

## ARTICLE VIII

*De Tribus Symbolis.*

Symbola tria, Nicænum, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt et credenda. Nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

*Of the Three Creeds.*

The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

THERE has been but little alteration in this Article since 1553. At the revision of 1563 the words "and believed" (*et credenda*) were inserted; and in 1571 in Latin the word *Apostolorum* was substituted for the adjective *Apostolicum*, which had stood there previously.

With the language of the Article may be compared that of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* :—

"Et quoniam omnia ferme, quæ ad fidem spectant Catholicam, tum quoad beatissimam Trinitatem, tum quoad mysteria nostræ redemptionis, tribus Symbolis, hoc est, Apostolico, Niceno, et Athanasii, breviter continentur; idcirco ista tria Symbola, ut fidei nostræ compendia quædam, recipimus et amplectimus, quod firmissimis divinarum et canonicarum scripturarum testimoniis facile probari possint."<sup>1</sup>

An Article on this subject asserting definitely the adherence of the Church of England to the ancient creeds of the Church Catholic was rendered necessary

<sup>1</sup> *Ref. Legum. Eccl.* "De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," ch. 5.

by the spread of Anabaptism, the leaders of which utterly ignored and set aside these summaries of the faith, together with the faith itself contained in them.

The subjects to be considered in connection with this Article are four in number :—

1. Creeds in general.
2. The Apostles' Creed.
3. The Nicene Creed.
4. The Athanasian Creed.

I. *Of Creeds in General.*

The origin of creeds must be sought in the baptismal service of the Church. Our Lord's command to His apostles had been to make disciples of all nations by baptizing them into the name

- (1) Of the Father;
- (2) Of the Son;
- (3) Of the Holy Ghost.

Hence comes the threefold division of all the ancient creeds,<sup>1</sup> referring to the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, and their work. In consequence of this command we find that from the earliest times some profession of faith was required from candidates for baptism, and that for this purpose short summaries of the main doctrines of Christianity were drawn up. It is possible to see in some passages of the New Testament indications of regular formularies in use even in apostolic days. Thus the statement in 1 Cor. viii. 6 looks very much like a reminiscence of one such :—

"To us there is *one God the Father*, of whom are all things, and we unto Him; and *one Lord Jesus*

<sup>1</sup> The Athanasian Creed is, of course, an exception, but it is scarcely a creed. It should be regarded rather as an *Expositio Fidei*, or even as a Canticle.

*Christ*, through whom are all things, and we through Him." <sup>1</sup>

So the summary in 1 Tim. iii. 16 is commonly thought to contain a fragment of an early creed or hymn—

" He who was manifested in the flesh,  
Justified in the Spirit,  
Seen of angels,  
Preached among the nations,  
Believed on in the world,  
Received up in glory." <sup>2</sup>

Again, according to the received text of Acts viii. 37, when the Ethiopian eunuch says, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip's answer is, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Whereupon the eunuch makes his profession of faith: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." These words are, however, universally regarded as an interpolation. They were probably inserted in order to bring the account into harmony with the requirements of the baptismal service. They cannot, therefore, be appealed to as a witness of the apostolic age, but as the interpolation was made before the days of Irenæus (A.D. 180), who quotes the whole passage with the inserted words,<sup>3</sup> it may fairly be taken as a witness to the practice of the Church somewhere about the middle of the second century. About the close of this century we meet with a definite statement in the writings of Tertullian, that the profession of faith required at baptism was somewhat amplified from the simple form of belief in the threefold name enjoined in the Gospel.<sup>4</sup> And since, even earlier than this, several writers,<sup>5</sup> when summing up the faith of the Church, give it in a form closely corresponding to the creeds used later

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Christological confessions seem also to be implied in Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; and 1 John iv. 5. <sup>3</sup> Irenæus, Bk. III. xii. 10; cf. IV. xxxvii. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *De Corona Militis*, ch. iii.: "Dehinc ter mergitatur, amplius aliquid respondentem quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit."

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.* Ignatius, *Ep. ad Trall.* ch. ix.

on, and appear to be alluding to something like a fixed formulary, it is more natural to suppose that they are definitely alluding to the creed, than to think that the creed was subsequently developed from the summaries of the rule of faith as given by them. Thus it is now generally acknowledged that traces of, and allusions to, the creed may be found in such early writers as Aristides and Justin Martyr (*circa* 140), as well as in Irenæus and Tertullian. The creed of the first-mentioned writer as collected from his *Apology*, and restored by Professor Rendel Harris, runs as follows:—

" We believe in one God, Almighty,  
Maker of heaven and earth;  
And in Jesus Christ His Son  
Born of the Virgin Mary;  
He was pierced by the Jews;  
He died and was buried;  
The third day He rose again:  
He ascended into heaven;  
He is about to come to judge."<sup>1</sup>

Even if we cannot feel quite certain of the details in all cases there is no longer room for doubt that formal creeds were in use by the middle of the second century, varying to some extent in different churches, but all following the same general outline, and all alike based on the baptismal formula, with its threefold reference to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.<sup>2</sup> In the fourth century our knowledge of creeds became much fuller. At

<sup>1</sup> *Texts and Studies*, vol. i. p. 25 (Ed. J. A. Robinson).

<sup>2</sup> The "rules of faith" as given by Tertullian, Irenæus, and others may be found in Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole*. One from Tertullian is added here as a specimen. *De Virg. Vel. I.* "Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia dia resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in caelis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris,

that time the practice of the Church was for the candidates for baptism to be carefully prepared beforehand and instructed in the main doctrines of the Church by one of the presbyters especially appointed for the purpose. A few days before the actual baptism the formal creed of the Church into which they were to be baptized was taught to them, and an exposition of it in the form of a sermon on it delivered before them. This was called the "delivery of the Creed," *Traditio Symboli*. At the time of the actual baptism they were interrogated as to their belief,<sup>1</sup> and required to return answer to the priest's question in the form of the creed which they had received, and which they were now to "give back" at this *Redditio Symboli*.<sup>2</sup> After baptism the creed was preserved in the memory as a convenient summary, written on the heart, but not committed to paper;<sup>3</sup> nor was it till a somewhat later period used in any other service of the Church.<sup>4</sup>

venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem." Other passages such as *Adv. Prax.* 2, and *De Præscript.* 13, show that Tertullian's Creed contained also the article on the Holy Spirit.

<sup>1</sup> In this way there grew up the interrogative creeds of the Church, such as that found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, p. 86, 116 (Ed. Wilson). Other forms are given in Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 106 *seq.* It would appear that sometimes a shorter form was used at the *Redditio Symboli* than had been rehearsed to the catechumens at the *Traditio*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lumby's *History of the Creeds*, p. 11 *seq.* The famous Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril of Jerusalem were delivered to candidates for baptism in the year 347 or 348. Cyril nowhere gives the creed continuously, but it can easily be collected from Lectures vi.-xviii. See Hahn, *op. cit.* p. 132.

<sup>3</sup> See Augustine's *Sermo ad Catechumenos*, which was delivered at the *Traditio Symboli*, and begins as follows: "Accipite, filii, regulam fidei, quod symbolum dicitur. Et cum acceperitis, in corde scribite, et quotidie dicite apud vos: antequam dormiatis, antequam procedatis, vestro symbolo vos munite. Symbolum nemo scribit ut legi possit, sed ad recensendum, ne forte deat oblivio quod tradidit diligentia, sit vobis codex vestra memoria. Quod audituri estis, hoc credituri; et quod credideritis, hoc etiam lingua reddituri."—*Opera*, tom. vi. col. 547.

<sup>4</sup> The first to introduce a creed into the Liturgy was Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch soon after 470. Constantinople followed about 510.

Another use of creeds comes prominently before us in connection with the controversies of the fourth century. From the date of the Council of Nicæa onwards we meet with them as *tests of orthodoxy*, accepted by Councils, and offered for signature to those members of the Church, the correctness of whose faith was called in question; and as time went on, and new heresies arose, amplified and enlarged with the express purpose of guarding against fresh errors.

Hence we get two different kinds of creeds—(1) the baptismal profession, which, as made by the individual, runs in the first person singular, *I believe*; and (2) Conciliar creeds, which, as containing the faith of the assembled fathers, were naturally couched in the first person plural, *We believe*. In course of time, however, when the creeds were introduced into the public services of the Church, we find that the East for the most part adopted the plural, and the West the singular, whether the creed was conciliar or baptismal in its origin,<sup>1</sup> and thus the distinction was almost obliterated, although it can be clearly traced in all the earlier forms.<sup>2</sup>

In the West, Spain led the way in 589. The Gallican and Anglican Churches adopted it in the seventh or eighth century; Rome possibly not till the eleventh. There is no certain indication of the use of the (Apostles') Creed in the hour services of the Church before the *ninth* century, when it is ordered to be used at Prime.

<sup>1</sup> Thus the Western Church has *altered* the Constantinopolitan Creed, and uses the singular in it "I believe," whereas the original Greek text has naturally enough the plural *πιστεύομεν*.

<sup>2</sup> Eastern creeds in the singular may be found in the Liturgy of S. James, the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VII. xli.), and the Coptic Liturgy. S. Cyril also has the singular in *Cat.* xix. 9, though elsewhere his words seem to imply the use of the plural. Cf. Hahn, p. 132. Western creeds in the plural are those of Augustine and pseudo-Augustine, as restored by Hahn, pp. 58, 60 (Heurtley, however, restores the singular, *Credo*); of Facundus of Hermiane (*ibid.* p. 63); pseudo-Ambrose (p. 56); and, as is only natural, the professions of several Councils, *e.g.* of Toledo, A.D. 400 and 589.

There are further differences between the creeds as ultimately formulated in the East and West respectively, which are owing to the different types and characters of the churches in different parts of the world. These may be briefly summed up as follows, and illustrated from the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, taken as typical specimens of Eastern and Western creeds.

(a) The Eastern creeds are more *dogmatic*, the Western more *historic*. "In the Eastern creeds, to use a modern form of expression, the 'ideas' of Christianity predominate: in the Western creeds the 'facts' of Christianity stand out in their absolute simplicity."<sup>1</sup> Thus in the Nicene (Eastern) Creed it will be noticed that *reasons* for the facts are sometimes given, and not only is the question *what* is to be believed answered, but the question *why* receives a reply as well. It was *for us men and for our salvation* that He "came down from heaven." He "was crucified also *for us* under Pontius Pilate." He rose again the third day, *according to the Scriptures*. We are baptized *for the remission of sins*. There is nothing whatever corresponding to the clauses marked in italics to be found in any Western creed.

(b) The Eastern creeds always insert "One" before God, and add "Maker of heaven and earth." These last words, though now found in the Apostles' Creed, were, as will presently be shown, the very last words to find their way into it, not appearing till the seventh century. The reason for these additional phrases in the East is obvious. In the presence of much philosophical dualism, and of the wild speculations of many among the Gnostic sects, with their theories of the eternity of matter, and of a "Demiurge" or Creator distinct from the supreme God, the doctrine of the unity of God, and of the creation of all things, possessed a dogmatic importance in

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 187.

the speculative East, which was wanting in the practical West.<sup>1</sup>

(c) The Eastern creeds dwell at greater length on the details of our Lord's nature and work before the Incarnation, and of His suffering, but never have the clause, "He descended into hell." The Apostles' Creed after the clause, "And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord," passes straight to the Incarnation, "Who was conceived," etc. The Nicene piles clause upon clause to insist on our Lord's divinity, and adds that "By Him all things were made," before saying that He "came down from heaven, and was incarnate," etc.

(d) No Eastern creed has "the Communion of Saints," while no Western creed mentions the "One Baptism" in connection with the remission of sins.<sup>2</sup>

Of the names for the creed in use in the ancient Church the commonest is *Symbolum* or *Σύμβολον*. This is used in both East and West, and applied not only to the Baptismal Creed, but also to the Nicene Creed as well, though this latter is also frequently termed *ἡ πίστις*. The word *Symbolum*, as applied to the creed, is met with for the first time in the writings of S. Cyprian about the middle of the third century. It is used by him more

<sup>1</sup> Since both Irenæus (representing Gaul), and Tertullian (representing Africa), repeatedly give the rule of faith as including belief in *One* God, who is the Maker of all things, it would seem probable that these phrases were originally found in the Western creed, but were suffered to drop out of it in the course of time, as the practical need for their insertion was not felt. See Irenæus I. ii. 1; III. iv. 1; IV. liii. 1, and Tertullian *De virg. vel.* 1; *Adv. Prax.* 2; *De Præscript.* 13. The rule of faith as given by Novatian has simply *in Deum Patrem*, and apparently takes *Omnipotentem* as implying the creation of all things. "Omnipotentem, id est verum omnium perfectissimum conditorem." See Hahn, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Westcott, *op. cit.* Note iii. The Gallican Creed quoted below may perhaps be considered an exception, as it does mention baptism in connection with the forgiveness of sins.

than once,<sup>1</sup> and from his day forward is of frequent occurrence. Some doubt has been felt concerning the origin of the name and its exact significance in this connection. Various theories have been proposed in order to explain its use, some of which fall to the ground at once when it is recognised that *σύμβολον* is really a distinct word from *συμβολή*, and that the latter word is never used of the creed. This enables us to set aside at once the theory which Rufinus mentions,<sup>2</sup> and which is adopted by many of the Latin Fathers, that the creed is a "collation" or epitome of Christian doctrine, made up of the "contributions" of the twelve apostles. This theory was improved upon in later times, until the creed was shown to consist of twelve articles, one having been contributed by each of the twelve apostles.<sup>3</sup> Apart from all other objections these views labour under the fatal mistake of confusing two quite distinct Greek words, and may be dismissed without further consideration. The true view of the origin of the term is probably that which gives it the meaning of "watchword."

<sup>1</sup> *E.g. Ep. lxi. 7.*

<sup>2</sup> *In Symb. § 2.* "Symbolum autem hoc multis et justissimis ex causis appellari voluerunt. Symbolum enim Græce et indicium dici potest et collatio, hoc est, quod plures in unum conferunt. Id enim fecerunt Apostoli in his sermonibus in unum conferendo unusquisque quod sentit." Cf. Cassian, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, VI. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Such a creed is found at the end of the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, which dates perhaps from the seventh century. "Petrus dixit: Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Johannes dixit: Credo in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum, Deum et Dominum nostrum. Jacobus dixit: Natum de Maria Virgine per Spiritum Sanctum. Andreas dixit: Passum sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixum et sepultum. Philippus dixit: Descendit ad inferna. Thomas dixit: Tertia die resurrexit. Bartholomæus dixit: Ascendit in coelos, sedet ad dexteram Dei patris omnipotentis. Matthæus dixit: Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Jacobus Alphæi dixit: Credo in Spiritum Sanctum. Simon Zelotes dixit: Credo in Ecclesiam Sanctam. Judas Jacobi dixit: Per Baptismum sanctum remissionem peccatorum. Matthias dixit: Carnis resurrectionem in vitam æternam. Amen." See Migne, vol. lxxii. p. 580.

It was the watchword of the Christian soldier, carefully and jealously guarded by him, as that by which he himself could be distinguished from heretics, and that for which he could challenge others, of whose orthodoxy he might be in doubt.<sup>1</sup>

Another term frequently found in connection with the creed is *regula fidei*. This is, however, not confined to the creed. It signifies the *credenda* or main doctrines of the Church rather than the precise form of words in which those doctrines were summed up. Thus we find that the same writer will give us the *regula fidei* in slightly different terms in different parts of his work; and though Augustine in his *Sermo ad Catechumenos*, quoted in a note on a previous page,<sup>2</sup> identifies the *regula* with the *Symbolum*, yet the former sometimes occurs in such a connection as to make it clear that its meaning is wider than that of the latter, and that it is not quite correct to regard the two as strictly convertible terms.

## II. *The Apostles' Creed.*

The Apostles' Creed, in the *exact* form in which it is

<sup>1</sup> Rufinus (*l.c.*) gives this as one of the reasons for which the Creed was termed *Symbolum*. "Indicium autem vel signum idcirco dicitur quia in illo tempore sicut et Paulus Apostolus dicit, et in Actibus Apostolorum refertur, multi ex circumeuntibus Judæis simulabant se esse Apostolos Christi, et lucri alicujus vel ventris gratia ad prædicandum proficiscabantur, nominantes quidem Christum sed non integris traditionum lineis nunciantes. Idcirco, istud indicium posuere, per quod agnosceretur is qui Christum vere secundum Apostolicas regulas prædicaret. Denique et in bellis civilibus hoc observari ferunt: quoniam et armorum habitus par, et sonus vocis idem, et mos unus est, atque eadem instituta bellandi, ne qua doli subreptio fiat, symbola distincta unusquisque dux suis militibus tradit quæ Latine signa vel indicia nuncupantur; ut si forte occurrerit quis de quo dubitetur, interrogatus symbolum, prodatur si sit hostis vel socius. Idcirco denique hæc non scribi chartulis aut membranis, sed retineri credentium cordibus tradiderunt, ut certum esset, hæc neminem ex lectione, quæ interdum pervenire etiam ad infideles solet, sed ex Apostolorum traditione didicisse."

<sup>2</sup> See p. 300. note 3.

familiar to us, is in all probability the latest of the three creeds, although *in general expression* it is the oldest, and the freest from terms inserted for the express purpose of emphasising and guarding the true faith against heresies.

It is strictly a Western creed, being unknown in the East,<sup>1</sup> and the Greek copies of its received text which exist in MSS. are of late date, and bear evident marks of being translations from the Latin.<sup>2</sup> This received text represents the ultimate form taken by the Baptismal Creed of the Western Church, and is developed from the older creed of the Roman Church.

This Roman Creed we meet with for the first time in the year 341, when it is given in a letter written by Marcellus of Ancyra to Julius, Bishop of Rome. Marcellus was accused, not without good reason, of something very like Sabellianism, and wrote to Julius to defend himself. The letter, which is preserved by Epiphanius, is in Greek, but there can be no doubt that the creed which Marcellus gives as the expression of his own belief is really the creed of the Church of Rome. With the exception of two phrases, it is identical with the Roman Creed described in the work of Rufinus some fifty years later. Marcellus omits the word "Father" in the first article, and adds "the life everlasting" at the close. Otherwise the two creeds are identical. By the help, then, of these two documents, the letter of Marcellus, and the exposition of the creed by Rufinus, we can recover the text of the old Roman Creed as it stood

<sup>1</sup> At the Council of Florence (1439) the Greeks expressly denied all knowledge of it, *ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἔχομεν οὐτε εἶδομεν τὸ σύμβολον τῶν ἀποστόλων*. See Swainson, *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> The Greek copy in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, referred to by Pearson, is now assigned to the fifteenth century.

in the fourth century. It may be reconstructed as follows:—

"I believe in God [the Father] Almighty,  
And in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord,  
Who was born of the Holy Ghost from the Virgin Mary,  
Was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried,  
The third day He rose again from the dead,  
He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father,  
Thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead,  
And in the Holy Ghost, the holy Church, the forgiveness of sins,  
The resurrection of the flesh."<sup>1</sup>

Three questions present themselves for consideration:

(1) Can this creed be traced to an earlier date than the

<sup>1</sup> The Greek as given by Marcellus (Epiphanius, *Hær.* lxxii.) is the following:—*πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν παντοκράτορα καὶ εἰς χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὃθεν ἔρχεται κρῖνει ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἅγιον ἐκκλησίαν, ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. The Latin of Rufinus runs thus: "Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum. Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus. Tertio die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in coelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem." So Hahn, p. 24. But the text of Rufinus has the ablative throughout, *in Deo Patre*, etc. With regard to the two variations noticed above in the text, the other authorities for this old Roman form of the creed agree with Rufinus as against Marcellus. Though the latter omits *Patrem*, as does Tertullian in giving the rule of faith, yet the word is found in Novatian's rule of faith, as also in Cyprian (*Ep.* lxix.), as well as in three MSS., two of which give the same creed as formerly used in England (Brit. Museum, Royal, 2 A. xx; Galba, A. xviii. [where the creed is given in Greek]), and one of Sardinian origin (Bodleian, Codex Laud. Gr. 35). These three MSS. also agree with Rufinus in omitting *vitam æternam*, and moreover S. Jerome expressly says that the creed ends with "the resurrection of the flesh."—*Contr. Joannem Hieros ad. Pammach.* § 28. The African Creed, however, as early as the days of S. Cyprian, had the clause "*vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam.*" But there can be no doubt that it has rightly no place in the old Roman form.

fourth century? (2) When and where were the additions made which transformed it into its present form? (3) How came the fuller form to be substituted for the old Roman text?

1. With regard to the first of these, it is now generally admitted that the creed must have taken shape *not later than the middle of the second century*. The ground for believing this is the fact that in writers of other Western churches, from the latter part of the second century onwards, we can trace allusions and references to creeds which are very similar to, and apparently derived from, the Roman Creed. "All the Western provincial creeds," says Harnack, "are evidently offshoots of the Roman," and thus, to quote the same writer, "we may regard it as an assured result of research that the old Roman Creed came into existence about, or shortly before, the middle of the second century."<sup>1</sup>

2. In considering the second question just raised, we note that the words and phrases wanting in the old Roman Creed, which are found in the current text of it, are these:—

1. Maker of heaven and earth.
2. Who was conceived.
3. Suffered.
4. Dead.
5. Descended into hell.
6. God . . . Almighty, in the article "Sitteth at the right hand."
7. Catholic.
8. The Communion of Saints.
9. The life everlasting.

Of these, one or two were already in use elsewhere, although not in Rome, before the close of the fourth century. We have already seen that "descended into

<sup>1</sup> *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, translated in the *Nineteenth Century*, July 1893, p. 162.

hell" was found at Aquileia in the time of Rufinus, though not at Rome, and that "the life everlasting" was adopted in very early days in the African Church. It would also seem possible that "suffered" had found its way into the African Creed before the days of Augustine.<sup>1</sup> But though one or two articles thus appear here and there at an earlier date, there can be no doubt that the bulk of the additions first secured a fixed position in the creed in Gaul during the fifth century, and that the Apostles' Creed, as we know it, is a *Gallican recension of the old Roman Creed*. For the creed of the Gallican Church, during the fifth and early part of the sixth century, we have three principal authorities, Faustus of Riez (*circa* 480),<sup>2</sup> Cæsarius of Arles (470-542),<sup>3</sup> and his friend and contemporary Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon.<sup>4</sup> From these three writers we can see that by the close of the fifth century the Gallican Church had received the words "who was conceived," "suffered," "catholic," "the communion of saints," and "the life everlasting." It is possible that "descended into hell," had already found its way from the Aquileian into the Gallican Creed.<sup>5</sup> There is some reason also

<sup>1</sup> *Passus* is not given in the creed commented on in *De fide et Symbolo*, *De Genesi ad literam*, *opus imperf.*, or the *Enchiridion*. It appears, however, to have found a place in the creeds of the *Sermo de Symbolo ad Catech.*, and of Sermon ccxii.; cf. Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> See Hahn, p. 70, and cf. *Fausti Reiensis Opera* (Ed. Engbrecht), *Ep.* 7, and *De Spiritu Sancto*, 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> That is, if the sermon in the Appendix to vol. v. of Augustine (*Serm.* ccxlv.) is rightly assigned to him, as it is by several authorities after the Benedictines.

<sup>4</sup> In his letter to Bishop Maximus, of Geneva, first printed by Gundlach in the *Monumenta Germaniæ Hist. Epistolæ ævi Merovingici*.

<sup>5</sup> It is found in the sermon assigned to Cæsarius, but is not in the creed given by Cyprian of Toulon. There may be a *possible* reference to the creed in Faustus, *Serm.* ii., "Mortem suscepit, pretioso nos sanguine liberavit, ad inferna descendit."

for thinking that "dead" was already received in Gaul.<sup>1</sup> At any rate, both these clauses are found there shortly afterwards. And the same holds good of the remaining phrases, namely, "Maker of heaven and earth," and "God . . . Almighty" in the Sixth Article, for these are all found in the creed as given in the *Gallican Sacramentary*, assigned to the middle of the seventh century.<sup>2</sup> There are, however, slight variations between this creed and the text as now received, and the first writer to give the creed in *precisely* the words which the whole Western Church has since adopted is Pirminius, or Priminius, a bishop who laboured in France and Germany about the middle of the eighth century. In a treatise of his entitled "Libellus Pirminii de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus,"<sup>3</sup> we find the legend attributing the composition of the creed to the twelve apostles, and the form given is word for word the same as that with which we are familiar.<sup>4</sup> On the day of Pentecost, when the apostles were gathered together—"There appeared unto them divided tongues of fire, and sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the

<sup>1</sup> *Mortuus* is also found in the Creed of Caesarius, and may have been in that of Faustus. If the sermons formerly assigned to Eusebius Gallus really belong to Faustus, he would seem to have read "was crucified, *dead*, and buried," exactly as we have the words at present. On early Gallican Creeds reference should be made to Mr. A. E. Burn's *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 222 *seq.* Mr. Burn, it should be added, thinks that the alterations which have brought the Creed into its present form were made in Rome itself rather than in Gaul.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Missale Gallicanum* in Migne, vol. lxxii. col. 349. Precisely the same creed is given in *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, *ibid.* col. 489, and, as Heurtley points out, "the occurrence of the same form in two independent documents would seem to imply that they were to some extent established."—*Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 69.

<sup>3</sup> *Scarapsus* is explained as equivalent to *collectus*. But Heurtley suggests that it may be only a misreading for *scriptus*, *Op. cit.* p. 70.

<sup>4</sup> The whole extract is printed by Dr. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 103.

Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance: and they composed the creed. Peter: "*I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.*" John: "*And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.*" James said: "*Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.*" Andrew said: "*Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried.*" Philip said: "*Descended into hell.*" Thomas said: "*The third day He rose from the dead.*" Bartholomew said: "*He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.*" Matthew said: "*From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.*" James, the son of Alphæus, said: "*I believe in the Holy Ghost.*" Simon Zelotes said: "*The Holy Catholic Church.*" Jude, the brother of James, said: "*The communion of saints.*" Also Thomas said: "*The resurrection of the flesh,<sup>1</sup> the life everlasting.*"

The various additions, the earliest appearance of which has been now indicated, with one exception can scarcely have been made with the definite purpose of guarding against heresies. "The Communion of Saints" perhaps *was* added as an answer to the Donatist charge that there was in the Church a *communio malorum*, to which Augustine had replied, "that though in the Church the evil were mingled with the good, and the Church was to that extent a mixed body, there was

<sup>1</sup> It is strange that our reformers should have rendered *resurrectionem carnis* by "the resurrection of the body," in the translation of the creed, appointed to be recited at Matins, first printed in full in 1552, and in the Catechism (1549), whereas in the Office for Public Baptism (1549), it is correctly rendered "the resurrection of the flesh." The form of words is certainly non-scriptural, but it was "necessary in order to safeguard scriptural truth," and was probably adopted by the Church in order to guard against Gnostic subtlety, which could accept "the resurrection of the dead," but explain it away, as if it referred to baptism or a spiritual awakening. See Tertullian, *De Resur. Carnis*, 19, and cf. Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 89 *seq.*



within her a true *communio sanctorum*, in which the evil have no part, and which is not impaired by their presence."<sup>1</sup> But the other clauses of comparatively late introduction are rather the natural amplifications to which such a document would be subject in course of time (especially if used for catechetical purposes), expressing with great fulness of detail what was already implied in the briefer form previously in use. It may also be remarked that in some points the Nicene Creed represents an *older* type than the Apostles', not having received all of these later amplifications. For instance, to this day there is no mention of our Lord's death in the Nicene Creed. It is, of course, *implied* in the words, "He suffered and was buried," but the formal statement of the fact contained in the word "dead" is wanting; nor are the words "God . . . Almighty" found in the clause on the session "at the right hand of the Father."

3. The third question raised above was this: How came the fuller form (which we have now seen to be of Gallican origin) to be substituted for the old Roman Creed? It is generally thought that, owing to the prevalence of Arianism among the Teutonic invaders of Italy from the latter part of the fifth century onwards, the Roman Church adopted the use of the Nicene Creed at baptism,<sup>2</sup> instead of her ancient formula, in order the more effectually to exclude the Arians, who, while willing to accept the Apostles' Creed, would be definitely shut out by the more explicit form now tendered to them.<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Swete, *op. cit.* p. 83, where there is a reference to Augustine, *C. Epist. Parmenian.* ii. 37, and *De Bapt. c. Donatist.* ii. 8, v. 38, vii. 49. It is, however, the *thought* rather than the actual phrase *communio sanctorum*, which is Augustinian. Zahn and others have argued that originally *sanctorum* was neuter, "communion in the *holy things*," *i.e.* the sacraments; but see Sanday in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii. p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> This seems to be shown by its appearance in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* at the *Traditio Symboli*, p. 53 (Ed. Wilson).

<sup>3</sup> This is the view, *e.g.*, of Harnack.

old Roman Creed, however, still continued to be used in the provinces, notably in Gaul, where it received the additions which brought it to its present form, and whence it was reintroduced into Rome, *circa* 800, under the influence of Charlemagne. Further, it has been suggested that the old Roman Creed, even though deposed from liturgical honours, survived as a form of instruction, and was still used there in the days of Gregory the Great, so that it was brought into England by Augustine, and continued to be used in this country<sup>1</sup> until the Norman Conquest drew tighter the bonds of union with Rome, and led to the sole use of the creed in the fuller form which Rome, in common with the other churches of the West, had already adopted.<sup>2</sup>

Before leaving the subject of this creed, it remains to consider the origin of the name, which it has borne for centuries—the Apostles' Creed. The name was originally given to the old Roman Creed, and appears, so far as is

<sup>1</sup> Its use here would seem to be implied by its existence in the British Museum MSS. noted above, p. 307.

<sup>2</sup> See Swete, p. 13 *seq.*, where it is pointed out that the fuller form was certainly known (though apparently not exclusively used) in England before the Norman Conquest: "Traces of it may be seen in English Episcopal professions of the ninth century, and it is found with an interlinear translation in a Lambeth MS. of the same period" (No. 427). Its influence is also seen in the remarkable creed contained in the *Bangor Antiphonary*, which comes from Ireland, and belongs to the seventh century: "Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, invisibilem, omnium creaturarum visibilium et invisibilium conditorem. Credo et in Jhesum Christum filium ejus unicum, dominum nostrum Deum Omnipotentem, conceptum de Spiritu Sancto, natum de Maria Virgine, passum sub Pontio Pylato, qui crucifixus et sepultus descendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlis, seditque ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis, exinde venturus judicare vivos ac mortuos. Credo et in Spiritum Sanctum Deum Omnipotentem, unam habentem substantiam cum Patre et filio, sanctam esse ecclesiam Catholicam, abremissa peccatorum, sanctorum communionem, carnis resurrectionem. Credo vitam post mortem et vitam æternam in gloria Christi."—*Antiphonary of Bangor*, fol. 19 (Ed. Warren).

known, for the first time, in the writings of S. Ambrose.<sup>1</sup> S. Jerome also speaks of the symbol of faith "which was delivered by the apostles";<sup>2</sup> and Rufinus, like S. Ambrose, considers the creed to have been actually drawn up by the apostles.<sup>3</sup> The later form of the tradition, which divides the creed into twelve articles, assigning one to each of the twelve apostles, needs no serious notice. It is sufficiently refuted by the simple fact that some of the articles were demonstrably wanting in the creed for centuries. Nor, in the face of the silence of the Acts of the Apostles and all authorities prior to the close of the fourth century, is it reasonable to maintain that the actual form of words found in the old Roman Creed was really drawn up by the apostles. It is, however, quite possible that the name of the Apostles' Creed may have been given to it in consequence of the erroneous belief that it was their work. But, on the other hand, it is equally probable that the *name* may have given rise to the *belief*, rather than the *belief* have suggested the *name*. The adjective, "apostolic," was largely used by early writers as denoting that to which it was applied came substantially from the apostles. Thus, such expressions as "the apostolic tradition," or "apostolic preaching," did not imply that the words were "apostolic," but only that the substance was such. So, "the Apostolic Creed"<sup>4</sup> would denote

<sup>1</sup> "Epistola Concilii Mediolanensis," *Opera*, v. p. 292.

<sup>2</sup> "Ad Pammach. c. Joann. Hier." *Opera*, ii. col. 380. "Symbolum fidei . . . quod ab apostolis traditum."

<sup>3</sup> In *Symbolum*, § 2, where it is introduced as a tradition of the elders, "Tradunt majores nostri, etc."

<sup>4</sup> The definite title, "Symbolum Apostolorum," is certainly used by S. Ambrose, and in the "Epistola Concilii Mediolanensis," which was possibly drawn up by him, see *Opera*, vol. v. p. 292. But, as a general rule, in older MSS. "Symbolum Apostolicum" is the form found. "Symbolum Apostolorum" occurs in the *Bangor Antiphony* of the seventh century, and in most later documents.

that the creed contained the faith of the apostles, not that the *ipsissima verba* were due to them. In process of time the belief arose that the words, as well as the substance, came from the apostles, and finally the medieval legend took definite form and shape, and was unhesitatingly received throughout the whole of the Western Church until the Reformation in the sixteenth century. A third explanation of the name has been suggested. The creed, as we have seen, was the creed of the Roman Church. This was the only Church in the West which was founded by an apostle, and was emphatically termed "the Apostolic See" (*Sedes Apostolica*). Hence the creed, as being that of the Apostolic See, was termed the Apostolic Creed. This view is certainly a possible one, but it is believed that one or other of the two former explanations of the origin of the name is more probable.

Subjoined is the text of the creed in the original Latin, as formerly used in this country.<sup>1</sup>

#### SYMBOLUM APOSTOLORUM.

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem cœli et terræ. Et in Jesum Christum Filium Ejus unicum Dominum nostrum. Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine. Passus sub Pontio Pylato, crucifixus mortuus et sepultus. Descendit ad inferna:<sup>2</sup> tertia die resurrexit a mortuis. Ascendit ad cœlos: sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam.

<sup>1</sup> *Breviarium ad usum Sarum* (Cambridge reprint of the edition of 1531), *Psalterium*, col. 2.

<sup>2</sup> The *Roman Breviary*, like the *Bangor Antiphony*, and most later MSS. has *inferos*.

Sanctorum Communionem. Remissionem peccatorum  
Carnis resurrectionem. Vitam æternam. Amen.<sup>1</sup>

### III. *The Nicene Creed.*

In tracing out the history of the (so-called) Nicene Creed, the starting-point must be the Council of Nicæa, in the year 325.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, in writing an account of the proceedings to his flock shortly afterwards,<sup>2</sup> states that he himself proposed to the Council the creed of his own Church of Cæsarea, which he had received from the bishops who preceded him, and which he had professed at his baptism. It ran as follows:—

“We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible;

“And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the Only Begotten Son, the Firstborn of all creation; begotten of God the Father before all worlds; by whom also all

<sup>1</sup> Much has been written in recent years upon the creeds in general, and more especially upon the Apostles' Creed. The works of Lumby (1873) and Swainson (1875) are frequently referred to in the notes. Besides these, the collections of Heurtley (*Harmonia Symbolica*, 1858) and Hahn (*Bibliothek der Symbole*, ed. 3, 1897) will be found most valuable, as well as the great work of Caspari (*Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, 1870–1875; and *Alle und Neue Quellen*, 1879) and Mr. A. E. Burn's *Introduction to the Creeds*, 1899. On the Apostles' Creed, reference may be made to Dr. Swete's volume, *The Apostles' Creed: its Relation to Primitive Christianity* (ed. 3, 1899), in which Harnack's pamphlet, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis* (1892) (translated into English in the *Nineteenth Century*, July 1893), is well answered. Other recent studies of the same creed from different points of view are the following: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des altkirchlichen Taufsymbols*, D. F. Kattenbusch (1892); *Das apostolische Symbolum*, T. Zahn (1893, Eng. tr. 1899); *Das apostolische Symbol*, Kattenbusch (1897–1900); *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis*, C. Blume, S.J. (1893); *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis*, C. Baeumer, O.S.B. (1893); *The Apostles' Creed*, A. Harnack (Eng. tr. 1901); *Das Taufsymbolum der alten Kirche*, B. Dörholt (1898); and cf. Dr. Sanday in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vols. i. and iii.

<sup>2</sup> Socrates, *H. E.* i. viii.

things were made; who for our salvation was incarnate, and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come again in glory to judge the quick and dead

“We believe also in One Holy Ghost.”<sup>1</sup>

This creed, Eusebius tells us, was received without opposition. So far as it went, it was perfectly orthodox, and no objection could be taken to it. Only it did not express with quite sufficient clearness the great doctrine of our Lord's eternal divinity, which it was found necessary to guard against Arianism. It was therefore proposed that the crucial term, *Homoousios*, should be inserted in it. This was agreed to; and, finally, the following creed, which was evidently based on that proposed by Eusebius, was adopted and promulgated by the Council.

“We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible;

“And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Only-Begotten of the Father—that is, of the Substance of the Father—God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; Begotten, not made, Being of one substance

<sup>1</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, υἷον μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον· δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα, τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον· καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀνεληθόντα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· καὶ ἕξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἕν πνεῦμα ἅγιον. It is curious that this creed ends so abruptly, and the probability is that Eusebius only quoted so much of the baptismal creed as was necessary for his purpose. Other early creeds always have the third division more fully developed, e.g., the creed of Arius himself (Hahn, p. 255); of Antioch (*ibid.* pp. 141, 142); of the Apostolic Constitutions (p. 139); and that of the Council of Antioch of 341 (p. 183). It is impossible that the Baptismal Creed of Cæsarea can really have ended with the words, “We believe also in one Holy Ghost.”

with the Father; *by whom all things were made*, both that are in heaven and that are in earth; *who* for us men, and *for our salvation*, came down, and *was incarnate*, and was made man; *suffered, and rose again the third day*; *ascended* into heaven; is coming to *judge the quick and dead*. *And in the Holy Ghost.*"<sup>1</sup>

The clauses in italics are those which are also found in the creed of Eusebius, so that the amount of agreement between the two can easily be perceived. It will be seen that the fathers at Nicæa did a good deal more than merely insert the one important term *Homoousios*. As a matter of fact they framed a new creed on the basis of the creed of Cæsaræa—new in phraseology, but, as was shown above, in connection with the Second Article, not new in doctrine.

This creed, however, which was thus framed at Nicæa, is by no means verbally identical with that in use among us, which bears the name of the Nicene Creed. When or by whom, the additional clauses were inserted, and the alterations made whereby the creed assumed its present form, it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide with certainty. But it must have been about the middle of the fourth century. The grounds on which this conclusion rests are two. (1) The enlarged creed

<sup>1</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὄρατων τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, μονογενῆ—τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ· φῶς ἐκ φωτός· Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς· ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. To these were appended these anathemas: Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ἢ ποτὲ ὄτε οὐκ ἦν, ἢ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἢ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία.—Socrates, *H. E. I. viii.*

familiar to us (without the *Filioque*) is first met with in a work of Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, which was written in the year 373 or 374. It is there given in the following form:—

“We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and<sup>1</sup> of all things visible and invisible.

“And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-Begotten Son of God, *Begotten of His Father before all worlds*—that is of the Substance of the Father—Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father; By whom all things were made, both that are in heaven and that are in earth; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and is coming again with glory to judge the quick and dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets: in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The clauses in italics are the new ones not found in the true creed of Nicæa.

<sup>2</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς, ὄρατων τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, φῶς ἐκ φωτός· Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους

"This faith," Epiphanius adds, "was delivered by the holy apostles, and in the Church in the holy city, by all the holy bishops, above three hundred and ten in number." These last words indicate that the Nicene Council is intended, the traditional number of bishops present there being three hundred and eighteen. But it may be doubted whether Epiphanius meant to make the Council responsible for the *exact* words, any more than the apostles. He cannot possibly have imagined that this particular form of words was really drawn up by the apostles; and probably he is not to be understood as meaning that the creed was word for word that which came from Nicæa. It was the Nicene Creed, only in a revised and enlarged form. That the Church of the fourth century did not consider itself bound to the very words of the Creed put forth at Nicæa, except in so far as the crucial terms on the nature of the pre-incarnate Son were concerned, is shown by the fact that other versions of the Creed exist claiming, like that of Epiphanius, to be "Nicene."<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, Epiphanius himself, in the very next para-

καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς· καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς· καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ ὡμῶν συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. ἀμήν. Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, § 118. Epiphanius appends to this the anathemas of the Nicene Creed.

<sup>1</sup> The Syriac Creed of Mesopotamia now used by the Nestorian Churches, and the Cappadocian Creed now used by the Armenian Churches, both claim to be "Nicene," though differing widely from the original creed. See Hort's *Two Dissertations*, p. 110, and cf. p. 149 *seq.*, where these two creeds are given in full.

graph of the *Ancoratus*,<sup>1</sup> gives another enlarged form of the same creed, expanded in order to meet more fully the heresies of the Apollinarians and Macedonians, which he tells us had sprung up from the time of the Emperors Valentinian and Valens. This enables us to fix the date of the additional clauses in our own creed with some degree of certainty. The version is evidently given by Epiphanius, as that which was current before the date of Valentinian and Valens, who succeeded to the Empire in 364.

(2) Another consideration also points to the middle of the fourth century as the date of the additions. The expansion of the article on the Holy Ghost by the addition of the words, "the Lord and the life-giver; who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets," indicates that the Macedonian heresy had already begun to attract attention; while the addition of the clause "whose kingdom shall have no end," must have been due to the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra, who, in opposing Arianism, had become practically involved in a form of Sabellianism, and had been led to the denial of the eternity of Christ's kingdom. Now S. Cyril of Jerusalem read the last mentioned clause in the creed, which he expounded in his *Catechetical Lectures* in the year 347 or 348, and insisted on its importance, because of the heresy "lately sprung up in Galatia," for "a certain one has dared to affirm that after the end of the world Christ shall reign no longer; and he has dared to say that the Word which came forth from the Father shall be again absorbed into the Father, and shall be no more."<sup>2</sup> Thus

<sup>1</sup> *Ancoratus*, § 119.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* xv. § 27; cf. iv. 15: "Be sure to settle your belief in this point also, since there are many who say that Christ's kingdom has an end."

the existence of these clauses against Marcellus and the Macedonians points to a date not much *earlier* than 360, while the lack of additions, expressly directed against Apollinarianism, makes it tolerably certain that the form dates from a period prior to that in which Apollinarianism had formulated the heresy associated with his name.<sup>1</sup> It cannot, therefore, be much *later* than the middle of the century.

Thus all the evidence points to 360, or thereabouts, as the date of the enlarged Creed, which we now term Nicene.

The *place* at which the development of the Creed first took place must be a matter of conjecture. No positive evidence is forthcoming. But from the great similarity which the enlarged creed bears to the Creed of S. Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*, it has been conjectured with much probability that the expansion must be traced to the Church of Jerusalem.

S. Cyril's Creed, as collected from his lectures, runs as follows:—

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-Begotten Son of God, *who was begotten of the Father*, Very God, *before all worlds*; by whom all things were made; who

<sup>1</sup> This is very clearly seen by a comparison with the second of the Epiphonian Creeds, where the clauses on the Incarnation are expanded so as to insist on the *perfect* humanity of our Lord. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, τούτεστι γεννηθέντα τελείως ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας τῆς ἀειπαρθένου διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, τούτεστι τέλειον ἀνθρώπου λαβόντα, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα καὶ νοῦν καὶ πάντα, ἐκ τῆς ἐστῆν ἀνθρώπος κ.τ.λ. Both forms are given in Hahn, p. 134 *seq.*, and in Heurtley, *De Fide et Symbolo*, p. 11. It is possible that (as was asserted by Diogenes of Cyzicus, at Chalcedon) the words "He was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary," were added to guard against Apollinarianism (see, however, Hort's *Two Dissertations*, p. 90). But had the heresy been formidable, much more would seem to have been necessary, judging by the later form just cited.

was incarnate, and was made man; *was crucified, and buried*; rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven, *and sitteth at the right hand of the Father*, and is coming in *glory* to judge the quick and dead; *whose kingdom shall have no end.*

"And in One Holy Ghost, the Comforter, *who spake in the prophets*; and in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, and in one holy Catholic Church, and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life everlasting."<sup>1</sup>

If this be compared with the enlarged creed as given by Epiphanius, it will be seen that all the clauses which we have here put in italics, though wanting in the original Nicene Creed, are contained in the revised form of it. It would seem, then, highly probable that the said revised form is the result of a fusion of the original Nicene Creed with the local creed of the Church of Jerusalem, and (in accordance with what has been already said), that this fusion must have taken place about the middle of the fourth century.<sup>2</sup> This is perhaps

<sup>1</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς ἕν ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, καὶ εἰς ἕν βάπτισμα μετανόας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Hahn, p. 132. Heurtley (*De Fide et Symbolo*, p. 9) reads, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα ἐκ παρθένου καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου. But where these words appear in *Cal.* iv. 9 and xii. 3, they probably form part of S. Cyril's comment and not of the actual creed; cf., however, Touttée's edition of *S. Cyril*, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> See further the second of Hort's *Two Dissertations*, namely, that "on the Constantinopolitan Creed, and other Eastern creeds of the fourth century." Hort's view is that the creed is actually the local creed of Jerusalem, with an insertion from the Creed of Nicæa of the crucial passage on the nature of the pre-incarnate Son. "Light of Light, Very God of Very God, etc."

as far as we can go in tracing its origin. But, whatever may be thought of its connection with Jerusalem, the fact that it appears almost word for word as we have it, in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, in the year 373 or 374, is proof positive that the additions cannot have been "made" (as the common account states), at the Council of Constantinople in the year 381. This brings us to the question, Is the Council of Constantinople in any way responsible for the creed?

Grave doubts have been recently thrown on this responsibility by the following facts:—

1. None of the three early ecclesiastical historians, who relate the history of the Council—Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret—give any such creed as set forth by it.

2. Socrates and Sozomen both expressly state that the Fathers decided that the faith of the Council of Nicæa should remain inviolate.<sup>1</sup>

3. The first canon passed by the Council lays down in distinct terms that "the creed of the three hundred and eighteen bishops assembled at Nicæa shall not be made void, but remain firm"; and the synodical letter of the Fathers speaks in similar terms.<sup>2</sup>

4. At the Council of Ephesus in 431 no notice whatever was taken of the enlarged creed, but the genuine Creed of Nicæa was once more ratified and continued.<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand, there is to be set against this the fact that at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the enlarged creed was quoted as emanating from the Council of Constantinople, by those who themselves came from that city or its neighbourhood, and would therefore

<sup>1</sup> See Socrates, *H. E.* V. viii.; Sozomen, *H. E.* VII. ix.

<sup>2</sup> See Theodoret, *H. E.* V. ix.

<sup>3</sup> See the seventh canon of this Council, quoted above, p. 225.

be likely to have correct information on such a matter,<sup>1</sup> and it was finally accepted and ratified by the assembled Fathers in addition to the Creed of Nicæa. "We, therefore," so runs the definition of faith, "declare that the exposition of the right and blameless faith by the three hundred and eighteen holy and blessed Fathers, who were assembled at Nicæa in the time of the then Emperor Constantine of pious memory, should have the first place; and that those things should also be maintained which were defined by the hundred and fifty holy Fathers of Constantinople, for the taking away of the heresies which had then sprung up, and the confirmation of the same, our Catholic and Apostolic Faith." This definition was followed by the recital of *both* creeds—(1) the original Nicene, and (2) the enlarged Constantinopolitan form of it.

On a review of the whole evidence on both sides, it would seem quite clear that even if the Council of Constantinople made itself in any way responsible for the creed generally associated with it, it never intended it to *supersede* the creed put forth at Nicæa, or to come into general circulation as *the* creed of the Church universal. The silence of all the early authorities is conclusive on this point. But its recognition at Chalcedon may very possibly imply that it really received some sort of sanction at Constantinople *as an orthodox creed*.<sup>2</sup> But that is all that can be claimed for it. Before Chalcedon there is no trace of its general use; and even after this Council it only gradually made its way into general circulation. It probably superseded the true Nicene Creed, owing to its use in the euchar-

<sup>1</sup> See Lumby, *The History of the Creeds*, pp. 78–81.

<sup>2</sup> Hort argues that it may have been recognised at Constantinople as the Creed of Cyril of Jerusalem, whose authority was apparently impugned at the Council. See *Two Dissertations*, etc., pp. 97–107. According to Kunze, it was brought forward as the Baptismal Creed of Nectarius.

istic service, which dates in the East from about the middle of the sixth century;<sup>1</sup> in the West from some time later.<sup>2</sup> The confusion of name, and the transfer to the enlarged creed of the title Nicene, would appear to belong to a still later period.<sup>3</sup>

Appended are two forms of the creed—(1) the Greek text as commonly received in the East since Chalcedon, and (2) the Latin version which has been current in the Western Church since the Council of Toledo, 589.

“Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί· δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐράνους, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφήτων· εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν

<sup>1</sup> I.e., from the time of the Emperor Justin, see Zaccaria, *Bibliotheca Ritualis*, vol. II. civ. Previously to this the true Nicene Creed had been used in some parts of the East.

<sup>2</sup> Spain adopting it first in 589.

<sup>3</sup> The enlarged creed was carefully distinguished from the Nicene at Toledo (see above, p. 216), but is confused with it and definitely termed Nicene in Charlemagne's *Capitularc* of 787 (quoted above, p. 221).

ἀμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. ἀμήν.”

“Credo in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Factorem cœli et terræ, atque visibilium omnium et invisibilium: Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, et ex patre natum ante omnia sæcula, Deum de Deo, Lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, genitum non factum, consubstantialiẽ Patri: Per quem omnia facta sunt, Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de cœlis, et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est, crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato: passus et sepultus est, et resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas, et ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos: cujus regni non erit finis. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit, qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur, qui locutus est per prophetas. Et unam sanctam Catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam. Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum, et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum et vitam venturi sæculi. Amen.”

In comparing the English translation with this, three points deserve attention.

1. “By whom all things were made.” As Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, the expression in the English “fails to suggest any idea different from the other expression in the creed, ‘Maker of heaven and earth,’ which has before been applied to the Father.”<sup>1</sup> In the original, however, a distinction is accurately marked, and the preposition used (*διὰ*, not *ὑπό*, Latin *per*) describes the Son as the *mediate* agent of creation, *through* whom all things were made. The creed thus faithfully repro-

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, p. 122.



duces the teaching of Scripture, in which this preposition *διὰ* is specially used of the divine Word. *E.g.* S. John i. 3: "All things were made by (*διὰ*) Him"; ver. 10, "the world was made by Him" (*δι' αὐτοῦ*).<sup>1</sup>

2. "The Lord and Giver of life." Again to the English reader the phrase is ambiguous, and might be taken to mean the Lord of life and the Giver of the life; whereas in the original it is quite clear, "The Lord (*τὸ κύριον*) used absolutely, expressing the Divinity of the Spirit), and the Life-giver (*τὸ ζωοποιόν*).

3. "One Catholic and Apostolic Church." In this clause there is no English equivalent to the word *ἁγίαν*, or *sanctam*. It is generally thought that the omission of the word "holy" in the translation first made for the English Prayer-Book of 1549 was simply due to a printer's error. But if so, it is strange that the blunder was never corrected in any of the subsequent editions of the Prayer-Book. And it has been plausibly argued that the omission was *deliberate*, not because the Reformers made light of holiness as a note of the Church, for the word "holy" is retained in the corresponding article in the Apostles' Creed, "the holy Catholic Church"—but because they imagined on critical grounds that it had no place in the true text of the creed. It is certainly the case that the word was wanting in the creed as given in some of the early editions of the Councils which were accessible to them, and they may have thought that they were restoring a truer text than that which had been previously in use.<sup>2</sup> However this may be, whether the omission was intentional or due to inadvertence, there is no doubt that it is wrong, and that we ought to read this article with the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See an article on "The Anglican Version of the Nicene Creed," *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. viii. p. 372.

four notes of the Church plainly expressed: "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church."

#### IV. *The Athanasian Creed.*

As the Apostles' Creed was not composed by the apostles, and the Nicene Creed is not the Creed of Nicæa, so the Athanasian Creed is not the work of Athanasius. Not only is the creed indebted (as will presently be shown) for much of its language to the works of Augustine written some years after the death of Athanasius, but also there can be no question that the original language of the creed is Latin, whereas Athanasius wrote in Greek. "It is certain," says Luby, "that whoever peruses the various Greek versions of the creed which are extant cannot fail to abandon the notion that the original language of this composition was Greek. The unusual words and strange constructions betray the hand of translators, and those not of great skill. That this may be apparent from different versions, the first two verses are subjoined. . . . They vary widely from one another, as will be seen, and bear no trace whatever of a common Greek original. It is, therefore, impossible to believe that any such original ever existed."<sup>1</sup>

"Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem; quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit."

"(1) *Εἴ τις θέλει σωθῆναι, πρὸ πάντων χρὴ αὐτῷ τὴν καθολικὴν κρατῆσαι πίστιν ἣν εἰ μὴ τις ἰγνή καὶ ἄμωμον τηρήσειε, πάσης ἀμφιβολίας ἐκτός εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπολείται.*

"(2) *Τῷ θέλουσι σωθῆναι πρὸ πάντων ἀνάγκη τὴν*

<sup>1</sup> *The History of the Creeds*, p. 189.

καθολικὴν πίστιν κατέχειν ἢν εἰ μὴ τις ἀκεραίαν καὶ ἀπαράθραυστον συντηρήσειεν ἀναμφιβόλως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπολείται.

“(3) Ὅστις ἂν βούληται σωθῆναι πρὸ πάντων χρῆ κρατεῖν τὴν καθολικὴν πίστιν ἢν εἰ μὴ εἰς ἕκαστος σώαν καὶ ἀμώμητον τηρήσῃ ἄνευ δισταγμοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπολείται.

“(4) Ἐἰ τις βούλοιτο σωθῆναι πρὸ πάντων αὐτῷ χρῆ κρατῆσαι τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν ἢν ἔαν μὴ τις ἀμόλυντον καὶ ἄφθορον τηρήσῃ αἰῶνιον εὐρήσει τὴν ἀπόλειαν.”

This specimen is quite sufficient to demonstrate that the creed originated in the West and not at Alexandria. How, then, did it get its name? It has been thought that this may be accounted for by the fact that it contains an exposition of the doctrine which Athanasius so nobly defended, and of which he was the most prominent champion against Arianism; and accordingly the suggestion has been made<sup>1</sup> that when Arianism was rife in the West, the Arians may have termed the orthodox party Athanasians, and the creed which most fully expressed their doctrines “the Athanasian Creed.” This does not seem a very probable explanation of the origin of the names, and it is more reasonable to suppose that the name was attached to the creed because it was erroneously believed to be the work of Athanasius. In an uncritical age traditions concerning the authorship of famous documents easily grew up, often without the slightest foundation—witness the ascription of the *Te Deum* to S. Ambrose and S. Augustine—and even if we cannot now explain exactly how the title *Fides Athanasii* first became attached to the creed, whether by the carelessness of a copyist, or as a guess at authorship, there is no need to seek for any further explana-

<sup>1</sup> By Bishop Browne, *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 224; after Waterland, *Critical History*, ch. viii.

tion of its perpetuation than the belief that it was the work of the saint whose name was given to it.

Concerning the date of the creed, no small controversy has arisen. Its ascription to Athanasius can be traced back to the ninth century, nor does it appear that it was ever seriously questioned until the seventeenth century.<sup>1</sup> Almost the first to reject the traditional title of it was Gerard Voss, in his work *De Tribus Symbolis*, published in 1642. From his date onward the Athanasian authorship was generally given up, and various names were suggested by writers on the subject,<sup>2</sup> until in 1723 the *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed* was published by Daniel Waterland. This masterly work was commonly regarded as conclusive, and the controversy was set at rest for the next hundred and fifty years, and has only been reopened in recent times, largely owing to the discovery of evidence unknown to Waterland. His conclusion, based on a careful examination of both external and internal evi-

<sup>1</sup> It will be noticed that in the Eighth Article, Cranmer (or whoever drew it up) indicated his rejection of the tradition concerning the apostolic authorship of the Apostles' Creed, by speaking of it as “that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed,” but spoke unhesitatingly of this other as “Athanasius' Creed.” In the Ten Articles of 1536 it is said of the three creeds that “one was made by the apostles, and is the common creed, which every man useth; the second was made by the Holy Council of Nice, and is said daily in the mass; and the third was made by Athanasius, and is comprehended in the Psalm *Quicumque Vult*” (Article III). The rubric in the Prayer-Book which entitles it “this confession of our Christian faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius,” dates from 1662. In the earlier editions of the Prayer-Books there was nothing corresponding to the words in italics.

<sup>2</sup> (1) Voss himself thought that the creed was the work of a Gallican writer, possibly as late as the eighth or ninth century; (2) Paschasius Quesnel (1675) assigned it to Vigilius Tapsensis in the fifth century. So Cave, Dupin, Pagi and others; (3) Antelmi (1693) suggested Vincent of Lerins, also belonging to the fifth century; (4) Muratori (1698) gives it to Venantius Fortunatus in the sixth; while (5) Waterland himself decides in favour of Hilary of Arles.

dence, was that the creed was composed in Gaul between the years 420 and 430, and that it is very probably the work of Hilary of Arles. That it cannot be earlier than 420 may be taken as certain, for the coincidences of thought and expression between it and the writings of S. Augustine are so striking as to lead to the conclusion that the author of the creed, whoever he may have been, must have been well acquainted with the works of S. Augustine, including his books on the "Trinity," which were not published until 416.<sup>1</sup>

Waterland's *terminus ad quem* is arrived at mainly from internal evidence. The date fixed by him as the latest possible one for the composition of the creed is 430 A.D. This year is selected because he maintains that the creed does not condemn the Eutychian and Nestorian heresies in the full, direct, and critical terms, such as would naturally have been used had it been composed after these heresies had arisen and become formidable. There is nothing, so he asserts, in the creed but what is found in earlier writers in combating the errors of Arius and Apollinaris. Even those clauses (vers. 32-35) which at first sight bear the appearance of being expressly intended to condemn the Nestorian division of Christ into "two Persons," are found on examination to be based entirely on the writings of Augustine, so that there is really scarcely a phrase contained in them which may not be paralleled in one or other of Augustine's works.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare Waterland, *Critical History*, ch. ix., where the creed is given with parallel passages from the Fathers, and more especially from S. Augustine.

<sup>2</sup> See Waterland, ch. ix. The following striking parallels may be quoted: "Agnoscamus geminam substantiam Christi; divinam scilicet qua equalis est Patri, humanam qua major est Pater: utrumque autem simul non duo sed unus est Christus."—*In Johan. Evan. Tr.* lxxviii. 3. "Verbum caro factum est, a Divinitate carne suscepta, non in carnem

The *external evidence* as given by Waterland, although not necessitating quite so early a date as 430, is not inconsistent with it. If the creed is a composition of the fifth century, there is nothing surprising in the fact that no external testimonies to its use have come down to us before the sixth and seventh centuries to which Waterland assigns his earliest authorities. Recent researches, however, have shown that it is not safe to appeal without hesitation to some of Waterland's most important witnesses to the early use of the creed. Consequently the whole subject has been reopened, and the question of the date of the creed has been reconsidered in the light of modern discoveries.

The three most ancient testimonies relied on by Waterland are the following:—

1. A canon of a Council of Autun, insisting on the recitation of "the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius" by the clergy. Of this he gives the date as 670 A.D.<sup>1</sup>

2. A MS. "mentioned by Bishop Usher, which he had seen in the Cotton Library, and which he judged to come up to the age of Gregory the Great," *i.e. circa* 600. This MS., Waterland says, was not to be found when he wrote, but he entertains no doubt that Usher had really seen it, and is inclined to trust his judgment on the question of its date.

3. A commentary on the creed, published by Muratori, and unhesitatingly assigned by Waterland

Divinitate mutata."—*Enchiridion*, ch. xxxiv. "Idem Deus qui homo et qui Deus idem homo: non confusione naturæ, sed unitate personæ."—*Serm.* clxxxvi. "Sicut enim unus est homo anima rationalis et caro; sic unus est Christus Deus et homo."—*In Johan. Evan. Tr.* lxxviii. 3.

<sup>1</sup> "Si quis presbyter, diaconus, subdiaconus vel clericus symbolum quod sancto inspirante spiritu Apostoli tradiderunt, et fidem Sancti Athanasii præsulis irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit, ab episcopo condemnatur."—*Hardouin*, vol. iii. p. 13.

(as by its first editor) to Venantius Fortunatus, Bishop of Poitiers about 570.

Now with regard to these three pieces of evidence, it must be noted *first*, that though the canon referred to is a real canon of Autun, reasons have been given for doubting whether it actually belongs to the series passed in the Synod of 670;<sup>1</sup> and its date cannot be appealed to with the same confidence as formerly. *Secondly*, Archbishop Usher's lost "Cotton MS." has been discovered since Waterland's day in the library at Utrecht. It is now well known to scholars as the "Utrecht Psalter," and the opinion of experts assigns it to a date considerably later than that at which Usher put it. Indeed, there are grounds for thinking that it may have been written as late as the ninth century.<sup>2</sup> *Thirdly*, the commentary, supposed by Waterland to be the work of Venantius Fortunatus, is only assigned to "Fortunatus" in a single MS.<sup>3</sup> But Fortunatus is not an uncommon name, and there is really nothing whatever to identify the author of the commentary with *Venantius* Fortunatus, the Bishop of Poitiers in the sixth century. Thus the reason given for dating this work about the year 570 disappears altogether.

In this way the earliest testimonies formerly brought forward have had doubts thrown upon their value, and it has been thought that the internal evidence, if unsupported by early external authorities, is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider the creed as a work of the fifth century. Further, it has been said that there is no

<sup>1</sup> See Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, p. 204. Cf., however, Ommanney, *Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed*, p. 52 *seq.*, where strong reasons are given for upholding Waterland's view of the date of this canon.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 210.

<sup>3</sup> The MS. which is at Milan (M. 79 *sup.*) is assigned to the eleventh century. In other MSS. of the same commentary or exposition, e.g. that in the Bodleian (Junius, 25) no author's name is attached to it. See Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, ch. xxix. and Lumby, p. 208

certain reference to it as the *Fides Athanasii* till the ninth century,<sup>1</sup> though many striking parallels with different portions of it can be quoted from writings of an earlier date. Consequently, some writers have maintained that, even if the materials out of which it is compiled are comparatively early, yet in its completed form it must be set down as a work of the ninth century.<sup>2</sup>

This view the present writer finds it quite impossible to accept. It appears to him that although Waterland's chapters on the external testimonies, commentaries, and MSS. of the creed may require rewriting, yet a considerable portion of the early evidence adduced by him remains unshaken, and fresh evidence unknown in his day has been discovered, so that we are compelled to assign to the creed a date if not actually during the fifth century, yet at the latest in the earlier part of the sixth.

1. Manuscripts of the creed, which were undoubtedly written during the ninth and tenth centuries, are comparatively numerous, some of them being assigned by competent authorities to the *early years* of the ninth. But besides these there are at least *three* MSS. of it, which in the opinion of the highest authorities on palæo-

<sup>1</sup> Waterland gives three MSS. earlier than the ninth century as assigning it to Athanasius, namely, *King Athelstan's Psalter*, in the British Museum (Galba, A. xviii.), which he dates in 703. A S. Germain's MS. (257) at Paris, collated by Montfaucon, assigned to 760, and the Psalter given by Charles to Hadrian, now at Vienna (1861), which, if Charles be Charlemagne, and Hadrian the first of that name, must belong to the year 772. But the dates of all these MSS. have been questioned (see below).

<sup>2</sup> The late Dr. Swainson strongly contended that it belonged to the ninth century; and with him Lumby to some extent agreed, as he held that *in its present form* the creed was only compiled between A.D. 813 and 850; though he maintained that "before that date two separate compositions existed [one on the Trinity and the other on the Incarnation] which form the groundwork of the present *Quicumque*."—*History of the Creeds*, p. 254.

graphy were written *before the close of the eighth century*, viz. :—

(a) Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, 4858 (formerly 4908).—A copy of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, to which is appended at the close of the MS. a copy of the Athanasian Creed. In this it is without title, and only the first eleven verses are found, as the volume is mutilated and the remainder is torn off. This MS. is assigned by the present authorities of the MS. department at Paris, as it was by Montfaucon, to the later part of the eighth century.<sup>1</sup>

(b) Paris, 13159.—A Psalter with Canticles followed by the Athanasian Creed, with no title. Internal evidence seems to fix the date of this MS. beyond question to the period between 795 and 800, as, in the litany contained in it, there are prayers for Leo who became pope in 795, and for Charles as "Rex," which shows that it was written before he was crowned Emperor in 800. This date is accepted by M. Delisle and other authorities. It may be added that this MS. was unknown to Waterland.<sup>2</sup>

(c) Milan, Ambr. O. 212.—A MS. containing various documents, including among others the Athanasian Creed without title. This MS. was assigned by Muratori to the seventh century, by Montfaucon to the eighth, and with him agrees the present librarian at Milan, Dr. Ceriani.<sup>3</sup>

Besides these three MSS., two of which contain the creed

<sup>1</sup> Lumby mentions this MS., but does not really attempt to prove that it is later than the date assigned to it. See *History of the Creeds*, p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> Swainson describes this MS., and was evidently perplexed by it, but honestly tells us that M. Delisle assigns it to the year 795.—*Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 350. Lumby fails to notice it at all.

<sup>3</sup> Swainson and Lumby both try to make out that it is later, but their opinion on such a matter can hardly be set against the judgment of such experts as those mentioned in the text.

complete, the other being mutilated, there is (*d*) what is known as the "Trèves fragment." This is only known to us from a Paris MS. (3836) generally dated about 730. It contains a fragment of an address by a preacher to his congregation comprising much of the latter part of the Athanasian Creed, which address the writer says that he found in a book at Trèves. The original Trèves manuscript has not been discovered, but its date must be placed considerably earlier than that of the Paris MS. in which it was copied, and some have thought that it must have been written not later than the fifth century.<sup>1</sup> It has been suggested that it gives the groundwork from which the latter part of the *Quicumque* was subsequently worked up,<sup>2</sup> but it would seem to be a truer view that the preacher whose sermon is given in the MS. was actually quoting the creed, and applying it. If this is so, the document may be appealed to as bearing witness to the previous existence of the creed, the language of which it adopts and modifies.<sup>3</sup>

Mention must also be made of two other MSS. of the creed.

(e) Vienna, 1861.—This is the psalter presented by "Charles" to Pope Hadrian, which Waterland, identifying Charles with Charlemagne, and Hadrian with the first pope of that name, assigned to 772. It has, however, been pointed out that Charles may be identified with Charles the Bald, and the pope with Hadrian II., in which case the MS. will belong not to the eighth but to the latter part of the ninth century. It contains the creed under the title "Fides Sci Athanasii Epi Alexandrini."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> So Swainson and Lumby.

<sup>3</sup> See Ommanney, *Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed*, pp. 4 and 461, where a copy of the fragment is given.

<sup>4</sup> See Swainson, p. 372, and Lumby, p. 221.

(f) St. Germain's, 257, as described by Montfaucon, is placed by Waterland after him as of the date 760, and the title of the creed in it is given as "Fides Sancti Athanasii Episcopi Alexandriae."—Unhappily the MS. is now lost,<sup>1</sup> and therefore the date cannot be appealed to with absolute confidence, though the opinion of Montfaucon on such a subject is not lightly to be set aside. Without, however, laying stress on the last two manuscripts enumerated (e) and (f), there remain, in addition to the Treves fragment, *three* in regard to which there is absolutely no reason for refusing to credit the judgment of experts on the question of their date.<sup>2</sup> And if the dates assigned to them be accepted we may dismiss without further consideration the notion that the creed itself can have been a compilation of the ninth century.

2. A second important branch of evidence to the antiquity of the creed is to be found in *early collections of canons* in which it finds a place.

(a) Paris, 3848 B.—A MS. of the early part of the ninth century contains not only a collection of canons, which includes the Autun Canon, ordering "the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius" to be learnt by heart by all the clergy, but also a series of testimonies to the faith preceding the canons. Among these the Athanasian Creed itself is given in full under the title of "Fides Sancti Athanasii Episcopi."<sup>3</sup>

(b) Paris, 1451, is another MS. assigned by the best authorities to the same date, being probably written before the death of Leo III. in 816. It also contains a collection of canons, and also the full text of the Ath-

<sup>1</sup> Unless it can be identified with Cod. q o r n. i. 5 in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, which Mr. Burn tells me is probably the case.

<sup>2</sup> *King Athelstan's Psalter* in the British Museum (Galba A, xviii.), which Waterland put at the date 703, is now universally assigned to the ninth century.

<sup>3</sup> Maassen, *Biblioth. Latina Juris Canonici*; cf. Swainson, p. 268. Ommanney, *Early History of the Athanasian Creed*, p. 92.

anasian Creed, "Incipit exemplar fidei c̄ht̄ Sc̄i Athanasii Ep̄i Alexandrine ecclesie."<sup>1</sup>

(c) Vatican, Palat. 540.—A MS. also belonging to the ninth century; contains a Gallican collection of canons assigned to the sixth century, immediately followed by some other documents, including the creed: "Incipit fides Catholica beati Athanasii Episcopi."<sup>2</sup>

(d) Further, the Canon of Autun, mentioned above, even if it cannot be unhesitatingly connected with the Synod held under S. Leger in the year 670 *cannot be later than the eighth century*. Dr. Swainson himself admits that it is found in "five manuscripts of the ninth century, and one of the eighth or ninth";<sup>3</sup> and in the face of the evidence borne by the Paris MS. (3848 B) mentioned above, it is absurd to suppose that "the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius" can mean anything but the *Quicumque vult*.

3. Thirdly, we have the evidence of the early commentaries upon the creed. Our knowledge of these has been considerably increased of late years by the researches of Mr. Ommanney, and we are now able to state that there are several other comparatively early ones as well as (a) that which Waterland ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus. As we have already seen, there is no doubt that he was wrong in thus ascribing it to him. But though the authorship of the commentary is unknown, internal evidence is strongly in favour of its belonging to an early date. Besides this, Mr. Ommanney describes four other important commentaries—(b) the "Paris" Commentary which he holds to have been drawn up "not

<sup>1</sup> Maassen, *Biblioth. Latina Juris Canonici*; cf. Swainson, p. 268. Ommanney, *The S.P.C.K. and the Creed of S. Athanasius*, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> *De Antiquis Collectionibus Canonum* (Ed. Ballerini) ii. ch. x. §§ 2, 3. Cf. Maassen and Swainson, *ubi supra*.

<sup>3</sup> *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 272.

later than the ninth century, and not earlier than the seventh"; (c) the "Bouhier," of the eighth, (d) the "Oratorian" of the beginning of the eighth or quite the end of the seventh; and (e) the "Troies" between 649 and 680.<sup>1</sup> It must be borne in mind that the dates of these commentaries are not certain. But, even if they are not earlier than the ninth century, they would still imply that the creed was then regarded as a work of considerable antiquity. Commentaries are not written on new and recent works, but on those of long-standing and repute in the Church. It is remarkable also that in two of these Commentaries, the "Oratorian" and the "Bouhier" it is said that the creed was attributed to Athanasius, *etiam in veteribus codicibus*. Now the actual MSS. of these commentaries may not be older than the tenth century: but if even then there were in existence MSS. of the creed which could be termed "old," and which contained the title referring it to the authorship of Athanasius, a further argument is supplied in support of its early date.<sup>2</sup>

4. We are now in a position to estimate the bearing of *coincidences of language* with early writers. The three branches of evidence, of which the most important items have just been enumerated, are sufficient to show that by the ninth century at the latest the creed had obtained a recognised position. It was even then beginning to be admitted into ecclesiastical Psalters, together with the Te Deum, and the Canticles of the New Testament. It was ordered to be learnt by heart by the clergy, and commentaries were written upon it. Consequently, when we find that the language of the creed appears also in sermons and professions of faith, it is only reasonable to hold that

<sup>1</sup> On all the commentaries reference may be made to Ommanney's *Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed*.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Ommanney, p. 184 *seq.*

such coincidences imply a knowledge of the creed on the part of the writers in question. Nor can it fairly be inferred that if a writer only quotes a portion of the creed, the remainder did not exist in the document from which his citation was drawn. It cannot be said that there is any definite external evidence of the existence of two separate compositions which formed the groundwork of our present *Quicumque vult*; and, therefore, we are justified, as in the case of any other work, in appealing to a citation as at least *prima facie* evidence of a knowledge of the document as it is found in every single MS. that contains it.

Of writers who appear thus to make use of the creed, the following may be mentioned:—

(a) Denebert, Bishop of Worcester, after his election to the bishopric in 798, made a profession of faith, which has been preserved to us, and affords clear evidence that the Athanasian Creed had already found its way into England, for in this profession he quotes a large part of it, saying that he will expound the orthodox Catholic and Apostolic faith, as he has learnt it, "for it is written, Whosoever will be saved, etc." Since he introduces his citation with the formula, "it is written," it is manifest that he is quoting from a recognised and familiar document, and as he proceeds to express his adherence to the decrees of the six General Councils, there was no necessity for him to quote more of the creed than the portion referring to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as the Church's faith in the Incarnation is fully set forth in the decrees of the Councils.<sup>1</sup>

(b) The "Trèves fragment" referred to above must be

<sup>1</sup> See Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, vol. iii. p. 526. "Insuper et orthodoxam catholicam apostolicamque fidem sicut didici paucis exponam verbis, quia scriptum est quicumque vult salvus esse ante omnia opus est illi ut teneat catholicam fidem. Fides autem Catholica hæc est ut unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in Unitate

mentioned again in this place, since it supplies a clear instance of a writer making use of the creed. It is, as has already been said, a portion of a sermon on the creed, the language of which is freely referred to, and applied, as it might be, by any modern preacher. This takes us back to a considerably earlier date than Denebert's profession, possibly even to the fifth century.<sup>1</sup>

(e) Howsoever this may be, we are brought to the sixth century by another consideration. In the appendix to the sermons of Augustine is a discourse formerly attributed to him which the Benedictine editors of his works ascribed to Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles from 502 to 542.<sup>2</sup> Their conclusion is accepted by recent writers,<sup>3</sup> and if it can be established, it will furnish a strong argument for Waterland's view that the creed emanated from Southern Gaul during the fifth century, for the sermon in question obviously betrays a knowledge of the *Quicumque vult*, alluding to both parts of it, namely, that on the Incarnation as well as that on the Holy Trinity.<sup>4</sup>

veneremur; neque confundentes personas neque substantiam separantes; alia est enim Persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti; sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est Divinitas, æqualis gloria, cœterna majestas; Pater a nullo factus est, nec creatus nec genitus; Filius a Patre solo est; non factus, nec creatus, sed genitus; Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens. In hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totæ tres Personæ cœternæ sibi sunt et cœquales; ita ut per omnia sicut supra dictum est, et Trinitas in Unitate et Unitas in Trinitate veneranda sit. Suscipio etiam decreta Pontificum, et sex synodos Catholicas antiquorum heroicorum virorum et præfixam ab eis regulam sincera devotione conservo. Hæc est fides nostra," etc.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 337.

<sup>2</sup> *Opera*, vol. v. Appendix, Serm. cxxliv.

<sup>3</sup> *E.g.* Caspari, Kattenbusch, G. F. Arnold, and Malnory. In any case, as the Baptismal Creed commented upon corresponds closely with what we know to have been the form of the Gallican Creed about the fifth century, the sermon cannot be much later than Cæsarius.

<sup>4</sup> The discourse begins as follows:—"Rogo et admoneo vos, fratres carissimi, ut quicumque vult salvus esse, fidem rectam ac Catholicam discat, firmiter teneat, inviolatamque conservet. Ita ergo oportet uni-

(d) A discourse of a somewhat similar character, but, to judge from some features in the character of the Baptismal Creed commented upon in it, possibly belonging to a yet earlier date, has been discovered and printed by Mr. Ommanney.<sup>1</sup> It likewise seems to allude to the *Quicumque vult*, and to imply a familiarity with its contents on the part of the preacher.

On the whole, then, it is believed that the attacks made upon the antiquity of the creed have completely failed, and that there is no reason for discarding the older view, which regarded it as a work of the fifth century, composed by some writer belonging to the Gallican Church. In style it bears a strong resemblance to the writings of Vincent of Lerins (who died about 450), and if not actually his work, is probably from the hand of someone of the same school, who was familiar with his *Commonitorium*, and borrowed from it.<sup>2</sup>

cuique observare ut credat Patrem, credat Filium, et credat Spiritum Sanctum. Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus; sed tamen non tres Dii, sed unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus. Attamen credat unusquisque fidelis quod Filius æqualis est Patri secundum Divinitatem, et minor est Patre secundum humanitatem carnis, quam de nostro assumpsit; Spiritus vero Sanctus ab utroque procedens. Credite, ergo, carissimi, in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem," etc.

<sup>1</sup> *Dissertation*, p. 3, and *Early History*, etc., p. 121, and cf. p. 393, where the sermon is printed in full. It is contained in the Paris MS. mentioned above, 3848 B, assigned to the early part of the ninth century, and in another of the same date, 2123. The Baptismal Creed commented on in it is curious. An early date may be inferred from the omission of the words *passus, mortuus, descendit ad inferna, sanctorum communionem, vitam æternam*. But, on the other hand, it agrees with the remarkable form found in the *Bangor Antiphonary* (fol. 19), in reading "in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, invisibilem, visibilium et invisibilium omnium rerum conditorem," and "in Spiritum Sanctum Deum omnipotentem unam habentem substantiam cum Patre et Filio"; while, like one of the creeds in the *Missale Gallicanum*, it has the phrase, "*Victor ascendit ad celos*." These features may, perhaps, point to a later date than that which Mr. Ommanney is disposed to assign to it.

<sup>2</sup> See on the whole subject, *The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries*, by A. E. Burn, in Dr. Robinson's *Texts and Studies*, vol. iv.



From the question of the date of the creed, which, after all, is a matter of comparatively small importance, we may pass in conclusion to the consideration of *the use made of the creed by the Church of England*. It has been said in the Western Church in the office of Prime certainly since the tenth century.<sup>1</sup> According to Roman use it is said at this service only on Sundays, but according to the Sarum use, followed in England before the Reformation, it was ordered to be said daily. Prime, however, is a service of monastic origin, and was never intended for a general congregation. Consequently, when on the publication of the first English Prayer-Book in 1549 this confession of our faith was ordered to be recited at matins immediately after Benedictus on the six great festivals of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday, a new departure was taken, and for the first time this creed was adopted for *popular* use. Owing to its position in the Prayer-Book, and its

No. 1. Mr. Burn thinks it more probable that Vincent "used and illustrated the creed than that anyone in a subsequent century of less correct scholarship picked out his phrases and wove them into a document of this nature." Compare these passages of the *Communitorium*: "Ecclesia vero Catholica . . . et unam Divinitatem in Trinitatis plenitudine, et Trinitatis æqualitatem in una atque eadem majestate veneratur, et unum Christum Jesum, non duos, eundemque Deum pariter atque hominem confitetur. . . . Alia est Persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti. Altera substantia Divinitatis, altera humanitatis; sed tamen Deitas et humanitas non alter et alter, sed unus idemque Christus, unus idemque Filius Dei, et unius ejusdemque Christi et filii Dei una eademque Persona; sicut in homine aliud caro, et aliud anima; sed unus idemque homo, anima et caro . . . unus idemque Christus Deus et homo . . . idem Patri æqualis et minor; idem ex Patre ante secula genitus item in seculo ex matre generatus; perfectus Deus, perfectus homo; in Deo summa Divinitas in homine plena humanitas . . . Unus, autem, non corruptibili nescio qua Divinitatis et humanitatis confusione, sed integra et singulari quadam Unitate personæ."—*Communitorium Vincentii Lerinensis*, ch. xiii. Dom Morin has recently suggested Cæsarius of Arles (470–542) as the probable author of the creed. See *Revue Bénédictine*, Oct. 1901.

<sup>1</sup> This is rendered certain from its position in the Psalters. It is alluded to by Honorius of Autun (1136) in the *Gemma Animæ*, bk. ii. ch. 60; by Abbo of Fleury, A.D. 1001 (Migne, cxxxix. p. 462); but not by Amalarius or Walafrid Strabo in the ninth century.

use in the public service of the Church on the six great festivals, and (since 1552) on seven saints' days<sup>1</sup> the *Quicumque vult* is probably much more familiar to the lay members of the Church of England than to those of any other community; and since there is abundant evidence that it is often misunderstood and regarded with suspicion, it may be well to say something in explanation of it, and in answer to the popular objections which are urged against it.

The creed itself falls into two clearly marked divisions. Part 1 (verses 1–26) states the doctrine of the Trinity; Part 2 (verses 27–40) the doctrine of the Incarnation. The form in which the Church's faith is stated in each case is due to the fact that heresies had arisen and had to be met. Thus in Part 1 the two chief heresies combated are those of Sabellius and Arius. The former of these "confounded the Persons," while the latter "divided the substance." The necessity of excluding these errors is obviously present to the mind of the writer from verses 5 to 26, and accounts for most of the expressions used, so that if the character of the heresies in question be borne in mind, the meaning of this portion of the creed will be readily understood.<sup>2</sup> The second part begins with

<sup>1</sup> Not until 1662 was the order given for it to be *substituted* for the Apostles' Creed on those days for which it is appointed.

<sup>2</sup> In verse 9 "incomprehensible" in the English translation is misleading. The Latin is *immensus*, i.e. *infinite*. Cf. *Patrem immensæ majestatis*, "the Father of an *infinite* majesty" in the Te Deum. It is a little uncertain whether the English "incomprehensible" was intended by the translators to be taken in the sense of "illimitable" or infinite; or whether the rendering was meant by them to be equivalent to "inconceivable," as the translation of the Greek ἀκατάληπτος, for that they imagined the Greek to be the original, and translated from it may be taken as certain. See Bp. Dowden's *Quæstionculæ Liturgicæ*.

In verse 19, "by Himself," represents the Latin *singillatim*, and means "severally." Cf. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, XI. xxiv. "Cum de singulis quaritur unusquisque eorum et Deus et Omnipotens esse respondeatur; cum vero de omnibus simul, non tres dii vel tres omnipotentes sed unus Deus omnipotens."

Verse 24: "And in this Trinity none is afore or after other: none is

verse 27, and in it the doctrine of the Incarnation is stated at some length. Here again the thought of Arianism is present; for it and Apollinarianism are the principal heresies kept in view. As has been already shown, it is uncertain whether Nestorianism and Eutychianism were directly before the writer of the creed, though the former of these is effectually excluded by the terms (borrowed from Augustine) which are used in verses 32 to 35 :—

“Who although He be God and Man: yet He is not two, but one Christ;  
 One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God;  
 One altogether; not by Confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person.  
 For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and man is one Christ.”<sup>1</sup>

There remain the so-called “damnatory clauses” to be considered, and to these exception is often taken. Men point to them and say that they are harsh and uncharitable. It is owing to their presence that they object to the use of the creed, and complain (1) that it expressly makes salvation depend upon the correctness of a man’s faith, and that poor simple folk can scarcely be expected to understand and hold all that is here set before them, and (2) that these “damnatory clauses” exclude from all hope of salvation not merely the heathen, but Socinians, greater or less than another.” The words are neuter, *nihil prius aut posterius; nihil majus aut minus* (“Naught (or nothing) is afore or after: naught (or nothing) is greater or less.”) The first phrase refers to *duration*, the second to *dignity*. The next clause is explanatory of this: “But the whole three Persons are *co-eternal* together and *co-equal*.”

<sup>1</sup> Whatever may be thought of the bearing of these verses on the date of the creed as far as *Nestorianism* is concerned (and they are certainly very similar to language used against it by Vincent of Lerins), it seems almost impossible that they can have been written *after* Eutychianism had arisen. Verses 33 and 35 would surely have been worded differently, had the error of thinking that the manhood was absorbed into the Godhead arisen.

Arians, and all others who do not believe in the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation as here expounded.

Now it will be found that these difficulties are, if not entirely removed, at any rate greatly mitigated by observing what the creed really says. The English translation is in several places by no means exact. There is a harsh ring about it, which is wanting in the Latin. Moreover, in common parlance, the sharp edges of meaning often get rubbed off words in familiar use, so that, even where the translation is really not inadequate, phrases are liable to be taken in an inexact sense instead of being given the precise meaning which is really demanded.

The opening clauses of the creed in the original run as follows :—

“*Quicumque vult salvus esse ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem;  
 Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit absque dubio in aeternum peribit.*”

There are several terms here which call for a brief comment.

*Quicumque vult salvus esse.* It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary to call attention to the fact that in the English rendering “whosoever will be saved,” “will” is not the auxiliary verb. But it would be well if the meaning of the phrase could be placed beyond the possibility of misconception by the substitution of “wishes” or “desires.” “Whosoever,” then “wishes to be *salvus*.” Here, it must be admitted, there is an ambiguity in the Latin. It is possible that the word *salvus* should be taken as the equivalent to the Greek *σωζόμενος* in Acts ii. 47, *i.e.* “in a state of salvation (Vulgate, *qui salvi fierent*), or even that it should be rendered “in a sound and healthy condition” (spiritually). It is certainly used in the sense of “safe” or “in the way of salvation” by S. Vincent of

Lerins.<sup>1</sup> But on the other hand, it is employed in the Vulgate and in the writings of Augustine, in passages where it must mean more than this, and imply what is commonly understood by "saved."<sup>2</sup> Which was the precise sense intended by the author of the creed it may be hard to determine; nor does it seem really important to decide, when once it is fairly realised that the creed is only speaking of the *desire* for safety or salvation. But whatever be the precise shade of meaning given to this word *salvus* the significance of the verbs *teneat* and *servaverit* is perfectly clear. "Hold" and "keep" are not inadequate renderings; but if "keep" and "preserve" were substituted for them the drift of the clause would be more sharply brought out; and the English reader would feel at once that *the warning is against apostasy, i.e. against letting go that which has actually been received.* It is impossible for a man to "keep" or "preserve" that which is not previously in his possession. It would be an abuse of terms to tell an impure person to "preserve his chastity." He cannot do it, for such a phrase necessarily implies previous innocence and purity. So also when it is said of the Catholic faith that "except every one do keep [it] whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly," it is obvious that the only case contemplated is that of men who have already received it and are in possession of it.<sup>3</sup> This indicates that

<sup>1</sup> *Commonitorium* ch. iv.: "Intra sacraria Catholicæ fidei salvi esse potuerunt."

<sup>2</sup> The word is constantly used in the Vulgate, not only for *σωζόμενος* in Acts ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15, but for other parts of the verb. See e.g. S. Matt. xix. 25, xxiv. 13; Acts ii. 21, xi. 14, xvi. 30; Rom. v. 9, etc. So in Augustine it often means a good deal more than *σωζόμενος*. See the use of it in *Enchiridion*, ch. xciv. xcvi.; *De Spiritu et Litera*, ch. lviii.; *Contra Julian. Pelag.* iv. c. xlii. seq.

<sup>3</sup> Archdeacon Norris takes *servare fidem* in the creed as equivalent to the same phrase in the Vulgate in 2 Tim. iv. 7, where it is used to translate S. Paul's expression *τηρεῖν τὴν πίστιν*, and he holds that both

the warnings of the creed do not touch the case of the heathen or of any who are brought up in hereditary error (e.g. Socinians and Arians), but they apply only to those within the Church. The Church is not called upon to judge "them that are without" (1 Cor. v. 12).<sup>1</sup> But she is "bound to declare the whole counsel of God"; and it cannot be denied that there is a very severe side to the teaching of Scripture, and that our Lord Himself and His apostles speak in strong terms of the loss incurred by those who reject the faith.<sup>2</sup> But though the Church is bound to state the revealed law and to assert the rule of judgment which follows on wilful rejection of the faith, yet it is not for her to assume the office of judge and apply the law to individual cases. Thus we have no right to say of any given individual, that A. B. "without doubt will perish everlastingly." This may require to be made somewhat clearer. To our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned," common sense supplies certain limitations, and those who accept our Lord's statement in the fullest loyalty, yet understand that the "damnation" spoken of will only be incurred by those who, having had His claims set before their conscience, wilfully reject Him, and disbelieve. But who shall say in any given case whether the rejection has been wilful? To us it may appear that it has been so. But there is so much invincible prejudice

this phrase and the words *integram involatamque* have a moral meaning, "undefiled by a bad life." "Which faith, except each one, keep in integrity and purity."—*Rudiments of Theology*, p. 257. It may be added that "before all things," *ante omnia*, does not mean more than that right faith must precede right practice.

<sup>1</sup> See further on Article XVIII., where more will be said on the case of the heathen.

<sup>2</sup> See especially [S. Mark] xvi. 16; S. John iii. 36; and cf. R. W. Church, *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 101 seq.

in the world, and the force of evidence strikes different minds so differently that it is impossible to say for certain whether the man has ever had the faith fairly set before his conscience. Not till the secrets of all hearts are revealed at the last day can it be known who they are who have "not believed," and who, therefore, "shall be damned." In precisely the same way as that in which we deal with a text such as this, should we deal with the statements of the Athanasian Creed. They are of the nature of a *proclamation*. They stand, as our Lord's own words stand, as a warning to the believer of the danger of letting go that which he has received. They speak in close adherence to scriptural phraseology of the doom incurred by those who reject the Saviour of the world. But that is all. To apply them to any given individual is to assume the office of the judge, to whom alone it belongs to administer the law, and to consider how far it applies in the case brought before Him for judgment.

Verse 26: "He, therefore, that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity." Here, again, there is a harshness about the English translation which is absent from the original. If the words ran thus, "Let him, then, who wishes to be safe [or "saved"] thus think of the Trinity," no objection could reasonably be raised to the clause, and such a rendering would far more closely represent the original "Qui vult, ergo, salvus esse: ita de Trinitate sentiat."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Swainson has pointed out (on the authority of Professor Skeat) that "must" in the sixteenth century often bore a less strong meaning than is now usually attached to it, and was often used in the sense of "would have to," or "should."—*Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 495. The old English version in the Bodleian (Douce, 258), printed by Maskell (*Monumenta Ritualia*, Ed. 2, vol. iii. p. 257) gives the following rendering of the clause, "And who soeuer wele be saafe, yus fele he of ye trinite."

Verse 27: "Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In this sentence the word "rightly" is unfortunate, for to many minds it probably suggests the same idea as "correctly," and seems to imply that strict orthodoxy and correctness of belief is the main thing, making the faith spoken of a matter of the intellect, of the *head* rather than of the *heart*. The Latin, however, is this: "Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi *fideliter* credat"; and if this word *fideliter* were rendered "faithfully" instead of "rightly," it would be apparent that the belief spoken of is a *moral* quality, and belongs to the *heart* even more than to the *head*.<sup>1</sup> In this case the mistranslation, which is serious, is beyond question due to the fact that the Reformers believed that the creed was the work of Athanasius, and therefore corrected the Latin by reference to a Greek version, which they must have considered the original. The version known to them has been shown by Waterland to be that published by Nicholas Bryling at Basle about 1540, and this, we find, renders *fideliter* in this verse by *ὀρθῶς*.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, if, in spite of the considerations here urged, it is still maintained that the creed makes everything depend upon a man's belief, it may be well to emphasise the fact that in reality *it is the only one of the three creeds which expressly asserts judgment by works*.

"They that have *done* good [not 'thought correctly' nor even 'believed rightly'] shall go into life everlasting; and they that have *done* evil into everlasting fire."

<sup>1</sup> Compare Rom. x. 10, "With the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness."

<sup>2</sup> See Waterland, *Critical History*, ch. v. and x., and cf. Swainson, p. 493.

A word may be added with regard to the phrases used to describe the condemnation incurred by those who reject the faith. "Everlastingly" and "everlasting" can scarcely be defended as renderings of *æternus*. It would be better if "eternally" or "eternal" could be substituted, as these are the true equivalents of *in æternum* and *æternum* in clauses 2 and 39. The Latin phrases adequately represent the Greek *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* and *αἰώνιος*, and, therefore, whatever interpretation we put upon the original sayings of our Lord, the same we are justified in putting upon the quotations of them in the creed. Now, in verse 2, the phrase *in æternum perire* occurs. This is the equivalent used in the Vulgate for *ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* in S. John xi. 26. Its use in the creed may also be justified by the occurrence of the phrase "eternal destruction" (*δλεθρος αἰώνιος*) which is used of the doom incurred by those who "know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus" in 2 Thess. i. 9.<sup>1</sup> Still more directly are the words of the thirty-ninth verse of the creed founded upon Scripture. They are taken from our Lord's sayings in S. Matthew xxv. 41: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (*πὺρ αἰώνιον*, Revised Version, "eternal fire"), and in verse 46: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment (*εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, Revised Version, 'eternal punishment'); but the righteous into life eternal."<sup>2</sup>

Whatever, then, our Lord's words mean, *the creed means the same*, for, as the late Dr. Mozley forcibly pointed out, "where the language of a doctrinal formulary and the language of the Bible are the same, whatever explanation we give, in case there is a difficulty, of the language of the Bible is applicable to the language of the formulary as well; and therefore, in such a case,

<sup>1</sup> Compare also the expression "the second death" in Rev. xx. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also S. John v. 29.

the statement in the formulary is no fresh difficulty, but only one which we have already surmounted in accepting the same statement in the Bible."<sup>1</sup> Let due weight be given to this consideration, and let it be remembered that the creed *repeats* rather than *explains* or *interprets* the phrases used in Scripture, and it is believed that much of the difficulty now felt in some quarters with regard to the acceptance of the creed will be removed.

Appended is the creed itself in the original Latin, as found in the Sarum Breviary.<sup>2</sup>

#### SYMBOLUM ATHANASII.<sup>3</sup>

1. Quicumque vult salvus esse: ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem.
2. Quam nisi quisque integram, inviolatamque servaverit; absque dubio in æternum peribit.
3. Fides autem Catholica hæc est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate: et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur.
4. Neque confundentes personas: neque substantiam separantes.
5. Alia est enim persona Patris: alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti.

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures and Theological Papers*, p. 220. In the same volume is contained an important lecture on the Athanasian Creed, to which reference may be made (Lecture xiii.).

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i. col. 46, in the Cambridge edition.

<sup>3</sup> This title is not given to the creed in any ancient MS. Even where it is attributed to Athanasius it is not called *Symbolum*, but *Fides*, as in some of the MSS. referred to above. Various readings in the text of the creed are limited in number. They may be seen in Burn, p. 193.

6. Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est divinitas: æqualis gloria cœterna majestas.
7. Qualis Pater talis Filius; talis Spiritus Sanctus.
8. Increatus Pater increatus Filius: increatus Spiritus Sanctus.
9. Immensus Pater immensus Filius: immensus Spiritus Sanctus.
10. Æternus Pater æternus Filius: æternus Spiritus Sanctus.
11. Et tamen non tres æterni: sed unus æternus.
12. Sicut non tres increati nec tres immensi: sed unus increatus et unus immensus.
13. Similiter omnipotens Pater omnipotens Filius: omnipotens Spiritus Sanctus.
14. Et tamen non tres Omnipotentes: sed unus Omnipotens.
15. Ita Deus Pater Deus Filius: Deus Spiritus Sanctus.
16. Et tamen non tres Dii: sed unus est Deus.
17. Ita Dominus Pater Dominus Filius: Dominus Spiritus Sanctus.
18. Et tamen non tres Domini: sed unus est Dominus.
19. Quia sicut sigillatim unamquamque personam Deum ac Dominem confiteri, Christiana veritate compellimur: Ita tres Deos aut Dominos dicere, Catholica religione prohibemur.
20. Pater a nullo est factus: nec creatus nec genitus.
21. Filius a Patre solo est: non factus nec creatus sed genitus.
22. Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio: non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens.
23. Unus ergo Pater non tres Patres: unus Filius non tres Filii, unus Spiritus Sanctus non tres Spiritus Sancti.
24. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius: nihil majus aut minus.

- Sed totæ tres personæ: cœternæ sibi sunt et cœquales.
25. Ita ut per omnia sicut jam supradictum est: et Unitas in Trinitate, et Trinitas in Unitate veneranda sit.
26. Qui vult ergo salvus esse: ita de Trinitate sentiat.
27. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem: ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.
28. Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur: quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei Filius Deus et homo est.
29. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus: et homo est ex substantia matris in sæculo natus.
30. Perfectus Deus perfectus homo: ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.
31. Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem: minor Patre secundum humanitatem.
32. Qui licet Deus sit et homo: non duo tamen sed unus est Christus.
33. Unus autem non conversione Divinitatis in carnem: sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum.<sup>1</sup>
34. Unus omnino non confusione substantiæ: sed unitate personæ.
35. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo: ita Deus et homo unus est Christus.
36. Qui passus est pro salute nostra descendit ad inferos: tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.
37. Ascendit ad cœlos sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis: inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.
38. Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis: et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem.

<sup>1</sup> In this verse the majority of the older MSS. read *in Carne* and *in Deo*.

39. Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam æternam. qui vero mala in ignem æternum.

40. Hæc est fides Catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit: salvus esse non poterit.

## ARTICLE IX

### *De Peccato Originali.*

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

### *Of Original or Birth Sin.*

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

THE original object of this Article is shown very definitely by the words which in the Article of 1553 followed the reference to the Pelagians: "which also the Anabaptists do nowadays renew" (et hodie Anabaptistæ repetunt). These words, omitted at the revision of 1563 (possibly because the danger was less pressing), prove

that it was designed at least primarily to meet the revival of the Pelagian error on the subject of original sin by the Anabaptists.<sup>1</sup> A further object was probably to state the view of the Church of England on the effect of baptism in the removal of original sin, more particularly with regard to "concupiscence," which all parties admitted to remain in the regenerate, but concerning the character and precise nature of which widely differing views were advanced.

Except for the omission of the words just noticed, the Article has stood without substantial change since it was first drawn up in 1553.<sup>2</sup> It has been sometimes thought that its language is based on that used in the Confession of Augsburg; but the resemblance is very slight.<sup>3</sup> Nor is it much closer to the corresponding Article in the Thirteen drawn up in 1538 by a joint committee of Anglicans and Lutherans, which does little more than

<sup>1</sup> The same error on the part of the Anabaptists is noticed in Hermann's *Consultation*: "Fyrste they denie originally synne, and they wyll not acknowledg howe greate filthynes, how greate impietie and even pestilent corruption was broughte upon us all thorowe the fall of Adame."—English translation of 1548, fol. cxlii.

<sup>2</sup> Three slight changes in the English should be noticed. Where our present Article uses the phrase "original righteousness," the Edwardian Article had "his former righteousness, which he had at his creation"; and instead of "inclined to evil" it had "given to evil"; "baptized" was also the translation adopted in 1553 for "renatis" in both places where the word occurs. The alterations made at the revision of 1571 brought the English into closer conformity with the Latin.

<sup>3</sup> "Item docent quod post lapsum Adæ omnes homines secundum naturam propagati, nascantur cum peccato, hoc est sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum, et cum concupiscentia, quodque hic morbus, seu vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum. Damnant Pelagianos et alios qui vitium originis negant esse peccatum, et ut extenuent gloriam meriti et beneficiorum Christi disputant hominem proprii virtus rationis coram Deo justificari posse."—*Conf. August.* art. II. It will be noticed that the Anglican Article is far more guarded and cautious in its statements than this. See below, p. 376.

repeat the Lutheran formulary with the addition of a reference to the loss of original righteousness.<sup>1</sup> But though the language of our Article cannot be traced to any earlier source, the following passage from the *Reformatio Legum* illustrates its teaching, and points even more distinctly to the revival of the Pelagian heresy by a section of the Anabaptists:—

"In labe peccati ex ortu nostro contracta, quam vitium originis appellamus, primum quidem Pelagianorum, deinde etiam Anabaptistarum nobis vitandus et submovendus est error, quorum in eo consensus contra veritatem sacrarum Scripturarum est, quod peccatum originis in Adamo solo hæserit, et non ad posteros transierit, nec ullam afferat naturæ nostræ perversitatem, nisi quod ex Adami delicto propositum sit peccandi noxium exemplum, quod homines ad eandem pravitatem invitat imitandam et usurpandam. Et similiter nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt, ut eo solo sine alia speciali Christi gratia recte ab hominibus vivi posse constituent."<sup>2</sup>

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

1. Original sin.
2. The effect of baptism in the removal of original sin.
3. The character of concupiscence.

#### I. *Original Sin.*

Under this head there are various points which require elucidation—

- (a) The phrase "original sin."
- (b) The Pelagian heresy, as showing what original sin is not.

<sup>1</sup> See Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 261.

<sup>2</sup> *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Hæres, c. 7.*



(c) Original righteousness, as that from which man is "very far gone."

(d) The effect of the Fall.

(a) *The phrase "original sin"* (Peccatum originale or peccatum originis).<sup>1</sup> This does not occur anywhere in Holy Scripture, but is due to S. Augustine, who makes use of it in one of his earlier works;<sup>2</sup> and from his day forward it is of frequent occurrence, being made current coin through the Pelagian controversy. The phrase was perhaps suggested to Augustine by the similar expression "originis injuriam" which had been used by S. Ambrose;<sup>3</sup> while still earlier S. Cyprian had said of a new-born infant, "secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit."<sup>4</sup>

(b) *The Pelagian heresy, as showing what original sin is not.*

This heresy originated early in the fifth century. Its founder, Pelagius, was a monk of British extraction who had settled at Rome. There he took offence at the well-known saying of Augustine, "Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt," which seemed to him to exalt the Divine at the expense of the human in the work of salvation.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently he and his friend and convert, Cœlestius, elaborated the system which has since borne his name. His character may be seen from the charges which were brought against Cœlestius at a Council held in 412 at Carthage, whither the two friends

<sup>1</sup> The two expressions are evidently regarded as convertible terms. The latter is used in the text of the Article, the former in the title.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad Simplicianum*, I. c. i. § 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Apol. Proph. David*, i. § 56. Cf. *Aug. Contra duas Epist.* IV. § 29.

<sup>4</sup> Ep. lxiv. Cf. Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine*, p. ix.

<sup>5</sup> "Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis," Conf. X. c. xxix. Cf. *De dono persever.* c. xx., where Augustine himself refers to this fact.

had passed from Rome. The charges (to which Cœlestius returned evasive answers) were these:—

1. That Adam was created mortal, and would have died even if he had not sinned.

2. That his sin injured himself alone, and not the whole human race.

3. That infants at their birth are in the same condition in which Adam was before the Fall.

4. That unbaptized infants as well as others would obtain eternal life.

5. That mankind neither died through Adam's death or transgression, nor would rise again through Christ's resurrection.

6. That the law had the same effect as the gospel in leading men to the kingdom of heaven.

7. That even before Christ came there had been sinless men.<sup>1</sup>

Of these tenets the second and third are the most important, as being most intimately connected with the whole system that was subsequently known as Pelagianism. They amount to (a) a denial that the fall of Adam had affected his descendants; and (b) closely connected with this "a denial of the necessity of supernatural and directly assisting grace in order to any true service of God on the part of man."<sup>2</sup> This latter seems to have been in the order of time prior to the first mentioned, which, however, is its ground and basis. Admit in any true sense the Fall, and Divine grace becomes a necessity. Deny the Fall, and grace may perhaps be dispensed with and human nature without supernatural assistance be found equal to the conflict with sin.

<sup>1</sup> See on the whole subject Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, Introd. p. xvi. seq., and Schaff's *History of the Church*, "Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity," vol. ii. p. 790 seq.

<sup>2</sup> Bright, p. ix.

There was, however, the fact of universal depravity to be explained. What account could be given of the fact that sin is found everywhere? Pelagius could only explain it by saying that it resulted from *the universal following of Adam's example*. Adam's fall, according to him, had no effect on the nature of his descendants. But by sinning he set an example which all, or almost all (for Pelagius admitted exceptions), had followed. This is the view of original sin which was revived by the Anabaptists in the sixteenth century, and which is condemned in the opening words of our Article. **Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk.** The meaning of the English phrase is made clear by a reference to the Latin, *Peccatum originis non est in imitatione Adami situm*. "Standeth not" is equivalent to "does not consist;"<sup>1</sup> "the following of Adam" is the imitation of him, or sinning after his example.

In support of the assertion of the Article, and the position taken up by the Church on this subject, it appears to be sufficient to appeal to the teaching of S. Paul in Rom. v. 12-15: "As through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned: for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, *even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression*, who is a figure of Him that was to come."

Universal depravity is recognised as a fact throughout the Old Testament, but no explanation of it is offered. There appear to be only two possible ones. Either, as the Pelagians asserted, it results from the fact that all

<sup>1</sup> Compare the similar use of "standeth" in the Second Collect at Mattins: "in knowledge of whom *standeth* our eternal life."

men follow Adam's example, and sin "after the likeness of his transgression," or there is a "fault" in the inherited nature which makes sinning easy and natural. Jewish writings outside the Canon show us that though there was no consistent doctrine among the Jews on the subject, yet some among them were feeling their way towards the position laid down by S. Paul, and were inclined to hold that universal sin was due to the fact that the fall of Adam had permanently affected his descendants.<sup>1</sup> And on this point the teaching of the New Testament is quite clear. The passage cited above is decisive as to the apostle's view, and conclusive against the Pelagian theory, while the whole line of argument in the early chapters of the Epistle to the Romans tends to establish the fact that Adam's sin had a far-reaching effect upon mankind, that through it sin gained an entrance into the world and that all his descendants inherited a tendency to sin.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Wisd. ii. 23 *seq.*; Ecclus. xxv. 24 [33]; 4 Ezra iii. 7, 21 *seq.*; Apoc. Baruch xvii. 3, xxiii. 4; and cf. Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 165 *seq.*, and Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 136 *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> The question may be raised how far is the Church's doctrine on this subject, and S. Paul's teaching in particular, affected by "critical" views of the Old Testament, and the belief that in Gen. i.-iii. we have a symbolical representation of spiritual truths rather than a literal history. On this subject a valuable letter will be found in the *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. ii. p. 329, and reference may also be made to Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 146, where it is pointed out that the narrative in Genesis is "the typical and summary representation of a series of facts which no discovery of flint implements and half calcined bones can ever reproduce for us. In some way or other, as far back as history goes, and we may believe much further, there has been implanted in the human race this mysterious seed of sin, which, like other characteristics of the human race, is capable of transmission. The tendency to sin is present in every man who is born into the world. But the tendency does not become actual sin until it takes effect in defiance of an express command, in deliberate disregard of a known distinction between right and wrong. How men came to be possessed of such a command, by what process they arrived at the conscious distinction of right and wrong, we can

It may be added, that the conclusion which has forced itself upon the minds of theologians as an inference from the statements of Holy Scripture, that there is a taint in the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, is in remarkable accordance with the teaching of secular philosophers and poets,<sup>1</sup> and is but the theological expression of the doctrine which has been not discovered, but formulated by modern science under the name of heredity.

(c) *Original righteousness.*—Having set aside the Pelagian heresy, the Article proceeds with its account of original sin, and lays down that it is **“the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from**

but vaguely speculate. Whatever it was, we may be sure that it could not have been presented to the imagination of primitive peoples otherwise than in such simple forms as the narrative assumes in the Book of Genesis. The really essential truths all come out in that narrative—the recognition of the Divine will, the act of disobedience to the will so recognised, the perpetuation of the tendency to such disobedience, and we may add, perhaps, though here we get into a region of surmises, the connexion between moral evil and physical decay, for the surest pledge of immortality is the relation of the highest part in us, the soul, through righteousness to God. These salient principles, which may have been due in fact to a process of gradual accretion through long periods, are naturally and inevitably summed up as a group of single incidents. Their essential character is not altered, and in the interpretation of primitive beliefs we may safely remember that “a thousand years in the sight of God are but as one day.” . . . It would be absurd to expect the language of modern science in the prophet who first incorporated the traditions of his race in the sacred books of the Hebrews. He uses the only kind of language available to his own intelligence and that of his contemporaries. But if the language which he does use is from that point of view abundantly justified, then the application which S. Paul makes of it is equally justified. He, too, expresses truth through symbols; and in the days when men can dispense with symbols his teaching may be obsolete, but not before.”

<sup>1</sup> See the interesting lecture on this subject in Mozley's *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 148 seq.

**original righteousness.”** What, then, was this “original righteousness” from which man is “very far gone”? Following out the indications on the subject that may be gathered from Scripture, ancient writers have generally described it as being partly natural, partly supernatural,—natural in that it proceeded from free will and the power of choice, supernatural in that certain special gifts and graces in addition to free will were required for its exercise.<sup>1</sup> Adam could not have had concupiscence or lust, *i.e.* the direct inclination to evil which is now the incentive to sin in our nature, for he was made “in the image of God,” and was “very good.” On the other hand, as he was in a state of trial, there must have been something in him which sin could take hold of—a starting-point for temptation. To protect him from yielding, it is thought that he must have “had by his created disposition a pleasure in goodness, and that pleasure naturally preserved him in obedience without the need of express effort.”<sup>2</sup> This natural pleasure in goodness, which is practically equivalent to an *implanted virtuous character*, is what has been called

<sup>1</sup> See the quotations in Bishop Bull's famous discourse “On the State of Man before the Fall” (*Works*, ii. p. 52 seq.). Bull concludes that “the meaning of the question [whether the original righteousness of the first man was supernatural], if it signify anything to any considerable purpose, is clearly this, whether Adam in the state of integrity needed a supernatural principle or power in order to the performing of such a righteousness as through the gracious acceptance of God should have been available to an eternal and celestial life and happiness. And the question being thus stated, ought to be held in the affirmative, if the consentient determination of the Church of God may be allowed its due weight in the balance of our judgments.” “There is a sense, indeed,” he adds, “wherein we may safely acknowledge the original righteousness of the first man to have been natural, and it is this, that he received the principle of that righteousness *a natiuitate sua*, from his nativity, in his very creation, and together with his nature” (*Op. cit.* p. 131). Reference should also be made to S. Thomas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1<sup>ma</sup>, Q. xciv. seq.

<sup>2</sup> Mozley, *The Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 91.

by divines the *donum supernaturale*. It may be best understood by regarding it as a supernatural bias towards good, so that the natural tendency of man was to do what was right in consequence of this Divinely ordered inclination of his will in that direction. "This implanted rectitude," it may be added, "or good habit it was which made the first sin of man so heinous, and caused that distinction between it and all the other sins which have been committed in the world. For the first sin was the only sin which was committed against and in spite of a settled bias of nature towards good; all the other sins which have been committed since have been committed in accordance with a natural bias towards evil. There was therefore a perversity in the first sin altogether peculiar to it, and such as made it a sin *sui generis*."<sup>1</sup>

In view of modern theories of development, it may be added that there is nothing whatever in Holy Scripture to make us think that man was in his unfallen condition *perfect*. Innocent he is distinctly represented as being. His state is one of primitive simplicity. But this is all. Nor is there anything in the Biblical account to lead us to imagine that he was in a high state of civilisation or of intellectual greatness. Scripture gives no countenance to the view that "an Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam"; and more than one of the early Fathers denies that Adam was created "perfect" (*τέλειος*).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mozley, *The Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Theophilus of Antioch (180) says that God placed Adam in Paradise *διδούς αὐτῷ ἀφορμὴν προκοπῆς ὅπως ἀξάνων καὶ τέλειος γενόμενος*, κ.τ.λ., *Ad Autolye*. ii. 24; while Clement of Alexandria directly raises the question whether Adam was formed perfect or incomplete (*τέλειος ἢ ἀτελής*), and answers that he "was not made perfect in respect to his constitution, but in a fit condition to receive virtue" (*Stromata*, VI. xii. 96), "where," as Bishop Bull says, "he plainly enough teacheth that

(d) *The effect of the Fall*.—If the condition of man in his primitive condition before he had actually sinned was as it has been described above, what, it will be asked, was the effect of the Fall? Concerning this there have been various views held, differing in regard to the extent of the depravity actually inherited by all men.

(i) The Greek Fathers generally, and the earlier Latin ones as well, laid no great stress on the Fall, and the most that can be said is that—so far as they have any definite teaching on the subject at all—they hold that it involved the loss of the supernatural bias of the will towards good, but nothing more. Man was left with a fundamentally sound nature, with no direct bias in one direction or the other. Thus on this view "original sin" is nothing more than a loss of higher goodness; a state of defect rather than of positive sin; a *privatio* rather than a *depravatio naturæ*.

(ii) Augustine and his followers in the controversy with the Pelagians dealt fully with the subject, and drew out more thoroughly than had yet been done the teaching of Scripture, showing therefrom that the Fall involved something more than only the withdrawal of the supernatural gifts, and left man with a corrupt nature, a *direct bias towards evil*. "The will," says Mozley, "according to the earlier school was not substantially affected by the Fall. . . . But in Augustine's scheme the will itself was disabled at the Fall; and not only certain impulses to it withdrawn, its power of

Adam was from the beginning not indeed made perfect, but yet endowed with the capacity whereby he might arrive to perfect virtue." See the whole passage (*Works*, ii. p. 72), and cf. *Lux Mundi*, p. 535: "All that we are led to believe is that the historical development of man has not been the development simply as God meant it. It has been tainted throughout its whole fabric by an element of moral disorder, of human wilfulness."

choice was gone, and man was unable not only to rise above a defective goodness, but to avoid positive sin. He was thenceforth, prior to the operation of grace, in a state of necessity on the side of evil, a slave to the devil and to his own inordinate lusts."<sup>1</sup>

(iii.) In later days, many of the schoolmen, and after them the Roman divines of the sixteenth century, were content to regard original sin in a somewhat milder light than this, and to view it rather as a "privatio" than as a state of positive defect. Aquinas, however, after speaking of it as "quædam privatio," "carentia originalis justitiæ," terms it "inordinata dispositio, languor naturæ," and freely admits that it is more than a mere "privatio."<sup>2</sup> But the Council of Trent, following Scotus, regards it mainly as "the loss of holiness and righteousness";<sup>3</sup> and Bellarmine distinctly teaches that it is only the result of the withdrawal of the supernatural gift.<sup>4</sup>

(iv.) On the other hand, both Lutherans and Calvinists have generally maintained an *entire* depravation of human nature, so that man is only inclined to evil; and they have sometimes used such strong and exaggerated language on the corruption of man's nature, as to suggest that since the Fall the image of God is wholly

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 125. For Augustine's teaching reference may be made to the *Enchiridion*, § 10; *De Natura et gratia*, c. iii.; and the treatise *De Gratia Christi et de Peccato originali*.

<sup>2</sup> "Habet privationem originalis justitiæ et cum hoc inordinatam dispositionem partium animæ, unde non est privatio pura sed et quædam habitus corruptus," *Summa*, 1<sup>ma</sup> 2<sup>a</sup> Q. lxxxii.

<sup>3</sup> Decree concerning original sin, Session V. (June 17, 1546).

<sup>4</sup> "Corruptio naturæ non ex alicujus doni carentia, neque ex alicujus malæ qualitatis accessu, sed ex sola doni supernaturalis ob Adæ peccatum amissione profuxit," *De gratia primi hominis*, c. v.; cf. c. i.; and *Amis. gratiæ*, iii. 1. Modern Roman teaching is on just the same lines. See Moehler's *Symbolism*, p. 43 seq.; and Perrone, *Praelectiones*, vol. iii. p. 122 seq.

obliterated, and the nature of man no better than that of the evil spirits. Thus the "Westminster Confession" says of our first parents: "By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."<sup>1</sup>

To which of these views thus briefly enumerated, it may be fairly asked, does the Anglican Article incline? It clearly takes a darker view than that of the Greek Fathers, and of the Roman Church as represented by the Council of Trent. Original sin is more than a "privatio." It is a "depravatio naturæ." It "**deserves God's wrath and damnation.**" Such language can only be used of something positive, not simply of a withdrawal of supernatural grace. But, on the other hand, strong as the language of the Article is, it falls very far short of that of the "Westminster Confession," and of Calvinists in general. "Quam longissime" in the Latin Article, if pressed, might perhaps be taken to indicate agreement with the Calvinist notion of a *total* loss of original

<sup>1</sup> West. Conf. c. vi. So the *Formula Concordiæ* (1577) says that original sin "is so deep a corruption of human nature, that nothing healthy or incorrupt in a man's soul or body, in inner or outward powers," is left. Similar but even stronger language is used in the *Confessio Helvetica* II. c. 8: "Peccatum autem intelligimus esse nativam illam hominis corruptionem ex primis illis nostris parentibus in nos omnes derivatam vel propagatam, qua concupiscentiis pravis immersi et a bono aversi, ad omne vero malum propensi, pleni omni nequitia, diffidentia, contentu et odio Dei, nihil boni ex nobis ipsis facere, imo ne cogitare quidem possumus."

righteousness; but if so, the English "*very far gone*" would appear strangely inadequate. Moreover, there is a significant silence about any imputation of Adam's sin (a prominent feature in later Calvinistic teaching); and that the Article is seriously defective from a Calvinistic point of view, is conclusively shown by the suggested emendations of the Assembly of Divines in 1643. They were not satisfied with it as it stood, but wished to insert a reference to the imputation of Adam's sin, and to materially strengthen the language of the Article, substituting "wholly deprived of" for "very far gone from," and insisting that man "is of his own nature *only* inclined to evil."<sup>1</sup>

This being so, we need have no hesitation in interpreting the Latin by the English, and may rest content with the statement that man is "*very far gone from original righteousness.*" So much is clearly taught in Holy Scripture. Not to lay too much stress on the language of the Psalmist, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. li. 5), or on the question of Job, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" (Job xiv. 4), we notice that all through Scripture man is regarded as by nature corrupt. "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. viii. 21); "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually" (vi. 5); "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately sick" (Jer. xvii. 9). So also in the New Testament: "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18). "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be; and they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. viii. 7). But, on the

<sup>1</sup> See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 559, where the Article is given as amended by the Divines.

other hand, there are passages which no less clearly indicate that, in spite of this universal depravity, the "image of God," in which man was originally created, still remains since the Fall, and therefore it cannot be true to say that he is "wholly deprived of" his original righteousness. Thus in Gen. ix. 6 the law, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," is based on the fact that "in the image of God made He man." In 1 Cor. xi. 7, S. Paul speaks of man as "the image and glory of God," while S. James says that men are "made after the likeness of God" (iii. 9).

It may then be fairly concluded that on this subject the Church of England is *in the main* content to follow the teaching of Augustine: only, however, in the main, for there are statements which Augustine was led to make in the course of the controversy with the Pelagians to which we are most certainly not called upon to subscribe. To mention one point only. Augustine asserted that *as a fact* infants and others dying unbaptized meet with the punishment of hell.<sup>1</sup> Article IX. is careful only to state that original sin "*deserves* God's wrath and damnation,"—a statement which follows naturally from the view taken of it as something positive, involving a real taint and disorder of the nature, but which falls short of expressing any opinion on the further question whether it actually meets with that which it deserves.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, I. xxi., II. c. iv.; cf. Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, p. xiv, note 4.

<sup>2</sup> See on this point a striking letter of the late Dean Church, *Life and Letters*, p. 248. "The fact of what is meant by original sin is as mysterious and inexplicable as the origin of evil, but it is obviously as much a fact. There is a fault and vice in the *race*, which, given time, as surely develops into actual sin as our physical constitution, given at birth, does into sickness and physical death. It is of this inherited sin in our nature, looked upon in the abstract and without reference to concrete cases, that I suppose the Article speaks. How can we suppose that such a nature looks in God's eyes according to the standard of perfect right.

As an illustration of this, reference may be made to the careful reticence of the note at the end of the Baptismal Service in the Book of Common Prayer. "It is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." Nothing whatever is said of what happens in the case of those who die unbaptized, and the reticence is evidently designed; for the note in question was copied almost verbatim from the "Institution of a Christian Man" (1537), which proceeded to say "*and else not.*"<sup>1</sup> The

cousness which we also suppose to be God's standard and law. Does it satisfy that standard? Can He look with neutrality on its divergence from His perfect standard? What is His moral judgment of it as a subject for moral judgment? What He may do to cure it, to pardon it, to make allowances for it in known or unknown ways, is another matter, about which His known attributes of mercy alone may reassure us; but the question is, How does He look upon this fact of our nature *in itself*, that without exception it has this strong efficacious germ of evil within it, of which He sees all the possibilities and all the consequences? Can He look on it, even in germ, with complacency or indifference? Must He not judge it and condemn it as *in itself*, because evil, deserving condemnation? I cannot see what other answer can be given but one, and this is what the Article says. But all this settles nothing about the actual case of unbaptized infants, any more than the general necessity of believing the gospel settles anything as to the actual case of heathens who have never heard of the gospel. If, without fear, we leave them to the merciful dispensations, unrevealed to us, of Him who is their Father, though they do not know Him, much more may we leave infants who have never exercised will or reason. But in both cases we are obliged by facts and Scripture to acknowledge sinfulness and sin. In Christians, and those who may know of the gospel, this is cured, relieved, taken away, by known means which He has given us. In those who, by no fault of their own, are out of His family and Church, we cannot doubt, both from what we know of Him and from what He has told us, that He will provide what is necessary. But still *there* is the sinfulness and the sin; and as sin, *quod* sin, we can only suppose that He looks on it with displeasure, and condemns it. I don't see that the Article, which is only treating of sin and sinfulness, and not of its remedy or God's love, does more than express what must be God's judgment on all sin, even in germ. How He deals with it is a separate matter."

<sup>1</sup> *Formularies of Faith*, p. 93.

omission of these three words is highly significant; and it may be added that, though the work possesses no authority, yet the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* may be appealed to as an historical witness that by the time of the reign of Edward VI. leading Anglican divines had come to see that while salvation must be denied to those who despise or reject baptism, yet in the case of children (at least of Christian parents) dying unbaptized through no fault of their own, there is room for good hope.<sup>1</sup>

## II. *The effect of Baptism in the removal of Original Sin.*

In considering the effect of Holy Baptism in the removal of original sin, it must be remembered that there are *two* evils attaching to all sin, viz. the *guilt*, which needs pardon and forgiveness, and the *power*, which needs overcoming and driving out. On the view taken by the English Church, that what we call "original sin" is something more than a loss of higher goodness, being a germ of real evil, this is true of it as of all other sin. It has its guilt, which makes us "children of wrath";<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *De Hæresibus*, c. 18: "Illorum etiam impia videri debet scrupulosa superstitio, qui Dei gratiam et Spiritum Sanctum tantopere cum sacramentorum elementis colligant, ut plane affirmant nullum Christianorum infantem æternam salutem esse consecuturum, qui prius a morte fuerit occupatus, quam ad baptismum adduci poterit: quod longe secus habere judicamus. Salus enim illis solum adimitur, qui sacrum hunc baptismi fontem contemnunt, aut superbia quadam ab eo, vel contumacia resiliunt; quæ importunitas cum in puerorum ætatem non cadat, nihil contra salutem illorum auctoritate Scripturarum decerni potest, immo contra cum illos communis promissio pueros in se comprehendat, optima nobis spes de illorum salute concipienda est." See also Hooker, *Ecl. Polity*, Bk. V. c. lx. § 6.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the description in the Church Catechism of the "inward and spiritual grace" in baptism. "A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for *being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath*, we are hereby made the children of grace." The expression "children of wrath" is Biblical, and comes from Eph. ii. 3, τέκνα ὀργῆς.

and it has its power, which, in the form of concupiscence, draws us in the direction of evil. In baptism the guilt is pardoned. **There is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized** ("Renatis et creditibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio"),<sup>1</sup> a statement for which ample support may be found in Holy Scripture (see Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16, etc.), and which will be further illustrated under Article XXVII.<sup>2</sup> But the *power* of sin, that appetite for corrupt pleasure which is the incentive to sin in us still remains.<sup>3</sup> **This infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerate** (etiam in renatis), **whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek φρόνημα σαρκός, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh is not subject to the law of God.** This is unhappily a truth of universal experience, for which scriptural proof is scarcely needed. All history and the facts of each man's own experience combine in testifying to the existence of the old nature even after baptism and the reception of Divine grace. The phrase φρόνημα σαρκός, and the account given in the Article of this "lust of the flesh," is based on Rom. viii. 6, 7: "For the mind of the flesh" (τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός) is death;

<sup>1</sup> It should be noticed (1) that *renatis* in the Latin of the Article corresponds to "are baptized" in the English, thus marking the close connection between regeneration and baptism; and (2) that there is nothing in the English corresponding to *propter Christum* in the Latin.

<sup>2</sup> The statement of the Article may be further illustrated from the Baptistal Offices in the Book of Common Prayer, in which remission of sins is throughout regarded as one of the blessings granted in baptism to infants as well as to those of riper years.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, Lib. II. c. iv.: "Concupiscentia . . . cum parvulis nascitur, in parvulis baptizatis a reatu solvitur, ad agonem relinquitur."

<sup>4</sup> The Vulgate translates this phrase by *prudencia* in ver. 6, and *sapientia carnis* in ver. 7. The Geneva Version has "wisdom of the

but the mind of the spirit is life and peace: because *the mind of the flesh* is enmity against God; for it *is not subject to the law of God*, neither indeed can it be."

### III. *The Character of Concupiscence.*

There remains the question, What is the character of this concupiscence which, as all agree, remains even in the regenerate? Is it, before it positively breaks out into definite acts of sin, to be regarded as itself "true and proper sin," or is it merely to be reckoned as "an incentive to sin, arising from sin and inclining to it"? The question was keenly debated in the sixteenth century, the Church of Rome and the followers of Calvin returning diametrically opposite answers to it. The Roman view of concupiscence is given in the decrees of the Council of Trent, at the fifth session of which the subject was discussed, A.D. 1546, some years, therefore, before the Anglican Article was drawn up. The Tridentine divines in this decree maintain the following positions:—

(i.) In baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, and "all that has the true and proper nature of sin" is taken away (totum id quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet).

(ii.) There remains concupiscence, or an incentive to sin, which is left for us to strive against, but cannot injure those who consent not.

(iii.) "This concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin, the holy Synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin in the regenerate, but because it

flesh"; but in the Bishops' Bible there is the following note: "φρονουσι and φρόνημα, Greek words, do not so much signify wisdom and prudence, as affection, carefulness, and minding of anything."



is of sin and inclines to sin" (quia ex peccato est et ad peccatum inclinat).<sup>1</sup>

This position is quite clear and definite. Concupiscence, though it often leads to sin, is not "true and proper sin." Equally definite is the statement of Calvinists on the other side. According to them, concupiscence *is* "true and proper sin." So the Gallican Confession of 1561-6 asserts: "We affirm that this fault is truly sin even after baptism";<sup>2</sup> and in accordance with this, when, in 1543, the "Assembly of Divines" attempted to revise the Thirty-nine Articles in the interests of Calvinism, they proposed to substitute "is truly and properly sin"<sup>3</sup> for the milder statement of our own Article, which, it must be confessed, is somewhat ambiguous, and wanting in the precision of both the Roman and the Calvinistic statements.

**The apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin** (rationem peccati). It is hard to say exactly what this means. The Tridentine phrase "ratio peccati" is used, but there is nothing about "true and proper nature"; and the Article leaves us uncertain whether it is intended that we should regard concupiscence as truly sin or not. The ambiguity is in all probability designed;<sup>4</sup> nor need we regret that we are not called upon to give a more precise account of concupiscence. It is sufficient for us that it is very closely connected with sin, and that, if unchecked, it issues in sin. This is the practical matter,

<sup>1</sup> Canons of the Council of Trent, Session V. Decree on Original Sin.

<sup>2</sup> Niemayer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 332; cf. Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 109.

<sup>3</sup> Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 560.

<sup>4</sup> The Thirteen Articles drawn up in 1538 had, like the Confession of Augsburg, asserted that concupiscence is "vere peccatum." This makes the form of expression employed in our own Article still more noticeable.

and there, with wise moderation, those who drew up this Article were content to leave it.

One other question remains, to which it is not altogether easy to return a clear answer. The Article refers to "the apostle" as saying that concupiscence "hath of itself the nature of sin." To what passage or passages is allusion here made? S. Paul, who is evidently meant by "the apostle," nowhere directly terms concupiscence sin (although the Council of Trent maintains that he *does*), nor does any phrase corresponding to "ratio peccati" occur anywhere in Holy Scripture. On the whole, it appears probable that the passages in the mind of those who penned the Article were such as these, Rom. vi. 12, vii. 8; Gal. v. 16-24, in all of which lust or concupiscence is spoken of as closely connected with sin. Reference may also be made to the teaching of S. James on the same subject: "Each man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin; and sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death" (i. 14, 15).

## ARTICLE X

*De Libero Arbitrio.*

Ea est hominis post lapsum Adæ conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare non possit: Quare absque gratia Dei, quæ per Christum est, nos præveniente, ut velimus, et co-operante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera faciendâ, quæ Deo grata sint et accepta, nihil valemus.

*Of Free will.*

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God: Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

THE original Article of 1553 consisted only of the latter part of our present Article, beginning with the words, "We have no power," etc.<sup>1</sup> Its language was evidently suggested by a passage in Augustine's work, *On Grace and Freewill*, in which he says that "we have no power to do good works without God working that we may have a good will, and co-operating when we have that good will."<sup>2</sup>

The clause which now stands first in the Article was prefixed in 1563 by Archbishop Parker, being taken by him from the Confession of Württemberg.<sup>3</sup> The object of

<sup>1</sup> "Working *with us*" was substituted for "working *in us*" as a translation of "co-operante" in 1571.

<sup>2</sup> *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, xvii.: "Sine illo vel operante ut velimus vel co-operante cum volumus, ad bonæ pietatis opera nihil valemus."

<sup>3</sup> "Quod autem nonnulli affirmant homini post lapsum tantam animi integritatem relictam, ut possit sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis

the Article of 1553 is to disavow all sympathy with the Anabaptist denial of the absolute need of grace. This is indicated by a passage in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which, after a condemnation of the revival of the Pelagian heresy of these fanatics, we read: "Et similiter nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt, ut eo solo sine alia speciali Christi gratia recte ab hominibus vivi posse constituent."<sup>1</sup> But the clause added by Parker from the Confession of Württemberg seems also designed to condemn the theory of "congruous merit," which will be considered under Article XIII. There are two subjects which call for some consideration in connection with this Article—

1. Freewill.
2. The need of Grace.

I. *Freewill.*

It will be noticed that, although the title is **Of Freewill**, yet it is scarcely warranted by the substance of the Article that follows, in which freewill in the abstract is neither asserted nor denied. The title, then, of this Article, as of some others, is not quite accurate, and a more exact one would be "of the need of grace."<sup>2</sup> What is denied in the Article is the *power* and ability to turn to God and do good works without the assistance of God Himself: what is asserted is the absolute need of grace preventing and co-operating: but of "Freewill" in itself nothing whatever is directly said.

The statement of the first part of the Article follows

operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare, haud obscure pugnat cum apostolica doctrina et cum vero ecclesiæ Catholice consensu."—*De Peccato*. See Hardwick, p. 125.

<sup>1</sup> *De Hæres.* c. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 152.

naturally and directly from the view of "original sin" maintained in Article IX. It was there shown that the Church of England regards original sin as no mere "privatio" or loss of higher goodness only; but rather as a "depravatio naturæ," a real corruption of our nature, "whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil." If this is true, it follows as a necessary consequence that **the condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God.**

The position, then, taken up in the Article is that, though the will may be left free by God, yet there is in unaided man a lack of *power*. This is the teaching of the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man" (1543), with which the Article is in substantial agreement.

"Though there remain a certain freedom of the will in those things that do pertain to the desires and works of this present life, yet to perform spiritual and heavenly things, freewill is of itself insufficient; and therefore the power of man's freewill, being thus wounded and decayed, hath need of a physician to heal it, and an help to repair it."<sup>1</sup>

## II. *The need of Grace.*

While the Article thus neither affirms nor denies the freedom of the will in the abstract, its teaching on the absolute necessity of Divine grace for the performance of works that are "grata Deo" is clear and decisive.

<sup>1</sup> See *Formularies of Faith*, p. 360. Cf. also the Tridentine statement on the subject (Sess. VI. c. i.): "Freewill, attenuated and bent down as it was in its powers, was by no means extinguished."

**We have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.**

It is especially needful to remember, in studying this Article and those which immediately follow (XI.—XIII.), that they are concerned with God's method of dealing with those who are brought into covenant with Him through Christianity, and that what is said in them has little or no bearing on the case of those who live and die without ever having heard the gospel of Christ. Their case is not contemplated. Such terms as "faith and calling upon God," "good works, pleasant and acceptable to God," "grace of God by Christ preventing us . . . and working with us," etc., are expressions which properly refer to Christians; and therefore nothing that is said in these Articles need necessarily raise questions as to the "good works" of the heathen, and the light in which they are regarded by God. All that need be said is that they are not what the Articles call "good works, pleasant and acceptable to God" (*Deo grata et accepta*). This phrase, which we meet with here for the first time, is almost a technical one, used for the works of Christians done in a Christian spirit and from Christian motives. Thus it is used in Article XII. of those good works which "are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification." These are said to be "*grata Deo et accepta in Christo*"; whereas, according to Article XIII., "works done before the grace of Christ and inspiration of His Spirit" are "*minime Deo grata*." More will be said on this subject when these Articles are reached. But so much it seemed necessary to say at the outset in connection with the first occurrence of the phrase. To return now to the teaching of the Article before us: It

states that twofold grace is needed—(1) *preventing grace* (*gratia præveniens*), inclining the will to choose the good;<sup>1</sup> and (2) *co-operating grace* (*gratia co-operans*), assisting man to act, when the will has already been inclined to choose the good. The technical phrase “*gratia præveniens*” is apparently due to Augustine, who makes use of it several times,<sup>2</sup> and it seems to have been suggested to him by the Latin of Ps. lix. (lviii.) 10: “*Deus meus misericordia ejus præveniet me,*” a text which he quotes frequently. The term “*gratia co-operans*” is also his,<sup>3</sup> and, like “*preventing grace,*” is based on Scripture. See Phil. ii. 13: “For it is God that *worketh* (*qui operatur*) *in us* both to will and to do of His good pleasure”; and compare [S. Mark] xvi. 20: “The Lord also *working with them*” (*Domino co-operante*). On the necessity of both kinds of grace, the teaching of Scripture, which is faithfully reflected in the Book of Common Prayer,<sup>4</sup> as well as the Articles, is clear and definite. The beginning, the middle, and end of man’s salvation is influenced by God.

For the need of preventing grace, besides the passage just cited from Phil. ii. 13, it is sufficient to refer to our Lord’s own words in S. John vi. 44: “No man can come to Me, except the Father which sent Me, draw him,”

<sup>1</sup> For scholastic teaching on grace and the divisions into *gratia operans* and *co-operans*, as well as into *gratia præveniens* and *subsequens*, see Aquinas, *Summa* 1<sup>ma</sup> 2<sup>æ</sup> Q. cxi.

<sup>2</sup> *Serm.* 176, § 5; *De Nat. et Gratia*, § 35; *Contra duas Epist.* II. § 21. Cf. Bright’s *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, p. xix.

<sup>3</sup> *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, c. xviii.

<sup>4</sup> See the Collect for Easter Day: “Almighty God . . . we humbly beseech Thee, that, as by *Thy special grace preventing us* Thou dost put into our minds good desires, so by *Thy continual help* we may bring the same to good effect.” The Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity: “Lord, we pray Thee that Thy grace may always *prevent and follow us*, and make us continually to be given to all good works”; and the fourth Collect at the end of the Order of Holy Communion: “*Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with Thy most gracious favour and further us with Thy continual help.*”

and to such a phrase as that used in Acts xvi. 14, where the Lord is said to have “opened the heart” of Lydia, “to give heed unto the things which were spoken by God.” While for co-operating grace reference may be made to S. Paul’s attribution of all that he did, not to himself, but to “the grace of God which was with” him (1 Cor. xv. 10; cf. Gal. ii. 20); and to our Lord’s teaching in S. John xv. 4, 5: “Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit; for apart from Me ye can do nothing.”

But while we thus, on the one hand, in dependence on the teaching of Scripture, assert the absolute need of grace, and trace everything good in man to the action of Him from whom alone cometh “every good gift, and every perfect boon” (S. James i. 17); yet, on the other hand, it is equally necessary to insist, still in fullest harmony with the teaching of Scripture,—which everywhere assumes man’s responsibility and power of responding to God’s claim,—upon the freewill of man; for so only can any sense of human responsibility be developed.<sup>1</sup> We cannot, indeed, reconcile and harmonise the two counter-truths of freewill and the need of grace; but we can hold them both,<sup>2</sup> and place them side by side, as S. Paul himself does in the passage already quoted. “Work out your own salvation with fear and

<sup>1</sup> “There can be no question that S. Paul fully recognises the freedom of the human will. The large part which exhortation plays in his letters is conclusive proof of this.”—Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, II. c. xviii.: “[Nature] forbids us so to maintain God’s grace as to seem to take away freewill; and, on the other hand, so to assert its liberty as to lay ourselves open to the censure of being ungrateful to the grace of God in the arrogance of our impiety.”

trembling" (there is man's freedom, for it is idle to tell him to "work" unless he is free to work or not to work), "for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure" (there is the need of grace, both preventing and co-operating).

The teaching of S. Paul in Rom. vii. shows more clearly perhaps than any other passage, the state of the case as regards the freedom of the will, and makes it apparent that, though left free by God, the will of man has since the Fall been warped in the direction of evil, and thus man finds himself, as it were, under two different and incompatible laws. On the one hand, he approves of the law of God, and acknowledges himself bound to obey it. On the other, he feels that he is under the dominion of another law which continually leads him to sin. "To will (*τὸ θέλειν*)<sup>1</sup> is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would (*ὃ θέλω*) I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now, if I do that which I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good (*τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν*), evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members" (vers. 18-23). This double state or condition in which man finds himself is recognised by heathen poets and moralists.<sup>2</sup> It has in its favour the testimony of facts,

<sup>1</sup> It must be noticed that S. Paul does not use the word *βούλομαι*, which "lays the greater stress on the idea of purpose and deliberation," but only *θέλειν*, the more emotional word. See Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*

<sup>2</sup> The lines of Ovid are well known—

"Video meliora proboque,  
Deteriora sequor."

So Seneca asks: "What is it which, while we are going one way, drags

and our natural instincts which lead us while recognising our freedom and moral responsibility to refer everything that is good in us to God. But Scripture alone throws any light on its origin. Man's greatness is fallen greatness. This is the only explanation of the perpetual contrast between man's aspirations and man's achievements, the greatness and nobility of the one, and the lamentable failure of the other. The doctrine of the Fall is the key to the riddle of human nature.<sup>1</sup>

It only remains to point out how this tenth Article avoids opposite errors in connection with the difficult subject of Grace and Freewill.

(a) By its guarded reference to Freewill, which it neither asserts nor denies, it escapes the error into which Luther fell, of using such extreme language on the slavery of the will as practically to amount to a denial of human responsibility.<sup>2</sup>

(b) By its direct assertion of the absolute need of grace preventing and co-operating, it avoids the Pelagian heresy revived by the Anabaptists, which denied the necessity of grace and supernatural assistance.

(c) The terms in which the need of grace is spoken of are so worded as to avoid altogether the unscriptural views of the Anabaptists, and the exaggerations of the Calvinists, who maintained a theory of "irresistible

us another, and impels us thither, from whence we are longing to recede? What is it that struggles with our soul and never permits us to do anything? We vacillate between two opinions: We will nothing freely, nothing perfectly, nothing always."—*Lp.* lii.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pascal, *Pensées*, arts. xviii.-xxii.

<sup>2</sup> See the language from his treatise *De Servo Arbitrio*, quoted in Bishop Browne *On the Articles*, p. 259: "In his actings towards God, in things pertaining to salvation or damnation, man has no freewill, but is the captive, the subject, and the servant, either of the will of God or of Satan." "If we believe that God foreknows and predestinates everything . . . then it follows that there can be no such thing as freewill in man or angel or any other creature."

grace.”<sup>1</sup> Such views were still more effectually excluded by the tenth Article of 1553, which was headed “Of Grace,” and followed the one before us.

*De Gratia.*

Gratia Christi, seu Spiritus Sanctus qui per eundem datur, cor lapideum auferit, et dat cor carneum. Atque licet ex nolentibus quæ recta sunt volentes faciat, et ex volentibus prava, nolentes reddat, voluntati nihilominus violentiam nullam infert. Et nemo hæc de causa cum peccaverit, seipsum excusare potest, quasi nolens aut coactus peccaverit, ut eam ob causam accusari non mereatur aut damnari.

*Of Grace.*

The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost by Him given doth take away the stony heart, and giveth an heart of flesh. And although, those that have no will to good things, He maketh them to will, and those that would evil things, He maketh them not to will the same: yet nevertheless He enforceth not the will. And therefore no man when he sinneth can excuse himself, as not worthy to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillingly or by compulsion.

This was certainly primarily aimed at some among the Anabaptists who “seem to have been pushing their belief in absolute predestination to such frightful lengths that human actions were esteemed involuntary, and the *evil* choice of man ascribed to a necessitating fiat of his Maker.”<sup>2</sup> Its omission by Archbishop Parker in the revision of 1563 is probably due to the less formidable character of the danger of Anabaptism at that time. But it is possible that Parker was influenced by the fact that the Article was likely to be displeasing to some of the Marian exiles, who had returned to England with strong predilections in favour of Calvinism, and whom it

<sup>1</sup> This is closely connected with Calvin’s teaching on Predestination, which will be considered below under Article XVII.

<sup>2</sup> Hardwick, p. 99. Of the letter of Bishop Hooper (quoted on p. 22), where it is said of the Anabaptists that “they maintain a fatal necessity, and that beyond and beside that will of His, which He has revealed to us in the Scriptures, God hath another will, by which He altogether acts under some kind of necessity.”

was desired to retain in the Church. The excision of the Article would remove a stumbling-block from their path, as there is nothing in our present Article to which they could take exception, though from their point of view they might consider that its statements required supplementing.

## ARTICLE XI

*De Hominis Justificatione.*

Tantum propter meritum Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur: quare sola fide nos justificari, doctrina est saluberrima, ac consolationis plenissima: ut in Homilia de justificatione hominis fusius explicatur.

*Of the Justification of Man.*

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

IN its present form this Article dates from the Elizabethan revision in 1563. The Edwardian Article on the same subject was much less explicit: "Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ in that sense, as it is declared in the Homily of Justification, is a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian men."

The Article, as finally drawn up by Parker, is indebted for some of its phrases to the Confessions of Augsburg and Württemberg. In the latter of these documents we find these words: "*Homo enim fit Deo acceptus, et reputatur coram eo justus propter solum Filium Dei, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, per fidem*";<sup>1</sup> while in the former we read as follows: "*Item docent quod homines non possunt justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum, per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi, et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus*

<sup>1</sup> *De Justificatione.* See Hardwick, p. 125.

pro justitia coram ipso, Rom. iii. et iv."<sup>1</sup> And again: "Ut hanc fidem consequamur, institutum est ministerium docendi Evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta. Nam per verbum et sacramenta, tanquam per instrumenta, donatur Spiritus Sanctus, qui fidem efficit, ubi et quando visum est Deo, in iis qui audiunt evangelium, scilicet, quod Deus *non propter nostra merita, sed propter Christum* justificet hos, qui credunt se propter Christum in gratiam recipi."<sup>2</sup> The expressions placed in italics in these extracts will show how far the Article is indebted to Lutheran sources. But while it is undeniable that Parker did to some extent borrow from these documents, yet it is significant that he stopped short, and did not transfer to the Anglican formulary what has been aptly termed "the peculiar symbol of Lutheranism,"<sup>3</sup> viz. the statement that a man is justified when he believes himself to be justified,—an expression which occurs in these or almost identical words no fewer than seven times in the Confession of Augsburg.

The object of the Article is to state the mind of the Church of England on the subject of man's justification, which was regarded in some quarters as the "articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ," and which had unhappily given occasion for some of the worst excesses and extravagances of teaching which marked the course of the Reformation.

The subjects which call for consideration in order to a right understanding of the Article are these—

1. Justification, its meaning and relation to Sanctification.

<sup>1</sup> *Conf. Augustana*, art. iv. *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 124.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* art. v.

<sup>3</sup> Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 182. What makes the omission the more remarkable is the fact that the expression is actually contained in the fourth Article "De Justificatione" agreed upon by the Conference of Anglicans and Lutherans in 1538. See Hardwick, p. 263.

2. The meritorious cause of Justification.
3. The instrument or formal cause of Justification.
4. The "Homily of Justification."

I. *Justification, its meaning and relation to Sanctification.*

The Article treats as convertible terms the expressions "to be accounted righteous" (*justus reputari*) and "to be justified" (*justificari*). **We are accounted righteous . . . by faith . . . Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine.** Both phrases are founded on the language of Holy Scripture. The former is based on Gen. xv. 6: "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness" (LXX. ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Vulg. *Credidit Deo et reputatum est illi ad justitiam*). From this passage the phrase is adopted by S. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, ch. iv., and throughout this chapter the Greek λογισθῆναι εἰς δικαιοσύνην is always rendered by the Vulgate "ad justitiam reputari" (see ver. 3, 5, 9, 11, 22, 23; and cf. Gal. iii. 6; S. James ii. 23). *Justificari*, "to be justified," is also the invariable Latin equivalent for δικαιῶσθαι,—a verb which (in the active or passive) occurs nearly thirty times in S. Paul's Epistles, although used but rarely elsewhere in the New Testament.

To discover the meaning of justification it is therefore necessary to examine and determine the sense in which δικαιῶν and δικαιῶσθαι are used in Scripture.

(a) In the Old Testament the active voice is used by the LXX. as the translation of the Hebrew דָּיָן in a judicial or "forensic" sense: to "do right to a person," i.e. to do justice to his cause, and so to acquit (see Ex. xxiii. 7; Deut. xxv. 1; 2 Sam. xv. 4; 1 Kings viii. 32; 2 Chr. vi. 23; Ps. lxxxii. (lxxxii.) 3; Is.

v. 23, l. 8, liii. 11; Jer. iii. 11; Ezek. xvi. 51, 52); in other words, its meaning is not to "make a person righteous," but to "make him out righteous," or to "treat him as righteous."<sup>1</sup> But in itself the word indicates nothing as to whether he is or is not righteous. So in the passive, a person is said to be "justified" when he is regarded as righteous, held "not guilty," or acquitted (see Gen. xlv. 16; Job xxxiii. 32; Ps. li. (l.) 5, cxliii. (cxlii.) 2; Is. xliii. 9, 26, xlv. 25).

(b) In the New Testament outside the Epistles of S. Paul the word is not of frequent occurrence, but wherever it is found (eleven times in all<sup>2</sup>) its meaning is just the same. "Wisdom is *justified* by her works" (S. Matt. xi. 19; cf. S. Luke vii. 35), i.e. not "made righteous," but *vindicated*, *proved* to be righteous. In S. Matt. xii. 37 it is opposed to "condemned," and thus is equivalent to "acquitted." "By thy words thou shalt be *justified*, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." The lawyer, willing to *justify* himself, says: "And who is my neighbour?" where the meaning evidently is to vindicate himself, or make himself out to be righteous (S. Luke x. 29; cf. xvi. 15). The publican "went down to his house *justified* rather than" the Pharisee (S. Luke xviii. 14). These are representative instances, and

<sup>1</sup> This is quite in accordance with the classical use of the word, and with what might be expected from the formation of the word. "How can δικαιῶν possibly signify *to make righteous*? Verbs, indeed, of this ending from adjectives of *physical* meaning may have this use, e.g. τυφλοῦν, "to make blind." But when such words are derived from adjectives of *moral* meaning, as ἀξιοῦν, ὀσιοῦν, δικαιῶν, they do by usage, and must from the nature of things signify *to deem*, *to account*, *to prove*, or *to treat as worthy*, holy, righteous." *The Speaker's Commentary* on 1 Cor. vi. 11, quoted in Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matt. xi. 19, xii. 37; S. Luke vii. 29, 35, x. 29, xvi. 15, xviii. 14; Acts xiii. 39; S. James ii. 21, 24, 25. In Rev. xxii. 11, which is sometimes cited for the meaning of *infusing* righteousness, the reading is really δικαιῶσθαι ποιεῖσάτω.



establish the meaning of the word outside S. Paul's writings. But as the phrase "to be justified by faith" is due to him, it becomes necessary to examine further into his usage of the word. It is employed in his Epistles altogether twenty-five times;<sup>1</sup> and while in some cases it is unambiguous and *must* mean *treat as righteous*, and so (in the case of the guilty) pardon and acquit, in no single instance can the meaning of "make righteous" be established for it. This statement is one that can easily be verified, and therefore only a few examples need be cited here. "To him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that *justifieth* the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 4, 5). "All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God: being *justified* freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 23, 24). "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing against myself; yet am I not hereby *justified*: but He that judgeth me is the Lord" (1 Cor. iv. 3, 4). In 1 Tim. iii. 16 the word is used of Christ, who was "manifested in the flesh, *justified* in the spirit."

From these examples the meaning of the word may be ascertained without difficulty. It is regularly employed of the sentence or verdict pronounced on a man by God, and does not in itself tell us whether the person over whom the sentence is pronounced is really righteous or not. When a man is justified he is "accounted righteous," or regarded as righteous.

This leads to the inquiry, *when* is a man "justified"?

<sup>1</sup> Rom. ii. 13, iii. 4, 20, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, iv. 2, 5, v. 1, 9, vi. 7, viii. 30, 33; 1 Cor. iv. 4, vi. 11; Gal. ii. 16, 17, iii. 8, 11, 24, v. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Titus iii. 7.

And this raises the whole question of the relation of justification to sanctification.

*Sanctifico* and *sanctificatio* are in the Vulgate the regular equivalent of *ἀγιάζειν* and *ἀγιάζειν*, and of *ἀγίασμος* and *ἀγιοσύνη*, words which are all directly connected with the idea of *making holy*. Thus sanctification is a gradual work, the being really made holy in ourselves by the working of God's Holy Spirit in us. To "grow in grace" is to be sanctified. The question, then, to be decided is not whether obedience and good works are necessary for salvation, not whether sanctification is required, but at what point in the Christian life is the act of justification to be placed? in other words, the question is whether a man is first made righteous (sanctified) by God, and then declared to be so (justified); or whether God as it were *anticipates* what the man will become, and on his repentance accepts him, and for Christ's sake pronounces him "not guilty," the Divine verdict of acquittal running (as it has been said) *in advance* of the actual practice of righteousness.

In the early Church the question was not raised, as the subject of man's justification never came into controversy. But after the rise of Pelagianism it acquired a fresh importance, and assumed a new prominence, owing to the Pelagian assertion of human merit apart from grace; and in the writings of Augustine, while against Pelagianism the absolute need of grace, and the freeness of God's gift of salvation, is fully vindicated, the notion that *justifico* means to *make* righteous, and that justification is therefore an *infusion* of grace, can clearly be traced.<sup>1</sup> This thought was further developed by the

<sup>1</sup> In *De Spiritu et Litera*, § 45, Augustine admits that *justifico* may mean "reckon just," but practically his whole theory is that of an infusion of the grace of faith by which men are made just." Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 150, where these quotations are given; *De*

schoolmen in the Middle Ages, and justification was defined as not only forgiveness of sins, but also an infusion of grace; and thus it was practically made to include sanctification,<sup>1</sup>—a view which was finally endorsed by the Council of Trent. The subject was considered at the sixth session of the Council held in January 1547, and justification was decreed to be “not merely the remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inner man, through the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts, whereby man from unjust becomes just, from an enemy a friend, that so he may be an heir according to the hope of eternal life.” It was also stated that (1) the *final* cause of justification is the glory of God and of Christ and eternal life; (2) the *efficient* cause is the merciful God; (3) the *meritorious* cause is the Lord Jesus Christ, Who merited justification for us by His Passion; (4) the *instrumental* cause is the sacrament of baptism, “which is the sacrament of faith, without which justification never befell any man”; (5) the *formal* cause is the righteousness (justitia) of God with which we are endowed by Him.<sup>2</sup> Further, the

*Spiritu et Littera*, § 18: “Hæc est justitia Dei quæ in Testamento Veteri velata, in Novo revelatur: quæ ideo justitia Dei dicitur quod *impertiendo eam justos facit*.” *Enarratio*, § 6: “Credenti inquit in eum qui justificat impium, deputatur fides ejus ad justitiam si justificatur impius *ex impio fit justus*.”

<sup>1</sup> See the *Summa* of Aquinas, 1<sup>ma</sup> 2<sup>æ</sup> Q. cxliii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> “Justificatio . . . non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum. Unde homo ex injusto fit justus, et ex inimico amicus, ut sit hæres secundum spem vitæ æternæ. Hujus justificationis causæ sunt, finalis quidem, gloria Dei et Christi, ac vita æterna: efficiens vero misericors Deus, . . . meritoria autem dilectissimus unigenitus suus, Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui cum essemus inimici propter nimiam charitatem, qua dilexit nos, sua sanctissima passione in ligno crucis nobis justificationem meruit, et pro nobis Deo satisfecit: instrumentalis item, sacramentum Baptismi, quod est sacramentum fidei, sine qua ulli nunquam contigit justificatio: demum unica formalis causa est justitia

eleventh Canon passed at the same session anathematizes “any who shall say that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the righteousness of Christ or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and charity which is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost and is inherent in them.”<sup>1</sup>

Thus according to the Roman view justification includes sanctification. On the other hand, as is well known, Luther and the Reformers generally insisted very strongly and even vehemently on the distinction between justification and sanctification, and on the *forensic* meaning to be given to the former. According to them, justification is the *initial* blessing, when God receives the repentant sinner, pardons, and accepts him. And on this point an examination of S. Paul's usage of the word makes it clear that they were right. The Apostle certainly does distinguish between justification and sanctification, and uses the former word, not for final salvation, nor for infused holiness, but, as the Reformers insisted, for the *initial* blessing, when God accepts a man and, pardoning him, or “not imputing his sins to him,” at the outset, treats him as “not guilty.” “All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus” (Rom. iii. 23, 24; cf. iv. 5, where God is said to justify τὸν ἀσεβῆ). To be justified, according to him, is to be pardoned and accepted; to be taken into

Dei, non qua Ipse justus est, sed qua nos justos facit, qua videlicet ab eo donati, renovamur Spiritu mentis nostræ, et non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur, et sumus, justitiam in nobis recipientes.”—*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. c. vii.

<sup>1</sup> “Si quis dixerit homines justificari, vel sola imputatione justitiæ Christi, vel sola peccatorum remissione, exclusa gratia et charitate, quæ in cordibus eorum per Spiritum Sanctum diffundatur, atque illis inhæreat; aut etiam gratiam qua justificamur esse tantum favorem Dei; anathema sit.”—*Ib.* canon xi.

God's favour all sinful and unworthy as we are: and justification, according to this view, contains these two ideas, (1) pardon for sin, and (2) a right and title to eternal life founded upon promise; but the idea of an infused righteousness is not contained in the term. "Being made free from sin"—there is justification—"ye have your fruit unto holiness"—there is sanctification, distinct from justification, but not independent of it.

On the whole, then, it may be safely said that if we are to follow the teaching and language of S. Paul we must at least in thought distinguish between these two blessings, the one (justification) the work of the Son of God *for* us, the other (sanctification) the work of the Holy Spirit *within* us; and so distinguishing them, must hold that in the order of the Christian life justification *precedes* sanctification. In the words of S. Chrysostom, God "crowns us at the outset, making the contest light to us."<sup>1</sup> And if it be said that this introduces into God's dealings with us an element of unreality, man being regarded as righteous when he is not really so, and Christ's merits being "imputed" to him by a sort of legal fiction, it may be replied that there is no more unreality or fiction *necessarily* involved than is implied in all pardon, since the forgiveness of any wrong implies the treating of the doer of it as "not guilty."<sup>2</sup> But

<sup>1</sup> *Hom. in Rom.* xiii.

<sup>2</sup> "There is something sufficiently startling in this. The Christian life is made to have its beginning in a fiction. No wonder that the fact is questioned, and that another sense is given to the words—that *δικαιοῦσθαι* is taken to imply, not the attribution of righteousness in idea, but an imparting of actual righteousness. The facts of language, however, are inexorable: we have seen that *δικαιοῦν*, *δικαιοῦσθαι* have the first sense and not the second; that they are rightly said to be "forensic"; that they have reference to a judicial verdict, and to nothing beyond. To this conclusion we feel bound to adhere, even though it should follow that the state described is (if we are pressed) a fiction, that God is

when so much has been said, and the two blessings have been thus distinguished in thought and assigned definite theological names, it must never be forgotten that in actual life they are inseparable. In the order of thought justification precedes sanctification. But together the blessings stand or fall. If a man is justified we may be sure that he is being sanctified, however imperfect his condition may be. If he is not being sanctified, he has fallen from his state of grace, and can no longer be regarded as "justified."

## II. *The meritorious Cause of Justification.*

On this point the teaching of the Article is clear and distinct. The meritorious cause of our justification is the atoning work of Christ. **We are accounted righteous before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ** (propter meritum Domini, etc.), . . . **and not for our own works or deservings** (non propter opera et merita nostra). It will be observed that the same preposition, "for" (propter), is used in both clauses, whereas when faith is mentioned in connection with justification an entirely different preposition, "by" (per), is employed. It is

regarded as dealing with men rather by the ideal standard of what they may be than by the actual standard of what they are. What this means is, that when a man makes a great change, such as that which the first Christians made when they embraced Christianity, he is allowed to start on his career with a clean record; his sin-stained past is not reckoned against him. The change is the great thing; it is that at which God looks. As with the prodigal son in the parable, the breakdown of his pride and rebellion in the one cry, "Father, I have sinned," is enough. The father does not wait to be gracious. He does not put him upon a long term of probation, but reinstates him at once in the full privilege of sonship. The justifying verdict is nothing more than the "best robe" and the "ring" and the "fatted calf" of the parable (Luke xv. 22 f.).

—Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 36.

important to dwell on this, because it shows that the real antithesis in the Article (as in Scripture) is not between faith and works, but between the merit and work of our Saviour and human merit and work, *i.e.* between receiving salvation as God's free gift, and *earning* it by our own efforts. That the meritorious cause of justification is the merit and atoning work of our Saviour, is recognised as fully and frankly by the Church of Rome as it is by the Church of England; and indeed it is hard to see how it can be questioned *theoretically* by any except those who would deny altogether the need of the Atonement. And yet there can be no doubt that *practically* the medieval system did tend to make men rely on their own merits as the cause of their justification,<sup>1</sup> and led to the notion that they could *earn* it by what they did; while in the opposite quarter there are traces of the same error among some of the Anabaptists.<sup>2</sup> This error, it is to be hoped, has entirely passed away at the present day; and we may therefore proceed at once to the next subject that demands consideration.

### III. *The Instrument or formal Cause of Justification.*

This the Article asserts to be *faith*. **We are**

<sup>1</sup> So in the Article "Of Rites and Ceremonies," in the Ten Articles of 1536 after an enumeration of a number of "laudable customs, rites, and ceremonies not to be condemned and cast away, but to be used and continued," it was felt to be necessary to add the reminder, that "none of these ceremonies have power to remit sin, but only to stir and lift up our minds unto God, by whom only our sins are forgiven."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> "They [the Anabaptists] boste themselves to be ryghtuous and to please God, not purely and absolutely for Christes sake, but for theyr owne mortification of themselves, for theyr owne good workes and persecution, if they suffre any."—Hermann's *Consultation*, fol. cxlii. (English translation of 1548), quoted in Hardwick, p. 99.

**accounted righteous . . . by<sup>1</sup> faith** (*per fidem*).  
**. . . Wherefore that we are justified by faith only** (*sola fide*) **is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.**

There are several matters here which require elucidation—

(a) The meaning of "faith."

(b) The meaning of the expression "we are justified by faith *only*."

(c) The reason why faith is the instrument of justification.

(a) *The meaning of "faith."*—There is no Hebrew word exactly answering to our term "faith." The verb signifying to believe, to trust, is פָּקַד, which the LXX. habitually render by πιστεύειν, from the important passage, Gen. xv. 6, onwards: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness" (LXX. καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην). This is one of the two great passages on which S. Paul bases his doctrine of justification by faith. But there is in Hebrew no substantive meaning *faith as an active principle, i.e.* trustfulness, or the frame of mind which relies upon another. The nearest approach is found in נְאֻזָּה, firmness or constancy, which is variously rendered by the LXX. ἀλήθεια, πίστις, or by an adjective, ἀληθινός, πιστός, ἀξιοπίστος. The word, however, is rather *passive* than *active*, signifying *trustworthiness*, or the frame of mind that can be relied on; although in Hab. ii. 4 (S. Paul's other great text) it seems to have a double or "transitional"

<sup>1</sup> "By" in old English is ordinarily equivalent to "through." Cf. Lightfoot *On Revision*, p. 119: "Where in common language we now say 'by' and 'through' (*i.e.* by means of) respectively, our translators, following the diction of their age, generally use 'of' and 'by' respectively; 'of' denoting the agent (ὅτι), and 'by' the instrument or means (διὰ)."

sense. "The just shall live by faith" (LXX. ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται). Here it is hard to say whether πίστις and πίστις represent "trustfulness" (active) or "trustworthiness" (passive): in fact, the two ideas seem to be blended together. But when we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we find πίστις definitely stamped with the *active* sense, and as a Christian virtue it has the meaning of *trust* or *belief*.<sup>1</sup> Still it is employed with considerable variations of meaning, from the bare sense of "belief" or intellectual assent, as when S. James says that "the devils *believe* (πιστεύουσι) and tremble" (S. James ii. 19), rising to that "faith which worketh by love" (πίστις δι' ἀγαπῆς ἐνεργουμένη, Gal. v. 6), to which all the achievements of the Old Testament saints are attributed in Heb. xi. This last is the sense in which it is ordinarily used by S. Paul; and since he is the apostle who speaks of man being "justified by faith," it is evident that this is the sense in which the word is to be understood in the Article. Faith, then, is a principle of trust and reliance on God and His promises, which leads to practical action and issues in good works.<sup>2</sup>

(b) *The meaning of the expression "we are justified by faith only."*—This faith the Article asserts to be the instrument of our justification.

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Lightfoot *On Galatians*, p. 152 *seq.*, "Excursus on the Words denoting Faith," from which the above is mainly taken; and cf. Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 31 *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> "The centre and mainspring of this higher form of faith is defined more exactly as 'faith in Jesus Christ,' Rom. iii. 22, 26. This is the crowning and characteristic sense with S. Paul; and it is really this which he has in view wherever he ascribes to faith the decisive significance which he does ascribe to it, even though the object is not expressed (as in i. 17, iii. 27 *ff.*, v. 1, 2). We have seen that it is not merely assent or adhesion, but *enthusiastic* adhesion, personal adhesion: the highest and most effective motive power of which human character is capable."—Sanday and Headlam, *ubi supra*.

**We are accounted righteous . . . by faith** (per fidem). The expression is strictly Biblical, and is drawn from Rom. iii. 28–30: "We reckon that a man is justified by faith (πίστει, Vulg. *per fidem*) apart from the works of the law. . . . He shall justify the circumcision by faith (ἐκ πίστεως) and the uncircumcision through faith" (διὰ τῆς πίστεως, Vulg. *per fidem*); cf. Gal. ii. 16. Thus the Article keeps close to the actual language of the Apostle, and assigns to faith no other position than that of an instrument. Luther unhappily was not always so careful, and actually used language which would imply that faith was the meritorious cause of justification; asserting—what Holy Scripture never says—that we are justified *on account of* (propter) faith.<sup>1</sup> In such language, it is perhaps needless to say, the Church of England has never followed him.

But the Article is not content with assigning to faith the position of *an* instrument; it speaks of it as if it were the *sole* instrument. "**We are justified by faith only**" (sola fide). This expression, it must be admitted, is not contained directly in Scripture. But that faith *is* (in some sense) the sole instrument may be fairly inferred from the passage quoted above from Rom. iii. 28, where S. Paul speaks of men being "justified by faith apart from the works of the law." Compare also Rom. iv. 2–5, ix. 30; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 5 *seq.* In these passages the Apostle does not merely speak of faith as instrumental in justification, but expressly excludes "works."

On the other hand, S. James in his Epistle expressly includes "works," and denies that man is justified by "faith only" (ἐκ πίστεως μόνον, Vulg. *ex fide tantum*), c. ii. 14–26: "What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but have not works? can

<sup>1</sup> See his Comment. on Gal. ii. 16, iii. 6.

that faith save him? If a brother or a sister be naked and in lack of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled; and yet ye give them not the things needful to the body, what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself. Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith. Thou believest that God is one; thou doest well: the devils also believe and shudder. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was his faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God. Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith. And in like manner, was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, in that she received the messengers, and sent them out another way? For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead."

This passage, *as far as words are concerned*, is certainly contrary to the teaching of S. Paul in the passages referred to above, especially Rom. iv., where the case of Abraham is considered, and his justification ascribed to faith and not works; and compare Heb. xi. 17, 31, where the *faith* of Rahab as well as of Abraham is praised.

But though the words are different, yet the *teaching* of the two Apostles is identical. Their reconciliation may be established by pointing out—

1. *The different senses which they give to πίστις.*—In S. James it is merely intellectual assent, an affair of the *head*, not of the *heart*. The devils "believe" (πιστεύουσι). In S. Paul, on the contrary, it is πίστις δι' ἀγαπῆς

ἐνεργουμένη, a "faith that worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6); and according to him, "with the *heart* man believeth (πιστεύεται) unto righteousness" (Rom. x. 10).

2. *The different senses which they give to ἔργα.*—In S. Paul's writings this word, standing without any qualifying adjective, is always used in a *depreciatory* sense. When he would speak of works which are intrinsically good, he adds the qualifying adjective καλά or ἀγαθά (see Rom. ii. 7, xiii. 3; 2 Cor. ix. 8; Eph. ii. 10, etc.). It is, however, of such *good works* that S. James is speaking,—works which are really included in that faith which is defined as one which "*worketh by love.*"

3. *The different errors before the Apostles.*—S. Paul, in contending against a self-righteous Pharisaism, which boasted of its "works," vehemently denies that such "works" can aid in man's justification. S. James, on the contrary, has before him the case of those who thought that a barren orthodoxy was sufficient, and looked for justification from the correctness of their creed. To them he therefore says that such a faith, apart from works, is dead.

There is, then, no real contradiction between the teaching of the two Apostles; and it is providential that both sides of the truth are thus stated in Scripture. The Epistle of S. James forms a valuable safeguard against the errors of the "Solifidians," who, resting on faith only (*sola fides*), denied altogether the need of good works; while the teaching of S. Paul breaks down, once for all, all human *claim* to a reward.<sup>1</sup>

Returning now to the subject of faith as the instrument of justification, the question has to be asked: In

<sup>1</sup> See, further, Lightfoot *On the Galatians*, p. 162; Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 102 *seq.*; and Mayor *On S. James*, p. lxxxvii *seq.*, and 204.

what sense is it the *sole* instrument of justification? *i.e.* does it exclude good works, or the sacraments of the gospel?

With regard to the latter, if the description of justification given above is correct, and it includes (1) pardon of sin, and (2) a right and title to eternal life grounded on promise, then beyond all question it is granted in baptism: accordingly divines have frequently spoken of "first justification" as granted in it. It would perhaps be better to say that the exclusive term "alone," when we say that we are justified by faith alone, is only meant to exclude any other instrument on man's part for *receiving*, and is not intended to exclude God's instruments for *bestowing* justification. Thus faith is as it were the hand, and the *only* hand, which man can stretch forth to receive the blessing; while the sacraments of the gospel may be regarded as the channels through which God conveys the blessing to the faithful soul that is able to receive it.

With regard to *good works* the statement of the Article, that we are justified by faith only, is not meant in any way to exclude the necessity of good works, but only to shut them out *from the office* of justifying. That this is all that is intended is made perfectly clear by the statements of the Homily, to which the Article expressly refers us, as may be seen from the extracts quoted below in the next section. Repentance and obedience are necessary conditions or qualifications, but they are not the instruments for obtaining justification. Similarly, for a beneficial reception of the Holy Eucharist, charity is a necessary qualification; but "the *mean* whereby the Body of Christ is received is faith."

(c) *The reason why faith is the instrument of justification.*—It may be said without irreverence that the reason why, in God's method of salvation, faith is selected

for this office is not because there is any special virtue in it, or because it is the greatest of all Christian graces, for charity is greater (1 Cor. xiii. 2, 13), but because faith is peculiarly fit for this particular office, since there is in it that element of self-surrender, of trust, confidence, and reliance on another, which necessarily excludes all reliance on self and our own merits. Had we been justified by something else, as love, there would have been the possibility of reliance on self, and the notion of *earning* salvation would not have been in the same way shut out. Further, it is faith which enables us to realise the unseen. It is "the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen" (Heb. xi. 1); and thus it makes things distant become near, and admits them to close embraces.

Before passing on to the next section, it may be well to call attention to the fact that the Article maintains a wise silence on more than one subject connected with the doctrine of justification by faith, which was keenly disputed between the Romans and Lutherans in the sixteenth century. It has already been mentioned that the Article, seemingly of set purpose, ignores the Lutheran statement (condemned by the Council of Trent<sup>1</sup>) that a man is justified if he believes himself to be justified; but besides this there are two important matters on which the Article is markedly silent, (1) the question of the presence or absence of charity in justifying faith, and (2) the theory of an "imputed" righteousness. The first of these subjects was keenly debated at the time of the Reformation. The school-

<sup>1</sup> "If anyone shall say that a man is absolved from his sins and justified because he assuredly believes himself to be absolved and justified; or that no one is truly justified save he who believes himself to be justified; and that by this faith alone absolution and justification are perfected: let him be anathema."—Sess. VI. canon xiv.

men in their teaching on justification had drawn a distinction between "fides informis," a bare faith, and "fides formata," a faith informed by charity,<sup>1</sup> and had maintained that the latter alone is instrumental in justifying. In this they are naturally followed by the Tridentine divines.<sup>2</sup> Luther, on the other hand, while accepting the distinction thus drawn, insisted that it is "fides informis" which justifies, and argues that to say the contrary is to maintain justification by works.<sup>3</sup> The whole question is wisely ignored in the Article, though the Homily says pointedly that love is not excluded, but is "joined with faith in every man that is justified."

The second subject mentioned above, the theory of an "imputed" righteousness, is developed by Luther in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. According to it, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, and our sins are imputed to Him. It is in connection with this that the notion of a "legal fiction" comes into most prominence, and it is difficult to free the theory as it is maintained by Protestant divines from the charge of unreality. But as (like the points just noticed) there is not a word concerning it in our own Article, there is no need to consider the subject further here.

<sup>1</sup> See Aquinas, *Summa*, III. Q. xlix. art. 1: "Fides autem, per quam a peccato mundatur, non est fides informis, quæ potest esse etiam cum peccato, sed est fides formata per charitatem, ut sic passio Christi nobis applicetur, non solum quantum ad intellectum, sed etiam quantum ad effectum. Et per hunc etiam modum peccata dimittuntur ex virtute passionis Christi." Cf. 1<sup>ma</sup> 2<sup>o</sup> Q. cxiii. art. 4; and see Neander, *Church History*, vol. viii. pp. 220, 221, and Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> Sess. VI. canon xi.

<sup>3</sup> *Commentary on Galatians*, ii. 17.

#### IV. *The Homily of Justification.*

It only remains to say a word or two on **the Homily of Justification**, to which the Article refers us for fuller treatment of the subject. On turning to the Books of the Homilies, however, we find that there exists no homily with this title! That which is evidently referred to is the "Homily of Salvation," contained in the first book; together with which should be read the two following ones "Of the True and lively Faith" and "Of Good Works." In reading these the student is especially recommended to notice the emphatic way in which the writer insists (1) that faith alone has the office of justifying, (2) that good works are necessary, and (3) that faith has no merit any more than any other graces or good works. A few quotations shall be added by way of specimens.

"Faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that, although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not all together. Nor that faith also doth not shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done afterward of duty towards God (for we are most bounded to serve God in doing good deeds commanded by him in his holy Scripture all the days of our life); but it excludeth them so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made good by doing of them. For all the good works that we can do be imperfect, and therefore not able to deserve our justification; but our justification doth come freely, by the mere mercy of God; and of so great and free mercy that, whereas all the world was not able of theirselves to pay any part towards their ransom, it pleased our heavenly Father, of



his infinite mercy, without any our desert or deserving, to prepare for us the most precious jewels of Christ's body and blood, whereby our ransom might be fully paid, the law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied."

Again: "This sentence, that we be justified by faith only, is not so meant of them [namely, the ancient writers, Greek and Latin] that the said justifying faith is alone in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, dread, and fear of God, at any time or season. Nor when they say that we be justified freely, they mean not that we should or might afterward be idle, and that nothing should be required on our parts afterward; neither they mean not so to be justified without our good works that we should do no good works at all, like as shall be more expressed at large hereafter. But this saying, that we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being unable to deserve our justification at God's hands; and thereby most plainly to express the weakness of man and the goodness of God, the imperfectness of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ; and thereby wholly for to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only and his most precious bloodshedding."

And once more: "The true understanding of this doctrine—We be justified freely by faith without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only—is not that this our own act, to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us and deserve our justification unto us; for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves. But the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that, although we hear God's word and believe it, although we have faith, hope,

charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God within us, and do never so many good works thereunto, yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues of faith, hope, charity, and all our other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and insufficient and imperfect to deserve remission of our sins and our justification; and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and in that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace, and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism as of all actual sin committed by us after our baptism if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to him again. So that, as S. John Baptist, although he were never so virtuous and godly a man, yet in this matter of forgiving of sin he did put the people from him, and appointed them unto Christ, saying thus unto them, *Behold, yonder is the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world*; even so, as great and as godly a virtue the lively faith is, yet it putteth us from itself, and remitteth or appointeth us unto Christ, for to have only by him remission of our sins or justification. So that our faith in Christ, as it were, saith unto us thus: It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ only; and to him only I send you for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ."