collection of books thus admitted by rule—the books accepted by the Church were said to be "in the canon." So the phrase is used by Rufinus³ and other writers of the close of the fourth century. And, finally, the adjective "canonical" was used no longer in a passive sense, meaning that the books were *authorised*, or *ruled to be accepted* by the Church, but rather in an active sense, of the same books, regarded as *authoritative*, or *giving the rule of faith*, the sense in which the term is

¹ Origen, *De Principiis*, iv. 33; *Com. in Matt.* § 28 *cf.* § 117. The phrase *haberi in canone* also occurs in the Latin translation (*Prol. in Cant.*), but it is thought to be only the translator's version of *κανονισθαι*.

² Amphiloch. vii.

³ Rufinus in *Symb. Apost.* § 37.

familiarly used by us when we speak of a book as "canonical"—the "canonical books" being those books to which the ultimate appeal lies in matters of necessary doctrine, and the "Canon of Scripture" representing the collection of such books, It is probably owing to their use in the writings of Jerome and Augustine¹ that both terms "canon" and "canonical" passed into the common language of Western Christendom.²

(b) *The method of determining what books are canonical.*
—On this matter the language of the Article is perfectly clear. **In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.** The Church of England appeals to the historical evidence of reception by the visible Church, which, as Article XX. states, is "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ." This method of determining the canonicity of the books is in complete accordance with the general appeal which the Church of England makes to antiquity. It stands in sharp contrast to the method adopted by most of the Protestant communities in the sixteenth century, who preferred to base their acceptance of the books of Scripture on the "inner witness of the Spirit,"³ a witness which, however comforting and assuring to the believer who is conscious of

¹ Jerome, *Præf. in Libr. Salom. Prol. Galeatus*; cf. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*. xvii. 24; xviii. 38.

² See on this subject Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, p. 110, and Bishop Ellicott's *New Testament for English Readers*, vol. i. p. xii.

³ See the *Gallie Confession*, Art. iv. : "Nous connoissons ces livres estre canoniques et reigle tres certaine de nostre Foy non tant par le commun accord et consentement de l'Eglise, que par le tesmoionage et intérieure persuasion du S. Esprit, qui les nous fait discerner d'avec les autres livres Ecclésiastiques, sur lesquels (encore qu'il soyent utiles) on ne peut fonder aucun Article de Foy." So the *Belgie Confession*, ch. v. : "Hos libros solos recipimus tanquam sacros et canonicos, quibus fides nostra inniti, confirmari et stabiliri possit. Itaque absque ulla dubitatione ea omnia

feeling it in himself, is yet scarcely likely to convince any who still need convincing, and which is practically useless as a test for deciding what books are to be accounted canonical. Indeed, as Alford points out, "any reasoning must be not only in itself insufficient, but logically unsound, which makes the authority of a book which is to set us our standard of doctrine, the result of a judgment of our own respecting the doctrine inculcated in it."¹

But the question may be, and has been, raised, How does this appeal to the authority of the Church in settling what is Holy Scripture agree with the teaching of the Article itself that Holy Scripture "contains all things necessary to salvation?" The question was one which was apparently often put to the Anglican apologists in the sixteenth century. Accordingly, it is touched upon by Hooker in the first book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. "It may be, and oftentimes hath been, demanded, how the books of Holy Scripture contain in them all necessary things, when, of things necessary, the very chiefest is to know what books we are bound to esteem holy; which point is confessed impossible for Scripture to teach." The question thus fairly proposed by Hooker is by him as fairly answered. After pointing out that in every art or science *something* must be taken for granted to start with, he proceeds as follows:—"Albeit Scripture do profess to contain in it all things which are necessary to salvation; yet the meaning cannot be simply of all things which are necessary, but all things that are necessary in some certain kind or form; as all things which are neces-

credimus, quæ in illis continentur. Idque non tam quod ecclesia illos pro canonicis recipiat et comprobet; quam quod Spiritus Sanctus nostris conscientiis testetur illos a Deo emanasse; et eo maxime quod ipsi etiam per se sacram hanc suam auctoritatem et sanctitatem testentur atque comprobent; quum et ipsi cæciorum omnium, quæ in illis scriptis prædictæ fuerunt, implementationem et executionem clare conspiciere et veluti sensibus percipere possint."

¹ *Greek Testament*, vol. iv. p. 85.

sary, and either could not at all or could not easily be known by the light of natural discourse; all things which are necessary to be known that we may be saved; but known with presupposal of knowledge concerning certain principles whereof it receiveth us already persuaded, and then instructeth us in all the residue that are necessary. In the number of these principles one is the sacred authority of Scripture. *Being therefore persuaded by other means that these Scriptures are the oracles of God, themselves do then teach us the rest, and lay before us all the duties which God requireth at our hands as necessary to salvation.*"¹

In other words, while Holy Scripture contains everything essential that is a matter of revelation, in order to discover in what books this revelation is contained we have recourse to ordinary historical evidence, and inquire what books have been accepted without doubt by the Church.

(c) *The question at issue between England and Rome concerning the canon of the Old Testament.*—Of the canonical books of the Old Testament, the Article gives a complete list. There is, therefore, no room for doubt what is the mind of the Church of England on this point. For the view taken by the Roman Church, the decree of the Council of Trent is equally explicit. After the passage with regard to the authority of Scripture and tradition already cited, the decree proceeds to say that "it has been thought meet that a catalogue of the sacred books be inserted in this decree, lest doubt should arise in anyone's mind as to which are the books received by the Synod." [Then follows the list, including Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, First and Second Maccabees.] "But if anyone receive not, as sacred and canonical, these same books *entire with all their parts*, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and *as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition*, and knowingly

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. I. ch. xiv. § 1.

and deliberately despise the traditions aforesaid, let him be anathema." The words placed in italics show us that we are intended to add to the books counted as canonical by the Church of Rome those additions to the books of Esther and Daniel which are found in the Septuagint and Vulgate, but which, as having no place in the Hebrew text, are relegated to a position in the Apocrypha by the Church of England, under the titles of The Rest of the Book of Esther, Bel and the Dragon, The Story of Susanna, and the Song of the Three Children.

Here, then, is a clear and decided difference between England and Rome, the latter counting as canonical almost all those books which the Church of England uses "for example of life and instruction of manners," but refuses to "apply them to establish any doctrine."

The origin of this difference lies far back, and must be sought in the Greek version of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, to which were appended various books (some translations from the Hebrew, others originally written in Greek), which were certainly not regarded as sacred by the Jews of Palestine, and probably not even by those of the dispersion. That the Jewish Church has never admitted into the canon those books to which we refuse a place in it, may be proved with abundant evidence. Josephus (A.D. 70), who is our earliest direct witness on the subject, reckons up the "two and twenty books which are justly believed to be divine; five books of Moses, thirteen of the prophets extending to the reign of Artaxerxes, and four which contain hymns and directions of life";¹ while of later books he says that they are not esteemed worthy of the same credit, "because the accurate succession of the prophets was not preserved." The witness of the Talmud (A.D. 500) is to the same

¹ *Contra Apion*. I, § 8. The thirteen prophets must be Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, *Chronicles*, *Ezra with Nehemiah*, *Esther*, *Job*,

effect,¹ while Philo supplies indirect evidence that the Jews of the dispersion agreed with their brethren in Palestine in this matter.² In the New Testament, though there are occasionally striking coincidences of language and thought with some of the books of the Apocrypha, yet there is not a single direct and acknowledged quotation from any one of them, while quotations from, and references to, almost all the books of the Hebrew canon abound.³ Against this there is nothing to be set on the other side, and so we may conclude that there can be no reasonable doubt that at the beginning of the Christian era the Jewish canon contained the same books which it does at the present day, namely, those enumerated as canonical in our Articles, and none others.⁴

In the Christian Church our earliest witnesses all point to this list, and to this alone, as formally and distinctly recognised. But at the same time it needs very little

Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, *Daniel*, and the minor prophets. The four others are Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. Other Jewish authorities generally reckon those in italics not among the prophets, but among the "Hagiographa," the third class of Josephus.

¹ *Baba Bathra*, fol. 14b.

² "His language shows that he was acquainted with the Apocryphal books, and yet he does not make a single quotation from them, though they offered much that was favourable to his views. On the other hand, in addition to the law, he quotes all the books of 'the prophets,' and the Psalms and Proverbs from the Hagiographa, and several of them with clear assertions of their 'prophetic' or inspired character. Of the remaining Hagiographa (*Nehemiah*, *Ruth*, *Lamentations*, *First and Second Chronicles*, *Daniel*, *Ecclesiastes*, *Canticles*) he makes no mention, but the first three may have been attached, as often in Hebrew usage, to other books (*Ezra*, *Judges*, *Jeremiah*), so that four writings alone are unattested by him."—Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 504 (Ed. 2).

³ The only books of the Old Testament to which the New gives no direct attestation are *Ecclesiastes*, *Canticles*, *Esther*, *Ezra*, and *Nehemiah*.

⁴ For the history of the gradual growth of the Jewish canon, and of the doubts which existed in early days among Jewish doctors as to the canonicity of a few of the books, namely, *Esther*, *Canticles*, and *Ecclesiastes*, reference may be made to Professor Ryle's *History of the Canon of the Old Testament*. Cf. also the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 503.

research to discover that quotations from the Apocrypha are abundant in the writings of the Fathers, from the earliest days. This, however, is easily accounted for. The Fathers were, with scarcely an exception, ignorant of Hebrew, and dependent on the Septuagint Version for their knowledge of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. In this version, as we have seen, the books of the Apocrypha found a place. It was, therefore, only natural that the Fathers should fall into the habit of employing and quoting all the books in the collection with which they were familiar, and thus should gradually lose their sense of the distinction between the books of the Hebrew canon and the additions of the Septuagint. The "old Latin version" was made from the Septuagint, and consequently included the additional books. Hence the confusion passed over into the Western Church. But in spite of this growing recognition of the books of the Apocrypha, and the popular use of them, it remains that during the first four centuries every Father who gives a deliberate judgment on the subject, and has the slightest claim to occupy a representative position, accepts the Hebrew canon alone. In its behalf may be quoted the testimony of the Syriac (*Peschito*) version which is limited to the books of the Hebrew canon; the witness of Melito of Sardis (A.D. 180), who made the number of the books of the canon a subject of special inquiry;¹ Origen (220);² Cyril of Jerusalem (348);³

¹ See Eusebius, *H. E.* IV. xxvi. Melito does not mention *Esther* separately, but the suggestion has been made that it may have been reckoned with *Ezra*, as *Nehemiah* almost certainly was. See *Routh, Reliquiæ Sacrae*, vol. i. p. 136.

² See Eusebius, *H. E.* IV. xxv. Origen gives the Hebrew canon exactly as we have it.

³ *Catech.* iv. § 35. Cyril includes *Baruch* in the canon, taking it as an appendix to *Jeremiah*; otherwise his list of the Old Testament coincides exactly with our own.

Athanasius (367);¹ Gregory Nazianzen (390)² in the East; and of Hilary of Poitiers (368);³ Rufinus (390)⁴ and Jerome (430)⁵ in the West. Especially important is the testimony of the last-mentioned writer. He gives a complete and accurate list exactly coinciding with our own, and ends by saying, "Whatever is without the number of these must be placed among the Apocrypha."⁶ Contemporary with Jerome was Augustine, and it is to his varying and uncertain language that the claim of the Apocrypha to be ranked as canonical must be traced. Not only does he freely quote (as others had done before him) books of the Apocrypha as Scripture, but (as others had *not* done before him) when formally enumerating the books contained in the canon of Scripture he includes these books among them without drawing any clear distinction between them,⁷ although else-

¹ *Festal Epistles*, No. xxxix. Like Cyril, Athanasius includes Baruch, but he expressly excludes Esther from a place among the canonical books.

² *Carmina*, xii. 13. Esther is not mentioned in this list.

³ *Prologus in Psalmos*, § 15. Hilary's list is identical with our own, though he mentions that some added to it the books of Tobit and Judith.

⁴ In *Symbolum Apostolorum*, § 37. The list is exactly the same as ours, and expressly says that Tobit, Judith, etc., are "not canonical, but ecclesiastical."

⁵ *Prologus Galeatus*.

⁶ No reference is made in the text to the Fifty-ninth canon of the Council of Laodiceæ (A.D. 363), which is often quoted as determining the canon of Scripture; because there appear to be very strong grounds for questioning the genuineness of that part of the decree which contains the list of the books. See Westcott *On the Canon*, p. 498. Hefele, however, accepts it as genuine (*History of the Councils*, vol. ii. p. 322 *seq.*, English translation). The list given in it is, however, exactly the same as our own. It ought to be added that many of the authorities quoted in the previous notes as accepting the Hebrew canon rather than the enlarged one of the Septuagint as authoritative, yet make use of the other books, and cite them from time to time as Scripture. This was under the circumstances only natural, and the same thing is equally true of our reformers. Habit and custom were often too strong for them. Hence the Apocrypha is freely quoted as "Scripture" and "the word of God" in the Homilies, and yet distinctly separated off from the canonical books of Scripture in the article.

⁷ *De Doctrina Christiana* II. viii. : Totus autem Canon Scripturarum

where he seems occasionally to use language which implies that he recognised a distinction;¹ from which it has been inferred that possibly he really differed from Jerome only in language. Be this as it may, there is no doubt that the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), at which Augustine himself is thought to have been present, recognised and adopted the enlarged canon of the Septuagint, including

. . . his libris continetur; quinque Moyseos, id est Genesi, Exodo, Levitico, Numeris, Deuteronomio; et uno libro Jesu Nave, uno Judicum, uno libello qui adpellatur Ruth, qui magis ad Regnorum principium videtur pertinere; deinde quatuor Regnorum, et duobus Paralipomenon, non consequentibus sed quasi a latere adjunctis, simulque pergentibus. Hæc est historia quæ sibimet adnexa tempora continet atque ordinem rerum. Sunt aliæ tanquam ex diverso ordine, quæ neque huic ordini neque inter se connectuntur, sicut est Job et Tobias, et Esther, et Judith et Machabæorum libri duo, et Esdræ duo, qui magis subsequi videntur ordinatam illam historiam usque ad Regnorum vel Paralipomenon terminatam. Deinde Prophetæ, in quibus David unus liber Psalmorum, et Salomonis tres: Proverbiorum, Cantica Canticorum, et Ecclesiastes. Nam illi duo libri, unus qui *Sapientia*, et alius qui *Ecclesiasticus* inscribitur, de quadam similitudine Salomonis esse dicuntur; nam Jesus Sirach eos conscripsisse constantissime perhibetur; qui tamen, quoniam in auctoritatem recipi meruerunt, inter propheticos numerandi sunt. Reliqui sunt eorum libri qui proprie prophetæ adpellantur duodecim prophetarum libri singuli, qui connexi sibimet, quoniam nunquam sejuncti sunt, pro uno habentur, quorum prophetarum nomina sunt hæc: Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michæas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachi; deinde quatuor prophetæ sunt majorum voluminum: Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Ezekiel. His quadraginta quatuor libris testamenti veteris terminatur auctoritas." The books of the Apocrypha are italicised in this list. It will be noticed that there is no mention of Baruch. This probably does not indicate rejection, but may be accounted for by supposing that it was reckoned along with Jeremiah. Cf. *De Civitate Dei*, xviii. 33, c. *Faustum*, xii. 43.

¹ In *Contra Gaudentium*, i. 38, Augustine speaks of the books of the Maccabees "as received by the Church not without profit, if they be read with sobriety." In the *De Civitate Dei*, xviii. 36, he says that a reckoning is found "not in the Holy Scriptures which are called canonical, but in others, among which are also the books of the Maccabees—which the Church and not the Jews account canonical, on account of the wonderful sufferings of the martyrs, etc." He thus draws a distinction between the books recognised by both the Jewish and the Christian Church, and those held in honour by the Christians only. Cf. *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 505.

the books of the Apocrypha.¹ The same is true of the decretals which bear the names of Innocent, Damasus, and Gelasius, and of many later writers, so that it may fairly be said that from the fifth century onwards, at least in the Western Church, the distinction between the two classes of books was generally obliterated. Nevertheless it has been pointed out with truth that in spite of this wide recognition of the Apocrypha as canonical "a continuous succession of the more learned fathers in the West maintained the distinctive authority of the Hebrew canon up to the period of the Reformation," and "repeat with approval the decision of Jerome, and draw a clear line between the canonical and apocryphal books."² It was thus reserved for the Council of Trent in 1546 to decide finally against this continuous stream of testimony, and, in giving its verdict against all the more critical of the Fathers, to stereotype the confusion which could never have arisen except in an age devoid of the first principles of criticism.³

It is remarkable that notwithstanding the decision of the Council of Trent taken so early to include the Apocrypha among the canonical books, Cranmer was content

¹ *Conc. Carth.* iii. Canon xxxix., repeating the decree of the Council of Hippo, A.D. 393. See Hefele, *History of Councils*, vol. ii. p. 400, English Translation.

² Bp. Westcott in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 507 (Ed. 2). The whole article should be consulted. Among the later writers who are there noted as drawing a distinction between the canonical books and the Apocrypha are S. Gregory the Great, Bede, Nicholaus de Lyra, Cajetan, and Ximenes. The last mentioned in the preface to the great *Complutensian Polyglot*, published in 1517, describes the books of which he can only print a Greek and not a Hebrew text, as "the books outside the canon, which the Church receives rather for the edification of the people than to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas."

³ Of the distinction which is drawn by some Roman divines between Protocanonical and Deuterocanonical books, the latter having only an ethical authority, there is not the shadow of a trace in the Tridentine decree.

to issue the Anglican Articles in 1553 without any reference whatever to the question, for the list of books was, as has been already mentioned, not inserted until the revision by Parker in Elizabeth's reign. The omission in the earlier series is not easy to account for. That it cannot have been due to any hesitation felt by the Reformers is shown by the separation of the Apocrypha from the other books in the English Bibles published in the reign of Henry VIII. They are so separated in the edition of Coverdale (1535), and in the "Great Bible" of Cranmer (1539, 1540), and in both are described as "Apocrypha," for though the latter, by a curious blunder, has "Hagiographa" on the title-page of the section containing them, yet the running heading at the top of each page is "Apocrypha." Moreover, the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* devotes a section to the subject, and carefully distinguishes them from the books of the Hebrew canon, styling them "sacred but not canonical," assigning to them the very same position which was subsequently given to them in the Articles.¹

It may be well to add a few words on the view taken by the Eastern Church on the canon of the Old Testament, although it is by no means clear what is binding on members of that communion, owing partly to the absence of authoritative symbolical books, and partly to the fact that conflicting judgments on this subject may be quoted. The Confession of Cyril Lucar in the seven-

¹ *Ref. Legum Eccl.* "De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," ch. 7. *Libri sacri non tamen Canonici.* Liber vero qui Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur, Ecclesiasticus, item Judith, Tobias, Baruch, tertius et quartus Esdræ, libri Machabæorum, cum Apocryphis Hester et Danielis, leguntur quidem a fidelibus et in ecclesia recitantur, quod ad ædificationem plebis plurima in illis valeant, quibus tamen non tantum autoritatis tribuitur, ut fidei nostre dogmata ex ipsis solis et separatim citra alios indubitata Scripturæ locos constitui, constabilirique, vel possint, vel debeant. Sunt ergo et cum iudicio et sobrie isti tum audiendi tum legendi.

teenth century assigns an inferior rank to the additions of the Septuagint, and the same view is taken in the Confession of Metrophanes Critopulus put forth in 1625, especially for the information of the reformed bodies. "As to the other books which some would combine together with Holy Scripture, such as Tobit and the like, we do not hold that they are to be rejected, for they contain much that is moral and worthy of all praise. But as canonical and authentic they were not formerly received by the Church of Christ . . . wherefore we do not seek to establish our dogmas by them, but from the three and thirty canonical and authentic books which we call the inspired and Holy Scripture."¹ This judgment is repeated with approval by later writers, and probably represents the general opinion in the Greek Church; but on the other hand the Synod of Jerusalem (A.D. 1672), held "against the Calvinists," and violently hostile to Cyril Lucar, pronounced that the books which he had foolishly, ignorantly, or maliciously called Apocrypha, were to be received with the other genuine books of Holy Scripture, and to be acknowledged as "Canonical and Holy Scripture."²

The "Longer Catechism of the Russian Church" follows S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Athanasius, and S. John Damascene, in adopting the Hebrew canon, quoting S. Athanasius expressly as saying that the books which "do not exist in the Hebrew" are "appointed by the Fathers to be read by proselytes who are preparing for admission into the Church";³ and we are told that "the officially-printed Russian Bibles contain the apocryphal

¹ Metrophanes Critopulus, *Confessio*. ch. vii., quoted in Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 61.

² *Synodus Hierosolymitanus, Dosithei Confessio*, Q. 3. Kimmel, *Libri Symbolici*, p. 467.

³ *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, translated by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, p. 38.

books, with a note to the effect that they are taken from the Greek version or are not found in the Hebrew text."¹

(d.) *The canon of the New Testament*.—It is obvious that in the very limited space which alone can be devoted to the subject in a work of this character, it is impossible to do more than give the briefest summary of the evidence which has led the Church to accept the canon of the New Testament as it has come down to us. Fuller details must be sought in such works as Bishop Westcott's *History of the Canon of the New Testament*, or Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*. All that can be attempted here is to indicate the main outlines of the evidence, which may be summed up under four different heads, namely, the witness of (1) MSS., (2) Versions, (3) formal catalogues of the books, and (4) citations in early ecclesiastical writers. These four distinct branches of evidence all combine to establish the fact that the books of the New Testament, which we receive to-day, have come down to us from the days of the apostles; that, with the partial exceptions noted below, they have been recognised as sacred by the Church from the beginning; and that in very early days they were formed into a definite collection, so as to constitute a "New Testament" corresponding to the "Old."

1. **Manuscripts.**—The total number of manuscripts of the Greek Testament that are known to exist and have been examined with more or less care, amounts to something like twelve hundred. They are divided into two classes, known respectively as "uncial" and "cursives." The former class, written in capital letters, comprises all the more ancient among them, ranging from the fourth to the tenth century. The "cursives" are written in a small running hand, which began to come into use about the ninth century, and include the great

¹ *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 510.

bulk of the existing MSS. from that date to the sixteenth.

The oldest MSS. are the four great Bibles of the fourth and fifth centuries, containing the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, as well as the original Greek of the New. These are known to scholars under the following titles:—

i. *Codex Vaticanus* (B), in the Vatican Library at Rome, containing all the books of the New Testament except the later chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon, and the Revelation of S. John.

ii. *Codex Sinaiticus* (א), discovered by Tischendorf in the convent of S. Catherine at Mount Sinai in 1859, now at St. Petersburg. This contains all the books of the New Testament without exception.

Both of these MSS. are unhesitatingly assigned to the middle of the fourth century.

iii. *Codex Alexandrinus* (A), in the British Museum. This, like the Sinaitic MS., contains every book of the New Testament, though several leaves are wanting at the beginning of S. Matthew's Gospel, as well as two or three in other parts of the volume.

iv. *Codex Ephraemi* (C), at Paris. This MS., in which the works of an eastern Father, Ephraem the Syrian, have been written over the Greek text of the Scriptures, is in a very fragmentary condition; but sufficient remains to show us that it also originally contained the whole New Testament. Together with *Codex Alexandrinus* it is set down as belonging to the fifth century.

Of later MSS. there is no need to give any account here. While to the textual critic many of them are of the highest value, they can scarcely be said to add materially to the evidence for the point that is here under consideration. But the existence of these four MSS. just enumerated is of itself sufficient to establish the existence

of the New Testament as a collected whole—a definite Canon—placed on a footing of equal authority with the Old Testament, some time before the date to which the earliest of them is assigned. And it may be added that the fact that there are such a number of MSS. remaining, many of them belonging to an early date, enables us to place far greater reliance on the correctness of the text of the New Testament than we can do on the text of any of the great classical writers of antiquity, whose works often rest on the evidence of one or two MSS., and those of a comparatively recent date.

2. **Versions.**—While the MSS. of the Greek Testament thus testify to the existence of the collection before the middle of the fourth century, we are enabled, by the aid of the versions, to prove its acceptance by the Church some two centuries earlier still. For we find that before the second century had come to a close the books of the New Testament had been already translated into the vernacular in more than one country. The two oldest and most important versions or translations known to us are the Old Latin and the Syriac. Of these the former was in use in North Africa, probably in the days of Tertullian (A.D. 200), and certainly a considerable time before the days of S. Cyprian, by whom it is frequently quoted some fifty years later. It is, perhaps, scarcely correct to speak of the Old Latin as a single version. The MSS. of it which remain fall into distinct groups, from which scholars have concluded that besides the African text, used by Cyprian and others, there was another current, generally known as the European, which may have been originally an *independent* version.¹ Should

¹ From the European was probably formed the Italic, the third form in which the Old Latin is known to us. On these versions and their relation to each other see Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, vol. ii. ch. iii. (Ed. 4)

this prove to be correct it will supply us with a fresh evidence to the existence and widespread use of the books of the New Testament in early days.

No *complete* Old Latin version remains to us. It has come down in a partial and fragmentary form in the existing MSS.; but enough remains to enable us to state with certainty that the version contained all the books of our present canon, except the Second Epistle of S. Peter, and (at least in the first instance) the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Still older, perhaps, than the Old Latin is the original Syriac translation. The Peshito or Simple version is the Vulgate of the Syriac Church, and of itself can claim a high antiquity, although its actual date in the revised form in which it has come down to us is hard to determine. It has been placed by some scholars as early as the end of the second century; by others some time later. But portions of a still more ancient Syriac version have lately come to light. In 1842 a few fragments of a MS. of the fifth century were brought to England, and found to contain a limited number of passages from each of the four Gospels in a Syriac translation, different from that previously known. These were edited by Dr. Cureton, from whom the version is known as the Curetonian Syriac. It is thought to contain an older unrevised text, and to be *not later than the middle of the second century*. Since Cureton's day a second MS. of a recension of the same version has been discovered at Mount Sinai,¹ which, happily, contains the whole of the Gospels. Whether this oldest Syriac version ever contained more than this it is impossible at present to determine. But in its revised form in the Peshito the canon of the Syriac Church comprises the

¹ In 1892 by Mrs. Lewis, by whom an English translation of the Gospels has been published (1894).

whole of the New Testament except 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse.

A third group of versions must also be mentioned, namely, the Egyptian. Of these there are various forms known to us, now generally termed "Boharic," "Sahidic" (or "Thebaic"), and "Bashmuric," as well as fragments in other dialects. The early history of these is very obscure, but it has been said by a competent authority that we "should probably not be exaggerating if we placed one or both the Egyptian versions, the Boharic and Sahidic, or at least parts of them before the close of the second century."¹ Nor is there room for doubt that these versions contained the whole of the books of our present canon with the exception of the Apocalypse.

3. Catalogues.—Besides MSS. and versions, a third important branch of evidence is furnished by the formal lists of the books of Scripture drawn up in the early centuries. Of these several have come down to us from the fourth century, when the canon of Scripture was made a special subject of inquiry and was finally settled in the Church. The list of the books of the New Testament, exactly as we have them at present, was definitely ratified at the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397).² The catalogues given by Rufinus³ (390) in Italy, by Gregory Nazianzen⁴ (389) and Amphilocheus⁵ (*circa* 380) in Asia Minor, by Athanasius⁶ (367) in Alexandria, and Cyril of Jerusalem⁷ (348) in Palestine supply further evidence reaching back to the first half of the same century. In these the only book concerning the acceptance of which there is any hesitation expressed is the Apocalypse. While it is definitely recognised as canon-

¹ Scrivener, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 93.

² *Conc. Carth.* Canon xxxix.

³ *Carmina*, § 1, xii. 5.

⁴ *Ep. Fest.* xxxix.

⁵ *In Symb.* § 37.

⁶ *Ad Seleuch.*

⁷ *Catech.* iv. 36.

ical by Rufinus and Athanasius, it is passed over in silence by Cyril,¹ and expressly rejected by Gregory Nazianzen and Amphilochius.

For the earlier part of the fourth century we have a still more important witness in the list of the books given by Eusebius in the third book of his *Ecclesiastical History*,² in which he sums up the results of his investigation on the subject of the canon. In this he tells us that all the books for which any claim to divine authority has been made may broadly be divided into two classes—(1) the acknowledged books (*ὁμολογούμενα*), and (2) those which were disputed (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*). In the first class (which he elsewhere describes as “canonical and acknowledged”)³ he places the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of S. Paul, the First Epistle of S. Peter, and the First of S. John, and (with some hesitation) the Apocalypse. In the second class he finds it necessary to make a subdivision. (a) Some of the disputed books, or Antilegomena, were nevertheless “recognised by most,” and these form a separate class, including the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude, 2 and 3 John, and 2 Peter. (b) The remaining Antilegomena are set aside as spurious (*νόθα*), e.g. the Acts of Paul, the Pastor of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the so-called “Teaching of the Apostles,” and the Revelation of S. John, “which some reject, but others class with the acknowledged books.” Nothing is said expressly in this passage concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews. But as there is no mention of it among the disputed books it may be supposed to be included among the Epistles of S. Paul,

¹ As it is also in the list appended to the fifty-ninth canon of the Council of Laodicea.

² Eusebius, *H. E.* III. xxv.

³ III. iii. περὶ τῶν ἐκδηθῆκων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων.

as it apparently is in an earlier chapter of the same book,¹ although elsewhere it is spoken of as one of the Antilegomena.²

The importance of this passage of Eusebius can hardly be exaggerated. Eusebius had made the reception of the various books of the New Testament a subject of special inquiry; and the outcome of his researches was that he was aware of no doubts whatever as to the genuineness and authenticity of the great bulk of the books which have come down to us. Concerning *seven* books only, were doubts expressed by some of the authors whom he consulted. But for all these he was able to quote testimonies from earlier writers, and his deliberate judgment concerning them was that they were generally known and recognised.

There appear to be no formal catalogues of the Scriptures belonging to the third century. But of a second century list one precious fragment remains. It is commonly known as the “Muratorian Fragment on the Canon,” from its discoverer and first editor, Muratori.³ Its date, which is fixed by internal evidence, must be placed in the latter part of the *second* century.⁴ The beginning of the document is unfortunately lost, and in other parts it appears to be mutilated. But that if we possessed it entire we should find that the Gospels according to S. Matthew and S. Mark were recognised

¹ III. iii. “Paul’s fourteen epistles are well-known and undisputed (*πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφείς*). It is not, indeed, right to ignore the fact that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it was disputed (*ἀντιλέγεσθαι*) by the Church of Rome, on the ground that it was not written by Paul.”

² *H. E.* VI. xiii.

³ The fragment is printed in Westcott’s *History of the Canon*, Appendix C, and in Routh’s *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. i. p. 393.

⁴ Dr. Salmon seems to stand alone in assigning it to the *third* century, see the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. p. 1002.

there can be no reasonable doubt—for the opening sentences of what remains assign the *third* place to the Gospel of S. Luke, and the *fourth* to that of S. John. Besides these the fragment mentions the Acts of the Apostles; thirteen Epistles of S. Paul; the Epistle of S. Jude; two (or three)¹ Epistles of S. John; the Apocalypses of John and Peter, “which last some will not have read in the Church.” There is no mention in the fragment of the Epistles of S. Peter, the Epistle of S. James, or (apparently) of that to the Hebrews.² But as the MS is only a fragment, no great stress can be laid on these omissions, and we may feel sure that in its original form it must at least have included the *first* Epistle of S. Peter, as we never hear of doubts expressed elsewhere concerning the reception of this.

This is the earliest catalogue of the Scriptures that has come down to us. It proves conclusively two things—*first*, that before the close of the second century a definite canon of the New Testament had been formed; and, *secondly*, that this was substantially the same as our own, although, as we have seen, so late as the fourth century, some hesitation was felt in various quarters concerning the canonicity of a limited number of the books.

4. Citations in early writers.—In order (1) to bridge over the interval between the latter part of the

¹ “Though only two Epistles of John are here mentioned, the opening sentence of the First Epistle has been quoted in the paragraph treating of the Gospel; and it is possible that our writer may have read that epistle as a kind of appendix to the Gospel, and is here speaking of the other two.”—*Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. p. 1001. It is certainly hard to think that anyone could have accepted either the Second or Third Epistle without the other.

² It has been suggested that the Epistle to the Hebrews may be referred to as the Epistle to the Alexandrians, which the writer speaks of as “forged under the name of Paul, bearing on” (or “in the interest of”) “the heresy of Marcion.”

second century and the apostolic age, and also (2) to establish the genuineness of the “Antilegomena” recourse must be had to the fourth branch of evidence.

To the same age as the writer of the Muratorian fragment belong Tertullian and Irenæus; both of whom bear witness to the acceptance by the Church of a definite “canon” of Scripture.¹ But earlier than about the year A.D. 170, although there is ample evidence of the existence of all or almost all the books, the indications of a definite *collection* of them are but slight. In this period the canon of the New Testament was only being gradually formed by the separation of the genuine and authentic writings of apostles and apostolic men from all others.

That a “fourfold gospel” was acknowledged at a comparatively early date is shown by the *Diatessaron* of Tatian (A.D. 150–160), the recent discovery of which has placed beyond dispute the fact that it was a harmony of our four canonical Gospels.² Nor can there now be reasonable grounds for doubt that these four were known and used by Tatian’s master, *Justin Martyr* (140), by whom they are spoken of as the “Memoirs of the Apostles,” and said to have been written by “apostles and apostolic men.”³ To a still earlier date (*circa* 130) we are taken by the fragments which remain of the work of *Papias of Hierapolis*, one of which, preserved by Eusebius, describes the origin of Gospels attributed to Matthew and Mark, which it is only natural to identify with those which

¹ On the evidence of Tertullian and Irenæus see Sanday’s *Gospels in the Second Century*, ch. xiii.

² See *The Earliest Life of our Lord*, by H. Hill; and Hemphill’s Tatian’s *Diatessaron*.

³ *Apol.* I. lxvi. lxvii.; cf. ch. xxxiii.; *Dial.* lxxxviii. c. etc. See on the evidence of Justin Martyr Westcott’s *Canon of the New Testament*, p. 86, and for proof that Justin was acquainted with the Gospel of S. John, reference may be made especially to Ezra Abbot’s *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*.

certainly passed under these names a few years later.¹

This brings us very near to the date at which the Gospels were written, and when it is added that in the writings of the apostolic Fathers and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,² there are many striking coincidences of language with passages found in all the four Gospels, we need not hesitate to set these down as proofs of their existence and acceptance by the Church, from the days of those who were themselves the pupils and companions of the apostles.

Equally clear is the witness of citations from early writers for the remainder of the books which Eusebius ranked as "acknowledged,"³ and although it is clear that

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* III. xxxix.; cf. Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 142 seq.

² S. Matt. xx. 6 is actually quoted in the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. iv., as Scripture, being quoted with the formula *ὡς γέγραπται*. There is a possible allusion to the Four Gospels in the *Pastor of Hermas*, vis. iii. 13. With S. Matt. vii. 1, 2, and S. Luke, vi. 36-38, cf. Clement of Rome, *Ad Cor.* I. xiii., *Ep. Polyc.* ch. ii.; with S. Matt. xxvi. 24, and S. Mark xiv. 21, cf. Clement of Rome, *Ad Cor.* ch. xlvi.; with S. Matt. xxvi. 44, and S. Mark xiv. 38, cf. Polycarp, ch. vii.; with S. John vi. 32, 51, 53, vii. 38, cf. Ignatius, *Ad Rom.* vii.; with S. John x. 7, *Ad Philad.* ix. The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* appears to borrow freely from S. Matthew's Gospel. It also has coincidences with S. Luke (see ch. i., ix.), and S. John.

³ From the *Acts of the Apostles* we have a clear quotation in Polycarp i., cf. Acts ii. 24; and coincidences with Clement of Rome, ch. ii. (cf. Acts xx. 35), and Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.* iii.; cf. Acts x. 41.

The *First Epistle to the Corinthians* is expressly quoted as St. Paul's by Clement of Rome (ch. xlvi.), that to the *Philippians* by Polycarp, ch. iii. In Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* ch. xii., there is a reference to "every epistle" of S. Paul's, which seems to imply a collection of them. Besides these there are numerous verbal coincidences so close as to be marked by Bishop Lightfoot as quotations. Thus for *Romans* see Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* xix.; Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* vi. x.

¹ *Corinthians*, Clement of Rome, xxxiv. Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* xvi. xviii.; *Ad Rom.* v.; *Ad Philad.* iii.; Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* iv. v. x. xi.

² *Corinthians*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* ii. vi.

Galatians, Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* xvi. Polycarp *Ad Philip.* iii. v.

the "disputed" books only gradually won their way to universal recognition, yet it is believed that the final judgment of the Church in each case was correct, and that their genuineness can be satisfactorily established both from external and from internal evidence.¹

The brief sketch which has here been given, slight as it is, will be sufficient to show the nature of the grounds on which the Church has accepted the Canon of the New Testament. It will have made it clear that the great majority of the books must have been received from the days of the apostles without question, but that *seven* were not universally received until the latter part of the fourth century. Turning now to the text of the Article to see what is said on the canon of the New Testament, we are met by a difficulty. No list of the books is given, as in the case of the Old Testament. But two distinct statements are made which it is not

Ephesians, Ignatius, *Ad Polyc.* v. Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* i. xii.

Philippians, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* ix. xiii.

Colossians, Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* x.

² *Thessalonians*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* xi.

¹ *Timothy*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* iv. xii.

² *Timothy*, *ibid.* v. ix.

Titus, Clement of Rome, ii.

¹ *Peter*, Clement of Rome, xxx. (?) Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* v. (?) Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* i. ii. v. vii. viii. x.

¹ *John*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* vii.

¹ Of the disputed books there is strong attestation to both the *Epistle to the Hebrews* and the *Epistle of S. James* in Clement of Rome. See ch. xxx. xxxvi. xliii. xlix. There are *doubtful* allusions to 2 Peter in the same epistle. For 2 and 3 John and S. Jude nothing earlier than the Muratorian Fragment can be quoted. But for the Apocalypse there is ample evidence in Justin Martyr (*Dial.* lxxxi.; cf. *Apol.* xxviii.), Hermas (Vis. ii. 4; iv. 2), and Papias (see Lightfoot, *Supernatural Religion*, p. 214). For 2 Peter the external evidence is weaker than for any other book of the New Testament. The "clear evidence begins with Origen, who, however, mentions that the epistle was doubted." See Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 332, and on the whole subject of the Genesis of the New Testament, see *ibid.* Lectures, vi. vii.

altogether easy to reconcile with each other. It is first stated that **in the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church;** and finally, at the close of the Article, there is another statement on the subject, saying that **all the books of the New Testament as they are commonly received we do receive and account canonical.** Now there is no question that at the date at which the Article was drawn up all the Antilegomena were "commonly received," and therefore to judge by the last paragraph of the Article they ought to be received now, whereas if the terms of the earlier statement be interpreted strictly they should be excluded, for most certainly doubts have been expressed concerning their authority in the Church.

It is hard to find a satisfactory explanation of this ambiguity. A suggestion has been made that it was of set purpose that the terms of the Article were not made more precise. There certainly was at that time an inclination in some quarters to form a "canon within a canon," or even to reject one or two of the books of the New Testament altogether. Luther, for instance, finding that S. James' language on justification by works was scarcely in harmony with his own theory on the subject was at one time disposed to reject this epistle,¹ while

¹ "With bold self-reliance he created a purely subjective standard for the canonicity of the Scriptures, in the character of their "teaching of Christ," and while he placed the Gospel and First Epistle of S. John, the Epistles of S. Paul to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and the First Epistle of S. Peter, in the first rank, as containing the "kernel of Christianity," he set aside the Epistles to the Hebrews, S. Jude, S. James, and the Apocalypse at the end of his version, and spoke of them, and of the remaining Antilegomena with varying degrees of disrespect, though he did not separate 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John from the other Epistles."—*Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 518. For Luther's

others among the foreign reformers were anxious to place the Antilegomena on a lower level than the rest of the books. It is possible, therefore, that the Article was left as it now stands, in order to give some latitude for subscription, so that those scholars who were led to place any of the Antilegomena on a lower level of authority might be able to shelter themselves behind the conflicting terms of the Article. "A distinction," says Bishop Westcott, "remains between the 'canonical' books, and such 'canonical books as have never been doubted in the Church,' and it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the framers of the Articles intended to leave a freedom of judgment on a point on which the greatest of the continental reformers, and even of Romish scholars (Sixtus Sen. *Biblioth.* s. ii. 1; Cajetan, *Præf. ad Epp., ad Hebr., Jac., 2, 3 John, Jude*) were divided."¹ This view is possible, but it is perhaps over-subtle, and moreover it would involve the admission that the Antilegomena, though "canonical," are not included in what the article calls "Holy Scripture," for in the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church; and it has been proposed to understand "the Church" in the clause just quoted as referring to the *Church universal*. It is on the whole true, even of the Antilegomena, that though their authority has been questioned in particular parts of the Church, yet, so far as we know, there has never been any doubt about their authority in the *Church as a whole*.²

language on the Epistle of S. James, which he actually described as a "right strawy epistle," see Huther's *Commentary on St. James* (E. T.), p. 25.

¹ *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 518.

² "Some of them, as, for instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse—have been the subject of much doubt in the East and West, as the case may be. But the article asserts that there has been no doubt

According to Eusebius they were "recognised by most" of the writers whom he consulted, and so the words of the Article might fairly be taken to cover them all.

III. *The Position of "the other Books."*

Under this head it will be well to consider separately—

(a) The meaning of the term "Apocrypha."

(b) The position assigned to the Apocrypha by the Church of England, and the arguments by which it may be supported.

(a) *The meaning of the term Apocrypha.*—The adjective ἀπόκρυφος is used in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament and in the New Testament in its ordinary classical sense of "hidden" or "secret" (see S. Luke viii. 17, Col. ii. 3, and cf. Eccles. xxiii. 19). From this meaning it was employed even in pre-Christian times by teachers who claimed a higher "esoteric" wisdom, which they embodied in secret, *i.e.* apocryphal writings.¹ The plan of embodying teaching in such "secret" books which might not be openly read and used was one against which the Church set her face from the beginning. But it was the plan adopted by many of the heretical sects, and hence the word "apocryphal" as applied to their writings rapidly came to be a word of reproach, and to denote the ideas of *spurious* and *heretical*. It has been thought that this reference of the word was facilitated by an analogous use of a Hebrew word with

about them in the Church Catholic; that is, at the very first time that the Catholic or whole Church had the opportunity of forming a judgment on the subject, it pronounced in favour of the canonical books. The Epistle to the Hebrews was doubted by the West, and the Apocalypse by the East, only while those portions of the Church investigated separately from each other, only till they compared notes, interchanged sentiments, and formed a united judgment."—J. H. Newman, in *Tract XC.* p. 6, Reprint of 1865.

¹ Cf. 2 Esdras xii. 37, 38, xiv. 44.

much the same meaning. The late Hebrew or Aramaic term *Genuzim* (= hidden) was applied by the Jews originally to the worn-out copies of the Scripture rolls, which were no longer suitable for use in the synagogue, and were therefore withdrawn and consigned to a special chamber, known as the Genizah. It thus came to denote that a book was for some cause or other unfit for public reading.¹ How far it was as a translation of *Genuzim* that Apocryphal came into familiar use in the Christian Church it is hard to say, but it is certain that during the second century it was employed as a term of reproach, as described above. In this way it is used by such early writers as Irenæus,² Tertullian,³ and Clement of Alexandria;⁴ and this sense has attached to the adjective "apocryphal" ever since, so that by the term Apocryphal Gospels are denoted the spurious Gospels forged by heretics, and rejected by the Church. This appears to be the invariable use of the word till well on in the fourth century. Before this time it was never applied to those books which were "read in the Church for example of life and instruction of manners." These were ordinarily termed Ecclesiastical, and were carefully distinguished from the discredited Apocryphal works. Rufinus writing towards the close of the fourth century describes very clearly the practice of an earlier age. After enumerating the books of the Hebrew Bible and of the New Testament, he says: "These are the books which the Fathers included in the canon, and from which they wished the assertions of our faith to be established." He then adds the following: "But you must know that

¹ See Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 105, and cf. Wildeboer, *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament*, p. 91. Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, p. 56.

² *Adv. Hær.* bk. I. ch. xiii.

³ *De Pudic.* ch. x. xx; *De Anima*, ch. ii.

⁴ *Strom.* I. xix. 69.

there are other books which were called by our ancestors not Canonical but Ecclesiastical; that is, that which is called the Wisdom of Solomon, and another which is called the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, which book is called among the Latins by the descriptive name Ecclesiasticus, by which term not the author of the book but the kind of the writing is designated. And of the same order is the Book of Tobit, and Judith, and the Books of the Maccabees. And in the New Testament, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Two Ways, and the Judgment of Peter, all of which they wished to be read indeed in Church, but not to be brought forward for confirming the authority of the faith from them. But the rest of the writings they termed Apocryphal, which they would not have read in Church."¹ In the fourth century, however, a wider meaning was given to the word "apocryphal." S. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* contents himself with a twofold division of the books—(1) the canonical ones, which alone he would have read in Church, and (2) the apocryphal ones, against which he urgently warns his hearers.² Since the canonical books, of which he gives a list, embrace only those of the Hebrew canon, it is manifest that "apocryphal" is used by him in the sense of "withdrawn from public reading," and indicates nothing as to the character of the books to which it was applied. Practically it becomes the equivalent of "non-canonical." In this use of the word Cyril is followed by S. Jerome at the end of the century. In his famous "Prologus Galeatus," the preface to his new translation of the Scriptures, he gives a list of the books of the Hebrew Canon, after which he says: "Quicquid extra hos est, *inter Apocrypha* esse ponendum. Igitur Sapientia, quæ vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu filii Syrach liber, et Judith, et Tobias,

¹ *In Symb.* § 38.

² St. Cyril, *Catech.* iv. 35.

et Pastor *non sunt in Canone.*"¹ Here, exactly as in S. Cyril, the word means nothing more than non-canonical, and includes the books which had been usually termed Ecclesiastical, as well as those spurious and rejected ones to which the term had commonly been applied. It is probably from this passage of S. Jerome that the *substantive* Apocrypha has been formed, as the title of that collection of books which the Church of England declines to regard as canonical, but reads in the Church for example of life and instruction of manners.

The following table will serve to illustrate what has been said, and will help to make clear the varying sense of the word:—

	Hebrew Books regarded by the Jews as Authoritative.	Greek Books, not regarded by the Jews as Sacred, but read publicly by the Church.	Spurious and Rejected Books.
The Early Church	Canonical	Ecclesiastical	Apocryphal
S. Jerome (after S. Cyril)	Canonical	Apocryphal	
The Church of England	Canonical	The Apocrypha	Apocryphal
The Church of Rome	Canonical		Apocryphal

(b) *The position assigned by the Church of England to the Apocrypha, and the arguments by which it may be supported.*—It will be evident from what has been

¹ There is this difference between the use of the word in Jerome and Cyril. Jerome distinctly applies it to books which *were publicly read in church*, while Cyril would apparently have none but the canonical books read, and therefore with him the term "apocryphal" very fairly corresponds to the Hebrew *Genuzim*. Cf. also the use of the word in Origen's "Letter to Africanus," *Opera*, vol. i. p. 12 seq.

already said that the position assigned to these books by the Church of England is precisely that given to them by the early Church. **“The other books (as Hierome saith), the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.** The statement of Jerome upon which this is based has been already quoted, as also the very similar language of Rufinus. The practice of the Church of England has been objected to on two opposite grounds. Romanists, who have obliterated the distinction between these books and those of the Hebrew canon, maintain that we do not assign proper honour to them. Protestants have complained that we show them too much respect. The sketch of the history of the canon of the Old Testament given in an earlier section will show the grounds upon which the practice of the Church of England may be justified as against Roman objections. Our contention is that the position which we assign to these books is identical with that given to them in the primitive Church. In reply to the objection brought from the opposite quarter we cannot do better than follow the guidance of Richard Hooker, who was called on to defend the practice of the Church against the Puritans, who wished to do away with the use of these books altogether. He meets the objection—(1) by the appeal to the practice of antiquity; (2) by showing that since we make clear that there is a real distinction between these books and the canonical ones, no confusion between the two can arise; (3) by pointing out “the divine excellency of some things in all, and of all things in certain of those Apocrypha”; and (4) by the pertinent question: “If in that which we are to read there happen by the way any clause, sentence, or speech that soundeth towards error, should the mixture of a little dross constrain the Church to deprive

herself of so much gold, rather than learn how by art and judgment to make separation of the one from the other?”¹

¹ Hooker, *Eocl. Polity*, bk. V. ch. xx. It may be added that in Hooker's day the defence of the practice of the Church was harder than it is in our own. Bel and the Dragon, and Susanna and the Elders, were scarcely edifying, nor was all of Tobit suitable for public reading in Church. That there was some ground for the Puritan objections was admitted shortly after Hooker wrote, for in the revision of the Prayer Book made after the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, Bel and the Dragon and Tobit v. vi. and viii. were omitted from the daily lessons. Most unwisely, as it seems, they were restored after the Savoy Conference in 1662, and remained in use among the daily lessons until the revision of the Lectionary in 1871. This revision materially reduced the number of lessons from the Apocrypha, and at the present day nothing is read except from Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch.

ARTICLE VII

De Veteri Testamento.

Testamentum vetus Novo contrarium non est, quandoquidem tam in veteri quam in novo, per Christum, qui unicus est mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et Homo, æterna vita humano generi est proposita. Quare male sentiunt, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt. Quanquam lex a Deo data per Mosen, quoad Cæremonias et ritus, Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus præcepta in aliqua Republica necessario recipi debeant; nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum quæ Moralia vocantur, nullus quantumvis Christianus est solutus.

Of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth: yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever, is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

THIS Article was brought into its present form by Archbishop Parker in 1563, being formed out of two separate articles of the Edwardian series.

Article VI. of that set was entitled, "The Old Testament is not to be refused." It ran as follows:—

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

Article XIX. of the same series was this: "All men are bound to keep the moral law."

"The law which was given of God by Moses, although it bind not Christian men as concerning the ceremonies and rites of the same; neither is it required that the civil precepts and orders of it should of necessity be received in any commonwealth: yet no man (be he never so perfect a Christian) is exempt and lose from the obedience of those commandments which are called moral. Wherefore they are not to be hearkened unto, who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom (they say) they have learnt such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture."

The object of the Article is evidently to condemn two opposite errors, which were current in the sixteenth century among some of the Anabaptist sects.

1. The opinions of those who rejected the Old Testament entirely, and claimed to be themselves superior to the demands of the moral law, as laid down in it. Of these Anabaptists there is a notice in a work of Alley, Bishop of Exeter, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, which aptly illustrates the language of the Article.

"Here I note only one thing, which is the temerity, ignorance, and blasphemy of certain phantastical heads, which hold that the prophets do write only to the people of the Old Testament, and that their doctrine did pertain only to their time; and would seclude all the Fathers that lived under the law from the hope of eternal salvation. And here is also a note to be gathered against them which utterly reject the Old Testament, as a book nothing necessary to the Christians which live under the gospel."¹

¹ Alley's *Poore Man's Librarie*, ii. 97, quoted in Hardwick *On the Articles*, p. 395.

2. While some of the Anabaptists thus set aside the Old Testament as unnecessary, others adopted an error of a different character, and insisted that the whole civil and ceremonial law was still a matter of divine obligation for Christians. The outcome of this was seen in the extraordinary scenes that took place soon after 1533 at Münster in Westphalia, where the Anabaptists, under John of Leyden, set up what can only be described as a parody of the Jewish commonwealth, which they termed the "New Jerusalem."¹ That the error was causing trouble in England also appears from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which it is expressly condemned, together with the entire rejection of the Old Testament.

"De iis, qui vetus Testamentum aut totum rejiciunt, aut totum exigunt. Deinde quomodo priscis temporibus Marcionitarum sordes, Valentinianorum et Manichæorum fluxerunt, et aliæ similes earum multæ fæces, a quibus vetus Testamentum ut absurdum malumque, et cum novo dissidens, repudiabatur, sic multi nostris temporibus inveniuntur, inter quos Anabaptistæ præcipue sunt collocandi, ad quos si quis vetus Testamentum alleget, illud pro abrogato jam et obsoleto penitus habent, omnia quæ in illo posita sunt ad prisca majorum nostrorum tempora referentes. Itaque nihil eorum ad nos statuunt pervenire debere. Aliorum autem contrarius est, sed ejusdem impietatis error, qui usque adeo vetus ad Testamentum adhærescunt, ut ad circumcisionem et a Mose quondam institutas ceremonias necessario nos revocent."²

The principal subjects to be considered in connection with this Article are the following:—

1. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New.

¹ See Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iii. p. 143 (Ed. Stubbs).

² *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Hæresibus*, ch. 4.

2. The old fathers did not look only for transitory promises.

3. The ceremonial and civil law of the Jews is not binding on Christians.

4. The moral law remains of lasting and universal obligation.

I. *The Old Testament is not contrary to the New.*

The statement of the Article on this subject is as follows: **The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.**

In the present day there is perhaps no probability of a revival of the view of many among the early Gnostics that the Old Testament is positively contrary to the New. Such a position could scarcely be taken up by anyone who started from the acceptance of the canon of the New Testament without mutilation. The several books of it are so interpenetrated with references and allusions to the Scriptures of the Jews, and the gospel is so manifestly built up upon the Old Dispensation that an actual contradiction between the two is almost inconceivable. But modern criticism has insisted so strongly on the inferiority of the Old Testament to the New, and has brought out into such strong relief the imperfection of the old system, that it may be well to point out that there is nothing in the Article which calls us to deny this imperfection, or to maintain that the Old Testament is not inferior to the New. The general statements made in the article were clearly never intended to decide details of criticism or to bind the clergy who sign them to a particular view of the religious development of Israel.

The principle which our Lord Himself has taught us that some things were permitted under the Old Covenant "for the hardness of men's hearts"¹ admits of a wide range of application. But if the two dispensations are both from the same God they cannot be *contrary* the one to the other. That is the main point which the Article is concerned to maintain, and room is left for whatever views the discoveries of criticism may establish or render probable as to the condition of Israel in early days, the origin of its sacred rites, and the course of its religious development.

Further, it will be noticed that the Article bases the unity of the two Testaments on the hope of redemption through the Messiah, which is common to them both. The same position is maintained in the homilies. In the "second part of the homily of faith," the writer says of the "old fathers" that "although they were not named Christian men, yet it was a Christian faith that they had; for they looked for all benefits of God the Father through the merits of His Son Jesus Christ, as we now do. This difference is between them and us; for they looked when Christ should come, and we be in the time when He is come. Therefore saith S. Augustine, 'The time is altered and changed, but not the faith. For we have both one faith in one Christ.'"²

It is impossible that this can have been intended to suggest that all the "old fathers" had a clear knowledge of the "merits of Jesus Christ." Such an assertion would be quite unwarrantable. But it is a simple fact of history that, under the Old Covenant, there *did* in time grow up a very clear and definite expectation of a Messiah to come. In early days, no doubt, the hope

¹ S. Matt. xix. 8.

² The *Homilies*, p. 39 (Ed. S.P.C.K.). The reference to Augustine is to *In Joan.* Tract. xlv.

was but of an indefinite character, and there was little, if any, expectation of a *personal* deliverer. But as we follow out the course of the history we are able to see how the hope was gradually narrowed down to a race, a tribe, a family, and how it tended more and more to centre in a single person. To trace out the growth of this hope, and to mark its increasing definiteness, belongs to the province of the interpreter of the Old Testament rather than to that of the commentator on the Articles. The briefest outline must suffice here.

The earliest indication of the hope is found in the Protevangelium, immediately after the fall, when the promise was made that the "seed of the woman" should bruise the serpent's head.¹ After the flood it was not obscurely hinted that the blessing should come in the line of *Shem*.² The call of *Abraham*,³ the choice of *Isaac* rather than *Ishmael*,⁴ of *Jacob* rather than *Esau*,⁵ narrowed down the line still more; while, whatever be the true interpretation of the words rendered in the English Bible 'till Shiloh come,' the exalted language used in the blessing of *Judah*, at the very least marks out this tribe for pre-eminence, and points to it as the one from which the promised blessings should be looked for.⁶

¹ Gen. iii. 15. "The Protevangelium is a faithful miniature of the entire history of humanity, a struggling seed ever battling for the ultimate victory. Here is the germinal idea which unfolds in the sufferings and sorrows, the hopes and joys of our race, until it is realised in the sublime victories of redemption."—C. A. Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 77.

² Gen. ix. 26, 27. All the commentators call attention to the significant fact that the name of the covenant God Jehovah occurs alone in the blessing of Shem.

³ Gen. xii. 1-3.

⁴ Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 4, xvii. 1-21.

⁵ Gen. xxv. 23, cf. ch. xxvii.

⁶ Gen. xlix. 9-12. The margin of the R.V. will show the English reader how doubtful is the rendering "till Shiloh come." There is really no support whatever for it from antiquity, and it probably rests on an

The choice of the house of David marks a fresh stage in the development of the hope. From the time of the great promise made to him in 2 Sam. vii., the consummation of the kingdom of God is connected with a king of the line of David, to whom God will be in a special way a "Father," and who shall be in a special way God's "Son." But even so, for some considerable period, the thought is rather of a *line of kings* than of one individual;¹ and not till the crisis of the Assyrian invasion in the eighth century do we find that the hope is definitely connected with the thought of a *personal* Messiah. In the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah we meet for the first time with detailed predictions, which point forward with unmistakeable clearness to a child who should be born, whose name should be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace," and who should reign on the throne of David.² From this time onward, the evidence of the expectation of a personal Messiah is clear and decisive, and may be traced in the writings of the later prophets, both before and after the Captivity,³ as well as in later

erroneous reading, *שלה* for *שלו*. The latter reading is implied in most of the ancient versions, and would give one or other of the following renderings: (1) "Till there come that which is his," or (2) "Till He come whose [it is]." In the latter case there is reference to a *personal* Messiah, whereas, if the former rendering be adopted, the clause must be regarded as an indeterminate expression of the Messianic hope. See, on the whole passage, S. R. Driver in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*, vol. xiv. No. 27, and Spurrell's *Notes on Genesis*, p. 335 *seq.*

¹ That the thought is primarily of the *line* in the original promise in 2 Sam. vii. is shown by ver. 14. "I will be his father, and he shall be my son; if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men." It is impossible to apply these last words to the personal Messiah.

² See especially Isa. vii. 14, ix. 6, 7 and xi. 1-10; Micah iv. 8, v. 2-7.

³ In Jeremiah there are the great prophecies of "the Branch" in xxiii. 5-8, and xxxiii. 14-26, and in Ezekiel there is the promise of "one Shepherd, even my servant David," ch. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24; cf. ch.

Jewish writings, such as the Book of Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon,¹ which never obtained admission within the canon.

Modern criticism may affect the interpretation of particular passages. It may show us that texts which were relied on by the older expositors as prophecies of the Messiah can no longer be appealed to with the same confidence as formerly. It may even involve a re-writing of the whole history of the Messianic hope. But the broad truth stated in the Article will remain untouched by this, for the undeniable fact that, before the Incarnation, the fathers who lived under the Old Covenant had come to look for the "redemption of Israel," and were expecting a personal Messiah of the house of David is sufficient to justify the general statement that "both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man."

II. *The Old Fathers did not look only for Transitory Promises.*

Here again it can scarcely be thought that the Article is designed to close the door to criticism on a subject on which widely different views have been held by devout scholars within the Church, namely, the belief of the Jews, under the Old Dispensation, in a future life beyond the grave. The statement that **they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises** can never have

xxi. 27, where there is a probable allusion to Gen. xlix. 10. In the prophecies of the return from the Captivity, the clearest Messianic prophecies are those in Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, of "the Branch," which rest on the previous ones of Jeremiah. In Haggai ii. 6-9 the thought of a *personal* Messiah is not prominent. See the R. V. "the desirable things of all nations shall come," for "the desire" of the A. V.

¹ See the Book of Enoch, ch. xlv-lvii., which describes the coming of

been intended to compel us to maintain that the doctrine of a future life was clearly taught by Moses. We are expressly told in the New Testament that "life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel,"¹ and the whole tendency of modern criticism is to emphasise this by denying that there are sure and certain traces of a belief in a state of future bliss till a comparatively late period in the history of the Jews. It is patent to everyone that the promises of the Mosaic law, as a rule, refer exclusively to *this life* (see Ex. xx. 12, xxiii. 25-31; Levit. xxvi. etc.), and that length of days and temporal prosperity are the rewards contemplated in it. Moreover, it would seem that throughout the Old Testament, attention is for the most part concentrated on *this life*. It is "the land of the living" (see Ps. lli. 5; Isa. liii. 8; Jer. xi. 19, etc.). Death is regarded as an evil, and the dread of it is evident even among the best of the Hebrews, so that it has been said with some show of truth that they never spoke of death without a shudder (see Ps. lxxxviii. and Isa. xxxviii. in illustration of this). Nevertheless, while all this is admitted, it must not be forgotten that there is another side to it as well. Death is never regarded as *annihilation*. An existence of *some sort* after death is everywhere assumed in the Old Testament. Dathan and Abiram go down "alive" into Sheol (Num. xvi. 30). Jacob's anticipation that he will go down to Sheol to Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 35), and the familiar expression that a man was "gathered to his fathers," are evidences of a belief in a "something" beyond this life even in the

the chosen ruler of God, and ch. xc., where the Messiah is introduced under the figure of a white bullock. In the Psalms of Solomon, the Messiah of the house of David is spoken of in xvii. 23 *seq.* and xviii. 1-9, and is for the first time definitely called *χριστός Κύριος*.

¹ 2 Tim. i 10.

earliest days. But the state of the deceased, or the "shades,"¹ in Sheol or Hades, was in itself a state of unblestness, not worthy to be called "life"; and only very gradually did the conception of a resurrection make its way among the Jews. What the pious Jew really looked for was life in and with God; that is the "eternal life" which is offered to mankind in both the Old and New Testaments alike. It has been truly said that "the antithesis in the psalmist's mind is not between life here and life hereafter (as we speak), but between life with and life without God; and for the moment, in the consciousness of the blessedness of fellowship with God, death fades from his view."² So by degrees the Jew who had come to believe in "the living God" and his own communion with Him, came at last to see that there was involved in this the doctrine of a future life, for the communion could not be broken by death. It is, however, often hard to say whether the union of the soul with God, after which the psalmists were feeling, was contemplated by them as consummated in this life or the next. Such Psalms as xvi, xvii, xlix., and lxxiii., which contain the most exalted language on this subject, have been variously interpreted. But even if we put it at the lowest, they contain "the germ and principle of the doctrine of the resurrection." Still, however we may interpret them, it is clear that the doctrine was no article of faith to the Jews. It formed no part of the creed of the Jewish Church. There could not be a better instance of the manner in which it was worked out by the individual than that given by the Book of

¹ *διδωλα*, the word is used for the *εδωλα καμότων* in Job xxvi. 5; Ps. lxxxviii. 11; Prov. ii. 18, ix. 18, xxi. 16; Isa. xiv. 9, xxvi. 14, 19. It signifies properly "relaxed" or "weak."

² Professor Kirkpatrick on the Psalms (Cambridge Bible), vol. ii. p. 274.

Job, which modern critics are inclined to regard as a late work, not earlier than the time of the Babylonish captivity. Had the doctrine of the resurrection formed a part of the traditional creed of the writer, it would not have been represented as only gradually dawning upon the mind of Job. Three distinct stages are apparent in his apprehension of it.

In chapter vii. there is utter disbelief in anything of the kind.

“ Oh remember that my life is wind :
 Mine eye shall no more see good.
 The eye of him that seeth me shall behold me no more :
 Thine eyes shall be upon me, but I shall not be.
 As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away,
 So he that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more.
 He shall no more return to his house,
 Neither shall his place know him any more” (vers. 7-10).

In chapter xiv. the longing for a resurrection has arisen in Job's heart. He sees that nature points to one, and feels that if he could only look forward to one for himself, he could endure his present sufferings with greater calmness ; but he is still very far from believing in one.

“ There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again
 And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
 Though the root thereof wax old in the earth,
 And the stock thereof die in the ground ;
 Yet through the scent of water it will bud,
 And put forth boughs like a plant.
 But man dieth, and wasteth away :
 Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he ?
 As the waters fail from the sea,
 And the river decayeth and drieth up ;
 So man lieth down and riseth not :
 Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
 Nor be roused out of their sleep.
 Oh that Thou wouldst hide me in Sheol,
 That Thou wouldst keep me secret, until Thy wrath be past,

That thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me !
 If a man die, shall he live again ?
 All the days of my warfare would I wait,
 Till my release should come.
 Thou shouldest call, and I would answer Thee :
 Thou wouldst have a desire to the work of Thine hands”
 (Vers. 7-15).

Finally, in chapter xix., he rises to the certainty that God will appear as his “ vindicator,” and that he shall be granted a vision of God after death.

“ But I know that my redeemer liveth,
 And that He shall stand up at the last upon the earth :
 And after my skin hath been thus destroyed,
 Yet from my flesh shall I see God :
 Whom I shall see for myself,
 And mine eyes shall behold, and not another” (Vers. 25-27).¹

There are other late passages in which the hope of a resurrection appears with unmistakable clearness, such as Isaiah xxvi. 19 : “ Thy dead shall live ; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust ; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead.”²

In the vision of “ the dry bones ” in Ezekiel xxxvii., though it is a *national* restoration that is primarily contemplated, yet some knowledge of the resurrection is presupposed, as otherwise the passage would be almost meaningless. Clearer still is Daniel xii. 2, which in-

¹ On this passage see A. B. Davidson's commentary in the *Cambridge Bible*, and cf. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 393. Both the English and the Scotch professor agree in seeing in the passage distinct intimation of a belief in a life beyond the grave. The translation given above is that of the R. V., but “ redeemer ” would be more properly “ vindicator,” and “ from my flesh ” probably signifies “ apart from ” or “ deprived of ” my flesh, not as it is understood in the A. V., “ in my flesh.”

² Modern critics generally assign this passage to a post-exilic date.

troduces most distinctly the idea of future retribution, and shows the highest point reached by the faithful under the old covenant :

“Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.”¹

That there was only some such gradual development of the belief, as has been thus briefly indicated, appears to be a most certain result of criticism. But, from what has been said, it will be evident that even from early days the way was prepared for the future doctrine, and in germ and principle it was there from the earliest day on which the Jew recognised God as *his* God, and felt that life in and with him was the supreme object of desire. When once he had grasped this, it could not be said that he “looked only for transitory promises.”² Nor should it be forgotten that our Lord and His apostles teach us to see in the sayings of the Old Testament deeper and fuller meanings, unrecognised probably by those who first uttered or heard them. “That the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in the place concerning the Bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him” (S. Luke xx. 37, 38). “These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them, and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things

¹ See on all these passages Driver's *Sermons on the Old Testament*, Sermon 4, “Growth of Belief in a Future State.”

² On this point see a remarkable letter in the *Life of F. D. Maurice*, vol. i. p. 396.

make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their own. And if, indeed, they had been mindful of that country from which they went out, they would have had the opportunity to return. But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city” (Heb. xi. 13–16).

It has never been seriously maintained that these passages decide once for all the question of the actual amount of knowledge concerning a future state possessed by the Jews, and since the Article certainly says no more than they do, we may rest assured that it leaves us free to decide the critical question on critical grounds. And it may be added that it is a remarkable fact that when the reformers put forth the first book of the *Homilies* containing a sermon “On the Dread of Death,” they could apparently find no passage to quote from the Old Testament for the belief of the Jews in a life of bliss after death earlier than the Book of Wisdom, on which, therefore, they fell back, appealing to it as “Scripture,” and citing it as establishing the point in question.

“Now, the holy fathers of the old law, and all faithful and righteous men which departed before our Saviour Christ's ascension into heaven, did by death depart from troubles into rest; from the hands of their enemies into the hands of God; from sorrows and sicknesses unto joyful refreshing, into Abraham's bosom, a place of all comfort and consolation, as Scriptures do plainly by manifest words testify. The Book of Wisdom saith, *That the righteous men's souls be in the hand of God, and no torment shall touch them. They seemed to the eyes of foolish men to die; and their death was counted miserable, and their departing out of this world wretched; but they be in rest.* And another place saith, *That the righteous shall live for ever, and their reward is with the Lord, and*

*their minds be with God, who is above all; therefore they shall receive a glorious kingdom, and a beautiful crown at the Lord's hand. And in another place the same book saith, The righteous, though he be prevented with sudden death, nevertheless he shall be there, where he shall be refreshed."*¹

The remaining subjects in connection with this Article admit of the briefest possible treatment.

III. *The Ceremonial and Civil Law of the Jews is not binding on Christians.*

In proof of the assertion that **the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men**, it is sufficient to refer to the account of the Apostolic Council held at Jerusalem to settle this very subject, when it was once for all decided that circumcision was not to be enforced on Gentile converts (Acts xv.), and to the whole line of argument in S. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, in which he vindicates the liberty of Christians from the burden of the law; while since **the civil precepts** of the Mosaic code were never imposed on any nation but the Jews, it cannot be supposed that they **ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth.**

IV. *The Moral Law remains of Universal and Lasting Obligation.*

If proof is wanted for the statement that **no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral**, it may be found in our Lord's assertion that he came "not

¹ The third part of the Homily of the "Fear of Death," p. 103 (Ed. S.P.C.K.). The references are to *Wisdom*, iii. 1-3, v. 15, 16, and iv. 7.

to destroy the law, but to fulfil" (S. Matt. v. 17); in the special teaching of the sermon on the mount, in which the moral law is enforced, explained, and expanded (S. Matt. v. 21-48); in the reply to the question concerning "the great commandment" (S. Matt. xxii. 37-40); and in the frequent insistence on the duties of the moral law in S. Paul's Epistles (see especially Rom. xiii. 8-10).