

The
Thirty-Nine Articles
and
The Age of the Reformation

*An Historical and Doctrinal Exposition in the
Light of Contemporary Documents*

By
The Rev. E. Tyrrell Green, M.A.
Professor of Theology and Hebrew, S. David's College, Lampeter

SECOND EDITION

London
Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.
1912

PREFACE TO NEW EDITION

The demand for a reprint of this work may be taken to indicate that it meets in a special way the requirements of students who read the XXXIX Articles not merely with a view to passing examinations, but who desire by means of extracts from original authorities to go more carefully into the controversies of the Age of the Reformation, and to appreciate the place which our Articles hold in the symbolic theology of the sixteenth century.

Opportunity has been taken to introduce some corrections and improvements, and to bring more up to date passages dealing with such questions as the Reservation of the Sacrament and the validity of Anglican Orders, upon which important pronouncements have been delivered.

E. T. G.

LIST OF BOOKS

A

BOOKS UPON THE XXXIX. ARTICLES IN PARTICULAR

- Allnatt (M. E. S.). The Settled Doctrine of our Church. *Nisbet*. 1884.
- Baker (Dr. W.). Plain Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Rivingtons*. 1893.
- Beveridge (Bp.). Discourse upon the XXXIX. Articles. *Oxford*. 1840.
- Bickersteth (Dean). Questions Illustrating the XXXIX. Articles. *Rivingtons*. 1877.
- Boucher (J. S.). Lecture Notes on the Sacramental Articles. *Mowbray*.
- Boulton (T. P.). Commentary on the XXXIX. Articles. *Longmans*.
- Browne (Bp. Harold). Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Longmans*. 1878.
- Burnet (Bp.). Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Oxford*. 1831.
- Cloquet (R. L.). Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Nisbet*. 1885.
- Davey (W. H.). The Several Editions of the Articles of the Church of England. *Parker*. 1861.
- Dimock (N.). Dangerous Deceits. An examination of the teaching of our Article XXXI. *Eliot Stock*.
- Forbes (Bp.). Explanation of the XXXIX. Articles. *Parker*. 1878.
- Gibson (E. C. S.). The XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England explained, with an Introduction. *Methuen*. 1896-7.
- Hardwick (Archdn.). History of the Articles of Religion. *Bell*. 1881.
- Hodges (G. F.). Bishop Guest and Articles XXXVIII. and XXXIX. *Rivington*. 1894.
- J. W. Catechism of the XXXIX. Articles. *Griffith & Farran*. 1877.
- Jelf (R. W.). The XXXIX. Articles explained in a Series of Lectures.
- Ketchley (H. E.). Questions and Answers on the XXXIX. Articles. *Hall*. 1893.
- Lamb (Dr. J.). Historical Account of the XXXIX. Articles. *Cambridge*. 1829.
- Laurence (Abp.). Bampton Lectures. *Parker*. 1838.
- Lightfoot (Dr. J.). Text-Book of the XXXIX. Articles. *Sonnenschein*. 1890.
- Macbride (Dr. J. D.). Lectures on the XXXIX. Articles. *Parker*. 1853.

- Maclear and Williams. An Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England. *Macmillan*. 1896.
- Newman (J. H.). Tract XC. in "Tracts for the Times."
- Norris (Archdn.). On XXXIX. Articles in "Manuals of Religious Instruction. *Rivingtons*.
- Rogers (T.). Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Parker Society*. 1854.
- Sancta Clara. The Articles of the Anglican Church. *Hayes*. 1865. (Reprinted from ed. of 1646.)
- Tomlinson (J. T.). The Prayer-Book, Articles and Homilies. *Eliot Stock*. 1897.
- Welchman (Archdn.). The XXXIX. Articles. *S.P.C.K.*

B

HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL WORKS

- Ball (T. I.). A Paper on Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament (printed in the *Church Union Gazette*).
- Barlowe's Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions, ed. Lunn. 1897.
- Bayne (P.). English Puritanism, with Documents. *Kent*. 1862.
- Beard (C.). The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. *Williams and Norgate*. 1897.
- Bernardaces (D. N.). The Holy Catechism, translated by J. G. Bromage. *Masters*. 1891.
- Bingham (Dr. J.). Antiquities of the Christian Church. *Straker*. 1840.
- Britton (T. H.). Horæ Sacramentales. *Masters*. 1851.
- Buckley (T. A.). Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. *Routledge*. 1851.
- Buckley (T. A.). History of the Council of Trent. *Routledge*. 1852.
- Bulgaris (N.). The Holy Catechism, translated by W. E. Daniel. *Masters*. 1893.
- Burnet (Bp.). History of the Reformation, ed. Pocock. *Oxford*. 1865.
- Cardwell (Dr. E.). Documentary Annals. *Oxford*. 1844.
- Cardwell (Dr. E.). Synodalia. *Oxford*. 1842.
- Chambers's Encyclopædia, Articles in.
- Churton (Bp.). The Missionary's Foundation of Doctrine. *Masters*. 1892.
- Corpus et Syntagma Confessionem. *Chouët*. 1612.
- Curteis (G. H.). Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England. *Macmillan*. 1885.
- Cutts (E. L.). Dictionary of the Church of England. *S.P.C.K.*
- Dyer (A. S.). Sketches of English Nonconformity. *Masters*. 1893.
- Encyclopædia Britannica, Articles in.
- Formularies of Faith. *Oxford*. 1825.

- Fraser (Dr. Donald). Commentary on the Articles of the Faith of the Presbyterian Church of England. *Presbyterian Publication Committee*. 1892.
- Hagenbach (Dr. K. R.). History of the Reformation. *T. & T. Clark*. 1878-9.
- Hall (P.). Harmony of Protestant Confessions. *Shaw*. 1844.
- Hamilton (Abp.). Catechism, ed. T. G. Law. *Oxford*. 1884.
- Hamilton (Bp. W. Kerr). Visitation Charge, May 1867. *Sheppard and St. John*. 1885.
- Hardwick (Archdn.). History of the Christian Church. Middle Age. *Macmillan*. 1853.
- Hardwick (Archdn.). History of the Christian Church. Reformation. *Macmillan*. 1880.
- Jacobs (Dr. H. E.). The Lutheran Movement in England. *Gay & Bird*. 1892.
- Kurtz. Church History. *Hodder & Stoughton*. 1888-90.
- Littledale (Dr. R. F.). Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome. *S.P.C.K.* 1886.
- Littledale (Dr. R. F.). Short History of the Council of Trent. *S.P.C.K.* 1888.
- Luckock (Dean). After Death. *Rivingtons*. 1887.
- Maclear (Dr. G. F.). Introduction to the Creeds. *Macmillan*. 1890.
- Mant (Bp.). The Churches of Rome and England Compared. *S.P.C.K.* 1885.
- Mitchell (Dr. A. F.). The Westminster Assembly. *Nisbet*. 1883.
- Moore (A. L.). History of the Reformation. *Kegan Paul*. 1890.
- Niemeyer (Dr. H. A.). Collectio Confessionum. *Blinkhardt*. 1840.
- Norris (Archdn.). Key to the Acts of the Apostles. *Rivingtons*. 1877.
- Perry (G. G.). Student's English Church History, vols. i. and ii. *Murray*. 1881.
- Prynne (G. R.). The Truth and Reality of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. *Longmans*. 1894.
- Robinson (A. W.). The Church Catechism Explained. *Cambridge*. 1894.
- Sadler (M. F.). The One Offering. *Bell*. 1886.
- Smith (J. B.). English Orders: Whence Obtained. *Skeffington*. 1893.
- Sylloge Confessionum. *Oxford*. 1827.
- Tyrrell Green (E.). The Church of Christ. *Methuen*. 1902.
- Winer (Dr. G. B.). The Confessions of Christendom. *T. & T. Clark*. 1873.
- Westminster Confession and other Documents. *Blair & Bruce*. 1810.
- Woodford (Bp.). The Great Commission. *Rivingtons*. 1887.
- Young (J. E.). Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. *Hodder & Stoughton*. 1888.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY	I
A SHORT SKETCH OF FORMULARIES, ETC., ISSUED DURING THE COURSE OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION	5
ANALYSIS OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES	18
HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION	21
TEXT OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES, WITH NOTES	23
—————	
APPENDIX I.—	
TABLE OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, ETC.	324
APPENDIX II.—	
A COMPARISON OF THE BISHOPS' BOOK AND KING'S BOOK	336
APPENDIX III.—	
EXTRACTS SHOWING THE CHANGE IN CRANMER'S OPINIONS	341
APPENDIX IV.—	
TEXT OF ARTICLES I.—XV. AS REVISED BY THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY	343
APPENDIX V.—	
TEXT OF BISHOP GESTE'S LETTER ON ARTICLE XXVIII.	349

APPENDIX VI.—	PAGE
TEXT OF THE IRISH ARTICLES OF 1615	351
APPENDIX VII.—	
TRANSLATION OF PASSAGES QUOTED FROM DOCUMENTS	371
INDEX	438

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

I

INTRODUCTORY

*“With the heart man believeth unto righteousness,
And with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.”—ROM. x. 10.*

WHEREVER there is true belief in the heart, there will also be the outward expression of that belief, both in word and deed. Hence it is that we find very early traces of short summaries of Christian belief or Creeds.¹ Then in course of time were accepted the three Creeds, which, our Church says, “ought thoroughly to be received and believed” (Art. VIII). Until the Reformation the three Creeds were the only authoritative statements of doctrine. In the Church of Rome there was no written authority of doctrine, other than the Creeds, until the decrees of the Council of Trent (1564). The decrees of Councils may, from time to time, have added to received doctrines, *e.g.*, Transubstantiation was defined at the fourth Lateran Council (1215), but the process by which conflicting beliefs contended until one prevailed went constantly on until the Council of Trent.

The sixteenth century was marked by a general upheaval and unsettlement in religious matters, a state of things owing partly to the revival of learning, which had caused men to contrast the Church of the New Testament with mediæval Rome and to think for themselves, and partly due to ecclesiastical abuses. At this crisis, especially in those countries where a breach with Rome had taken place, a definition of doctrine became necessary. It had to be made clear how far the Church was at one with the

¹ See notes on Article VIII.

Church of the past, how it differed from the Church of Rome on the one hand, and from other Reformed bodies on the other hand. Thus at the period of the Reformation we find the various parts of Christendom putting forth more or less complete confessions of faith.¹

Speaking quite generally, there is this broad distinction between our English Articles and the formularies of foreign Protestant or Reformed bodies. The latter exhibit a more uniform body of doctrine than the Articles of the English Church, a result to which several causes contributed. In the first place the Continental Reformers, though at the outset with more or less unwillingness, severed their connection with the Church of the past, and, ignoring Ecclesiastical traditions, worked out a theology *de novo* from the Bible, guided by their own private judgment. The aim of the English Reformers, on the other hand, was simply the reformation of abuses: the Catholic creed was assumed and the Primitive Church taken as a pattern. Mediæval errors were purged away, but the organic identity of the Church before and after the Reformation was taken for granted, and in this country no break occurred either in the Episcopal succession or in the Liturgy. Another reason why the Continental Confessions of the sixteenth century contain a more systematic theology than our Articles may be traced in the remarkable fact that they owe so much more to individuals of commanding personality. The greater names and stronger characters in England, such as Wolsey, Fisher, More, Gardiner, were on the conservative side in religion, and our Articles, being the outcome of the operation of various and even conflicting influences, are not found to elaborate a logically complete theory of God's dealings with men. On the Continent it was far otherwise. The Reformation there owed everything to dominant individuals with special central theories of their own. Thus Lutheranism is a system gathered round the doctrine of justifying faith, and Calvinism is a system turning on election and reprobation, other doctrines being subordinated to, or influenced by, these central theories.

One sometimes hears the Articles spoken of as "containing a whole body of divinity." From what has been already said it will be seen that this is scarcely the case. What the Church of England does claim is that they are a fair Scriptural account

¹ See Appendix I.

of the leading doctrines of Christianity, set out in a way specially suited to the needs of the time when they were composed, together with a condemnation of prevalent errors, both of the Roman Church and of Protestants. Many subjects are unnoticed in them,¹ but as far as the Articles go, they are the legal definition of the doctrines of our Church, though it is to the Prayer-Book, together with the Articles, that English Churchmen look for the genuine expression of their Church's faith.

It is often stated that the XXXIX. Articles are a sort of compromise, drawn up with the view of reconciling contending parties; but surely the great object of the compilers was to set forth the true doctrine of the Church of England. The theory that the Articles are designedly ambiguous derives no support from the Articles themselves, and directly contradicts the avowed purpose of the compilers as expressed in the title. It is also abundantly clear that Cranmer, who had the chief hand in the composition of our Articles, altogether disapproved of such a dangerous and unprincipled line of conduct; *cf.* the Archbishop's letter to John a Lasco (dated Loudon, July 4, 1548), in which he says: "We are desirous of setting forth in our churches the true doctrine of God, and have no wish to adapt it to all tastes and to trifle with ambiguities, but, laying aside all carnal and prudential motives, to transmit to posterity a true and explicit form of doctrine agreeable to the rule of the sacred writings."²

The clergy are required at their ordination to subscribe the Articles, in accordance with Canon XXXVI.

"No person shall hereafter be received into the ministry, nor, either by institution or collation, admitted to any Ecclesiastical living, nor suffered to preach, to catechize, or to be a Lecturer, or Reader of Divinity, in either University, or in any Cathedral, or Collegiate Church, City, or Market-town, Parish Church, Chapel, or in any other place within this realm, except he be licensed,

¹ The following important subjects are not treated in the XXXIX. Articles:—

- (1.) The work of the Son of God in Creation.
- (2.) The work of the Holy Spirit in nature.
- (3.) The intercession of the ascended Christ.
- (4.) The nature and office of the Holy Angels.
- (5.) The resurrection of men in general, the everlasting life of the righteous and everlasting punishment of the wicked.
- (6.) We may also add that the devil is only once mentioned (in Art. XVII.) as thrusting men to desperation or to unclean living.

² Original Letters, vol. i. p. 17.

either by the Archbishop, or by the Bishop of the diocese where he is to be placed, under their hands and seals, or by one of the two Universities under their seal likewise; and except he shall first make and subscribe the following declaration, which, for the avoiding of all ambiguities, he shall subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian and surname, viz. :—

I, A. B., do solemnly make the following declaration: I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; I believe the doctrine of the [united] Church of England [and Ireland] as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.”

In former years subscription to the Articles was also required from all who graduated at the Universities.

II

A SHORT SKETCH OF FORMULARIES, &c., ISSUED DURING THE COURSE OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

1533. IN repudiating the Papal Supremacy it was maintained (25 Hen. viii. c. 21):—

“That the King and Parliament did not intend by it to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in anything concerning the very articles of the Catholic Faith of Christendom, and in any other things declared by Scripture and the Word of God necessary for salvation.”

1536. THE TEN ARTICLES.

Negotiations had been going on in 1535 between England and the Germans who had accepted the Augsburg Confession. Attempts were made to induce Henry VIII. to throw in his lot with the German Protestant Princes. The X. Articles were in reality a declaration as to how far England was at the time prepared to go with the German Protestants, viz., a very little way indeed, and the negotiations failed for the time. The most important advances in a Reforming direction in these Articles were:—

- (i.) The rejection of the Papal Supremacy and the substitution of the Royal Supremacy for it.
- (ii.) The prominence given to the authority of Holy Scripture. The rule of faith is the Bible, the Three Creeds, the first Four Councils, and the traditions of the fathers consistent with the Bible.
- (iii.) Three (*not seven*) Sacraments are treated of; Baptism, Penance, and the Sacrament of the Altar.

On the practical side, images, honour paid to saints, prayers offered to saints, rites and ceremonies, and practices connected with the doctrine of purgatory, are retained, but guarded from abuse. On comparing the Ten Articles with the Augsburg Confession, we notice that in the latter philosophical doctrines, such as Original Sin and Justification, occupy a much more prominent place. Concerning practice, the Augsburg Confession goes very much farther in a reforming direction than these English Articles: it prescribes the cup for the laity, admits the marriage of priests, condemns vows, and exalts the communion aspect of the Holy Eucharist at the expense of its sacrificial aspect.

1537. THE INSTITUTION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN.

(Sometimes called THE BISHOPS' BOOK, because it was the outcome of the deliberations of a committee of bishops and divines appointed to draw up a book of religious instruction.)

This is based to a great extent upon the Ten Articles, and is divided into four parts:—

1. An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed.
2. The *Seven Sacraments*.
3. The Ten Commandments.
4. The Lord's Prayer and Ave Maria, with Articles on Justification and Purgatory.

The prominence given to faith in this book may be accounted an advance in a Reforming direction, but this was balanced by a return to the *Seven Sacraments*.

1538. Negotiations with the Lutheran school of Reformers were at this time renewed, German deputies being sent over to this country to consult with English divines; the result of their deliberations was

THE THIRTEEN ARTICLES, based upon the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Augsburg Confession. These Articles were not published, but have been found amongst Cranmer's papers; they never had any authority in the Church, but they are important because

- (1.) They afford evidence of the desire for united action on the part of the Reformers.

- (2.) They show how far the Church in this country was at the time prepared to accept the Augsburg Confession.
- (3.) The opinions of Cranmer were modified by his discussions with the German deputies.
- (4.) They are the medium through which the language of the Augsburg Confession passed into the XLII. Articles, and thence to the XXXIX. Articles.

The Augsburg Confession had allowed the cup to the laity and the marriage of clergy, and had condemned vows and private masses. The English Church had not gone so far as this, and no agreement could be arrived at upon these points. When the German deputies expressed their opinion pretty freely about the Church in this country for withholding the cup from the laity, enforcing the celibacy of the clergy, &c., some defence was thought necessary. The King and Bishop Tonstal drew up a reply to the Germans, but the most effectual reply was,

1539. THE SIX ARTICLE LAW.

This marks the final failure of the attempts made in Henry's reign to Lutheranise the English Church; it briefly reaffirms Transubstantiation, Communion in one Kind, Celibacy of the Clergy, the Obligation of Vows, the use of private masses, and of auricular confession.

1543. NECESSARY DOCTRINE FOR ANY CHRISTIAN MAN.

(The work of a committee of bishops, approved by the King and by Convocation, and published by Royal authority, hence it is commonly called THE KING'S BOOK.)

This is based on the Bishops' Book, but contains additional Articles on Free-Will and Good Works; it also appends a general statement on the nature of Sacraments, and adds a preface on Faith. The King's Book was now the authoritative standard of doctrine of the Church of England, and remained so until the XLII. Articles were issued; it superseded the X. Articles, which up to this time had been in force.

It is commonly stated that the King's Book marks a retrograde step in the Reformation. It is true that

some Roman doctrines are affirmed more strongly than in the Bishops' Book, yet the general spirit of the two books is the same. The doctrines of the nature of the Church, the Royal Supremacy, and the Rule of Faith are laid down with equal fulness, and in the same sense in both books. The King's Book contains unreformed doctrine more rigidly than the Bishops' Book on the following important points:—

- (a) Communion in one kind.
- (b) Enforcement of celibacy of the clergy.
- (c) In treating of Penance, the necessity of absolution by a priest is more strongly affirmed.
- (d) The use of Scripture is restricted in the Preface to those of gentle birth.

Both books condemn the theory of good works which had been encouraged by Roman abuses.¹

In the reign of Henry VIII. no real reformation in doctrine had been attempted. The formularies above mentioned were mainly protests against Protestantism, and were so understood on the Continent. The religion of England during the latter part of the reign was Roman Catholicism with the King put in the place of the Pope.² Up to the close of the reign the Reformation had proceeded on English lines, and the interference of foreign Protestants had been rather resented.

1549. THE FIRST PRAYER-BOOK OF EDWARD VI. may be said to embody the ripe result of the English Reformation properly so called. During the short reign of Edward VI. foreign divines were eagerly welcomed, and the most illustrious of them put into high positions; thus Bucer was made Divinity Professor at Cambridge, Peter Martyr holding the corresponding post at Oxford. The Prayer-

¹ For a detailed comparison of the two books see Appendix II.

² Compare the following allusions in Original Letters:—

John Butler and others to Conrad Pellican and others, dated London, March 8, 1539—

"We pass on then to the state of this our kingdom, which is as follows; the ceremonies are still tolerated, but explanations of them are added."

Hooper to Bullinger, from Strasburg, January 27 [1546?]-

"Accept, my dear master, in a very few words, the news from England. As far as true religion is concerned, idolatry is nowhere in greater vigour. Our king has destroyed the pope, but not popery. . . . The impious mass,

Book of 1549 was too conservative for such men as these,¹ and the alterations made in the Book of 1552 were due to their influence.

1552. THE SECOND PRAYER-BOOK OF EDWARD VI. may thus be said to mark the extreme point reached in the attempt to conciliate foreign Reformers.

The Council of Trent had now been sitting for some time and defining the doctrines of Rome in opposition to those of the Reformers. Those who had broken with Rome consequently felt more strongly than ever the need of defining their position, and of presenting, if possible, a combined front against their common adversary. Cranmer especially seems to have cherished the idea of drawing the Continental Protestants and Reformed together, and uniting them with the English Church in the acceptance of a common confession of faith.² It was with this object in view that the Archbishop invited the co-operation of so many foreigners. Bucer, Peter Martyr, Fagius, Dryander, John a Lasco, Calvin, and Bullinger were all solicited

the most shameful celibacy of the clergy, the invocation of saints, auricular confession, superstitious abstinence from meats, and purgatory, were never before held by the people in greater esteem than at the present moment."

Dryander to Bullinger, from Cambridge, June 5, 1549—

"Meanwhile this reformation must not be counted lightly of; in this kingdom especially, where there existed heretofore, in the public formularies of doctrine, true popery without the name."

Beza to Bullinger, from Geneva, September 3, 1566, referring to the state of religion in England, says—

"The Papacy was never abolished in that country, but rather transferred to the sovereign."

Withers to the Elector Palatine—

"Under the auspices of Henry, the eighth of that name, England drove away the Roman Antichrist from all her borders, but yet in such a manner as that his authority seemed, not so much suppressed, as transferred to the king. The mass and other relics of Popish filthiness retained their former place and estimation."

¹ Cf. the letter of Geo. Withers to the Elector Palatine (*Zurich Letters*, vol. ii. p. 159), where, speaking of Edward's first Prayer-Book, he says:—

"He set forth a form of public prayer written in English, which, however, scarcely differed in any respect from the Latin, except that all the most glaring errors were abolished. The administration of the Sacraments altogether savours of Lutheranism."

² Cranmer thus writes to Melancthon, from London, February 10, 1549:—

"I am aware that you have often desired that wise and godly men should take counsel together, and, having compared their opinions, send forth under the sanction of their authority some work that should embrace the chief

bishop Parker drew up XI. Articles for circulation amongst the clergy. The meaning and force of such formularies is well illustrated by these Articles. They make the barest reference to the fundamentals of the Faith, merely affirming the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and referring to the Creeds, but they define the position of the Church of England upon points debated at the time. They lay down—

- (a) The authority of Scripture.
- (b) The rights of National Churches, their power to decree ceremonies, &c.
- (c) The rights of the State; the Royal, as against the Papal, Supremacy.
- (d) Points of divergence from Rome. Certain practices, such as the use of images, relics, &c., and private masses, are condemned, and the right of the laity to partake of the cup is affirmed, but it is noteworthy that there is no condemnation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

This is the most comprehensive of all the series of English Articles. Points debated amongst the Reformers are omitted, and even those who wished to hold Roman doctrine on the Sacraments might subscribe to these Articles, provided only they would accept the Royal Supremacy. The most prominent feature of this formulary is the assertion of the freedom from Papal interference of the National Church, which desires to embrace within itself the whole nation.

A few words should be said about

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, published in this same year, because it throws light upon the state of religious opinion in England at the time. It was the wish of the Queen, Parker, and Cecil to restore the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., but this was soon found to be impossible, owing to the number and influence of the returned Marian exiles, whose wish it was to remodel the English Church after the pattern of Geneva. The most that could be done was to revive the second Prayer-Book of Edward, which was

of a much more strongly Reforming type than the first. Two very significant changes were however made, much to the annoyance of the returned refugees and their party.¹

- (1.) In the Communion Office the words of administration from the first Book were prefixed to the words of administration as contained in the second Book. So long as the words of the second Book only were used, it might be maintained that that part of the service favoured Calvinistic and anti-sacramental doctrine; but the addition of the words from the first Book was understood at the time, and was doubtless intended, to imply a recognition of the Real Presence.
- (2.) The "Ornaments Rubric" was inserted, which restored such vestments of the clergy and furniture of the Church "as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth." What may be called the "Puritanism" of the Prayer-Book of 1552 was thus altogether neutralised.

1562-3. Convocation met in January of this year. XLII. Articles were presented. These were the XLII. Articles of 1553, which had been revised by Archbishop Parker, aided principally by Cox (Bishop of Ely) and Guest (Bishop of Rochester). Four of the XLII. Articles had been struck out, viz. :—

- (1.) *On Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.*
- (2.) *On Grace.*
- (3.) *On the Moral Law* [but part of this was incorporated with Art. VII.].

¹ Their opinion is well illustrated by a letter of George Withers to the Elector Palatine—

"The high Parliament of the whole realm was assembled, popery again cast out, and the second form of Prayers, which Edward left behind him at his death, was restored to the Church. But the ceremonies which, as was above stated, were retained in the Church at the first reformation of Edward, are restored under the same name. . . . In what way the Sacraments are disfigured by human inventions will easily appear from the public form of prayer, the royal injunctions, and the admonitions, or (as they call them) the advertisements of the Bishops. . . . What must we say when most of them (i.e., the English clergy) are popish priests, consecrated to perform mass!"
—*Zurich Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 161-163.

(4.) *Against the Millenarians.*

Four Articles had been added, viz. :—

- (1.) *On the Holy Ghost.*
- (2.) *On Good Works.*
- (3.) *On the non-participation of the wicked in the Holy Communion.*
- (4.) *On Communion in both kinds.*

No less than seventeen Articles had been more or less modified. The Upper House of Convocation omitted three more Articles which condemned opinions no longer of much importance in the controversies of the time: these were:—

Art. XXXIX. "*The resurrection of the dead is not yet brought to pass.*"

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

Art. XLII. "*All men shall not be saved at length.*"

A few verbal changes were also made by Convocation. Thus the number of the Articles was reduced to XXXIX.

In the Latin Articles sanctioned by the Queen *two important changes were made*:—

- (1.) A clause was added at the beginning of Art. XX. on the authority of the Church, "*Habet ecclesia ritus statuendi jus et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem.*"
- (2.) Article XXIX., on the non-participation of the wicked, was struck out.

The Articles, thus reduced to the number of XXXVIII. by the omission of Article XXIX., were published in 1563 as agreed upon "by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces and the whole cleargie, in the Conuocation holden at London in the yere of our Lord God MDLXII . . . for the auoiding of the diuersities of opinions, and for the stablishyng of consent touching true religion." They do not seem, however, to have met with general acceptance between 1563 and 1571. In the last-named year they were re-issued both in Latin and

1571.

English, with the addition of the Article struck out by the Queen in 1563, and thus, forming XXXIX. in number, were subscribed by both Houses of Convocation. Subscription was enforced by Act of Parliament, being required from all clergy, and from all taking degrees at the Universities.¹

In this same year the REFORMATIO LEGUM was brought into Parliament. The "*Submission of Clergy*" had provided that no new canons could be put forth by the clergy without the Royal sanction. The old Canon Law remained in force, but it was agreed that it should be revised by a Commission. Three times in Henry's reign a statute was passed for the appointment of the commissioners,² but it is not clear that any revision took place. By 3 & 4 Edward VI. 11, the king was empowered to appoint thirty-two persons "to compile such ecclesiastical laws as should be thought convenient." The Commission was appointed in October 1551, but in the next year the time allowed by the Act expired, and the work had not been completed. In the Parliament which met in 1571 an attempt was made to revive the "*Reformatio Legum*," but the attempt failed, and after this date the book disappears from Church history. As matters now stand, the Canons of the Church universal are binding in this country when they have been accepted by English synods, and *are not contrary to the statute law of the land*. The "*Reformatio Legum*" has thus no authority whatever, but its statements, especially in the section "*De Hæresibus*," illustrate the Articles, as they often throw light upon the controversies of the time.

The second section of the "*Act for ministers of the Church to be of sound religion*" (13 Eliz. c. 12) contains the following passage:—

"If any person ecclesiastical, or which shall have any ecclesiastical living, shall advisedly maintain or affirm any doctrine directly contrary or repugnant to any of the said Thirty-Nine Articles, and being convicted before the Bishop of the diocese, or the Ordinary, or before the Queen's Commissioner in causes ecclesiastical, shall persist therein, or not revoke his error, or, after such revocation, affirm such untrue doctrine, such maintaining, or affirming, or persisting, shall be just cause to deprive such person of his ecclesiastical functions, and it shall be lawful for the Bishop of the diocese, or Ordinary, or such Commissioner, to deprive such person."

¹ 25 Hen. VIII. 19; 27 Hen. VIII. 15; and 35 Hen. VIII. 16.

1595. THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

The wide prevalence of Calvinistic theology in England during Elizabeth's reign is indicated by the controversy at Cambridge between Whitaker, Regius Professor, and Baro, Margaret Professor, of Divinity, the latter of whom was compelled to resign for teaching that "Christ died sufficiently for all," and for maintaining that this was the doctrine of the English Articles. To this controversy the compilation of the "Lambeth Articles" is ultimately traceable. Archbishop Whitgift, desiring to settle matters, called to his aid certain bishops and divines, and at Lambeth a paper of Articles was drawn up and agreed upon. These Articles are nine in number, and assert in most uncompromising form the main points of the Calvinistic Theology. They never had any authority whatever. At the Hampton Court Conference the Puritans petitioned that the "Lambeth Articles" might be added to the Thirty-nine, but the request was refused.¹ The history of these Articles suggests two important reflections:—

1604.

- (1.) The Calvinistic party could not have been by any means satisfied that the XXXIX. Articles were Calvinistic in sense, otherwise they would scarcely have thought it necessary to add a statement of Calvinistic doctrine to them.²
- (2.) When an express statement of Calvinistic doctrines was offered for the acceptance of the English Church, it was deliberately refused. Such doctrines therefore form no part of the theology of our Church.

1604. The fifth of the CANONS of this date lays down that,

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that any of the nine-and-thirty Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and

¹ They were, however, incorporated with the Irish Articles of 1615. See Appendix VI.

² That the Calvinistic party was not satisfied with the Church of England Articles is also clearly shown by the action of the Westminster "Assembly of Divines," who in 1643 commenced a revision of the Articles, "with a design to render their sense more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism" (see Neal, "History of the Puritans," vol. i. p. 48, ed. 1754). The committee actually revised the first fifteen Articles. The text of these as revised is given at length in Appendix IV.

Bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy, in the convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred and sixty-two, for avoiding diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto; let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of such his wicked errors."

1628. HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION was prefixed to the XXXIX. Articles. Its immediate cause seems to have been the strong censure of Arminianism uttered by the House of Commons, and it was put forth with a view of settling or smoothing the raging controversy between Arminians and Calvinists. It enjoins that the Articles be taken "*in the literal and grammatical sense*," and points to Convocation as the proper body for settling disputed points of doctrine or discipline. The "Declaration" was drawn up by Laud, but not submitted to Convocation, so that it had not the sanction of the Church, but was put forth solely on the King's authority.
1635. The XXXIX. Articles adopted by the Convocation of the Church of Ireland.
1804. The Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church accepted the XXXIX. Articles.
1865. In this year there was passed "*An Act to amend the law as to the declarations and subscriptions to be made, and oaths to be taken, by the clergy*" (28 and 29 Vict. c. 112). This Act provides that a clergyman, on being instituted to a living, shall, on the first Sunday that he officiates there, "publicly and openly in the presence of his congregation read the whole Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and immediately after reading them, make the declaration of assent to them."

III

ANALYSIS OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES

THE ARTICLES may be divided into groups under the following heads:

I. ARTICLES SETTING FORTH THE FOUNDATION TRUTHS OF RELIGION (I.-V.).

The great truths embodied in the Ancient Creeds and held in all ages by the Church are here set forth, with very little in the way of comment or exposition.

II. ARTICLES GIVING THE RULE OF FAITH (VI.-VIII.).

The great principle which underlay the Reformation is laid down, viz., the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as containing all things necessary to salvation.

III. ARTICLES DEALING WITH INDIVIDUAL RELIGION (IX.-XVIII.).

These set forth the theory of man's unregenerate and regenerate state, and deal with those points more particularly upon which variety of opinion existed amongst those who had separated from Rome. Articles IX.-XIV. are concerned more especially with the great subject of Justification, which had been brought into such prominence by Luther's work in Germany. Articles XV.-XVIII. are connected rather with those questions upon which the systematic teaching of Calvin turned.

IV. ARTICLES DEALING WITH CORPORATE RELIGION (XIX.-XXXVI.).

These fall into two groups—(a) Those dealing with the nature, constitution, order, and authority of the Church (XIX.-XXI., XXIII., XXIV., XXXII.-XXXVI.). (b) Those setting forth the doctrine of the Sacraments, and including the condemnation of Purgatory, &c. (XXII., XXV.-XXXI.). It is in this group that we have the greatest divergence from the Church of Rome.

V. ARTICLES DEALING WITH NATIONAL RELIGION (XXXVII.-XXXIX.).

These treat of the Church and of the individual Christian in their relation to the State.

ARTICLES

AGREED UPON

BY THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF BOTH
PROVINCES, AND THE WHOLE CLERGY,

IN THE CONVOCATION HOLDEN AT LONDON IN THE YEAR 1562, FOR
THE AVOIDING OF DIVERSITIES OF OPINIONS, AND FOR THE
ESTABLISHING OF CONSENT TOUCHING TRUE RELIGION:
REPRINTED BY HIS MAJESTY'S COMMANDMENT,
WITH HIS ROYAL DECLARATION
PREFIXED THEREUNTO.

HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION¹

BEING by God's Ordinance, according to our just Title, Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor² of the Church, within these our Dominions, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge, in the unity of true Religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary Disputations, Altercations, or Questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth. We have, therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our Bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this Declaration following:—

That the Articles of the Church of England (which have been allowed and authorised heretofore, and which our Clergy generally have subscribed unto) do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's Word; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles: which to that end we command to be new printed, and this our Declaration to be published therewith.

That we are Supreme Governor of the Church of England: and that if any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the Injunctions, Canons, and other Constitutions whatsoever thereto belonging, the Clergy in their Convocation is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under our Broad Seal so to do: and we approving their said Ordinances and Constitutions; providing that none be made contrary to the Laws and Customs of the Land.

That out of our princely care that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, the Bishops and Clergy from time to time in Convocation, upon their humble desire,

¹ Prefixed to the Articles in 1628, see p. 17.

² For the history of this title see notes on Art. XXXVII.

shall have Licence under our Broad Seal to deliberate of, and to do all such things, as being made plain by them, and assented unto by us, shall concern the settled continuance of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England now established; from which we will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree.

That for the present, though some differences have been ill raised, yet we take comfort in this, that all Clergymen within our Realm have always most willingly subscribed to the Articles established; which is an argument to us, that they all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said Articles; and that even in those curious points,¹ in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for them; which is an argument again that none of them intend any desertion of the Articles established.

That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures,² and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.

That if any Public Reader, in either of our Universities, or any Head or Master of a College, or any other person respectively in either of them, shall affix any new sense to any Article, or shall publicly read, determine, or hold any public disputation, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the Universities or Colleges respectively; or if any Divine in the Universities shall preach or print anything either way, other than is already established in Convocation with our Royal Assent; he, or they the offenders, shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censure in our Commission Ecclesiastical, as well as any other; and we will see there shall be due execution upon them.

¹ Viz., the points in dispute between the Calvinistic party and those whom, on account of their opposition to them, they designated Arminians.

² See notes on Art. XVII.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION

ARTICLE I

OF FAITH IN THE HOLY
TRINITY.

DE FIDE IN SACROSANCTAM
TRINITATEM.

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

Unus est vivus et verus *Deus*, *aeternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis; immensae potentiae, sapientiae, ac bonitatis; Creator et Conservator omnium tum visibilium, tum invisibilium.* Et in unitate hujus divinae naturae, *tres sunt Personae, ejusdem essentiae, potentiae, ac aeternitatis, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.*

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Largely borrowed from the Augsburg Confession, Part I., Art. I., through the medium of the XIII. Articles. The words printed in italics are common to all three formularies.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The Article of course excludes Arian and Sabellian heretics. Its immediate object doubtless was to condemn the Anabaptists, and kindred spirits, who had revived these heresies at the period of the Reformation, many of them having renounced all belief in the Holy Trinity.¹

¹ That even those Articles which affirm the fundamental doctrines of the faith were called forth by the needs of the time is abundantly proved by contemporary documents; see, e.g., letter written by Ridley to Bradford shortly before his death (*Works*, p. 367, ed. Parker Society):—

“Whereas you write of the outrageous rule that Satan, our ghostly enemy, beareth abroad in the world, whereby he stirreth, and raiseth so pestilent and heinous heresies, as some to deny the blessed Trinity, some the Divinity

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1) THE BEING OF GOD.

“There is but one living and true God.”

Belief in the existence of God is the very foundation of all religion (Heb. xi. 6). His existence does not admit of demonstration, yet is a matter of reasonable certainty, being testified to by

(a) *The phenomena of nature* (Job xii. 7–10; Rom. i. 20).

The argument for the existence of God from natural phenomena falls under two heads:—

(i) The argument from causation. The succession of causes which we observe in nature must have derived its origin from some First Cause. In the words of Herbert Spencer, “The assumption of the existence of a first cause of the universe is a necessity of thought.”

(ii) The argument from adaptation. The order and usefulness of the world, and all things therein, point to a wise and mighty Will behind it (Acts xiv. 17). So John Stuart Mill, in his work “On Theism,” confesses, “I think it must be allowed that, in the present state of our knowledge, the adaptations in nature afford a large balance of probability in favour of creation by intelligence.”

(b) *The moral sense of mankind* (Rom. ii. 15).

Should we not see in the obligatory influence of conscience, the sense of right and wrong, and of responsibility, the image, and therefore the proof, of the Divine Mind?

Thus we follow alike the strongest presumption of our reason, and the best intuition of the soul, when we believe that God is.

The existence of God is confirmed, and His character more clearly manifested to us by *Revelation*. It was the work of Christ to declare to us the Father¹ (S. John i. 18; cf. xvii. 6).

of our Saviour Christ, some the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, some the baptism of infants, some original sin, and to be infected with the errors of the Pelagians, and to re-baptize those that have been baptized with Christ's baptism already; alas, Sir, this doth declare this time and these days to be wicked indeed.”

¹ This declarative aspect of Christ's work is especially prominent in the Gospel according to S. John.

Being Himself “the Image of the invisible God” (Col. i. 15), He showed the Father by exhibiting in Himself the moral image of God. Those who saw Him saw the Father (S. John xii. 45; xiv. 9). Those who hearkened to Him heard the words of the Father (S. John vii. 16; viii. 28; xiv. 24). The whole of His perfect life was a manifestation of the Father, with Whom He is one (S. John x. 30), and from Whom He came forth (S. John vi. 28), His mission being attested by (a) fulfilment of prophecies (S. John v. 46), and by (b) miracles (S. John v. 36; xv. 24).

God is:—

one (Deut. vi. 4; Isa. xlv. 8; S. Mark xii. 29; 1 Cor. viii. 4).

living, *i.e.* self-existent, having life in Himself (Exod. iii. 14; Jer. x. 10; S. John v. 26; 1 Thess. i. 9).

true (*ἀληθινός*, 1 Thess. i. 9; S. John xvii. 3)—the meaning of the Greek word is ‘genuine,’ denoting that which truly and completely is that which it professes to be. The sense is therefore that there is One only who perfectly fulfils the conception we form of what God should be.

(2) THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

“Everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness.”

The Divine attributes given in the Article may be classified as follows:—

(a) *Positive attributes*, such as impute to God the possession of certain qualities.

everlasting (Deut. xxxii. 40; Ps. cii. 27; Rev. i. 8). This follows upon recognition of God as the ‘First Cause,’ which must exist of Itself, and therefore must always exist.

of infinite power (S. Matt. xix. 26; but see 2 Tim. ii. 13; Heb. vi. 18). Thus ‘Almighty’¹ is a title often applied to God in Holy Scripture. When we say “God can do everything,” we of course exclude those things which are in themselves impossible; *e.g.*, that a thing should exist and not exist at the same moment.

¹ *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, παντοκράτωρ*, Lat. ‘omnipotens,’ (*i.e.* strictly, “having power over all things”).

We likewise except those things which contradict the perfection of God. He is of infinite power, but He cannot sin. Sin is, in fact, a mark of weakness, not of power.

of **infinite wisdom** (Ps. cxlvii. 5; Rom. xi. 33). By wisdom we mean knowledge of things together with skill to apply that knowledge.

of **infinite goodness** (Lev. xi. 45; S. Luke xviii. 19; S. James i. 17). He is perfectly good in Himself, and the Author and Giver of all good.

(b) *Negative attributes*, such as deny to God the possession of certain qualities.

without body (incorporeus), *i.e.*, immaterial, spiritual (S. John iv. 24; v. 37; *cf.* S. Luke xxiv. 39).

without parts (impartibilis), *i.e.*, incapable of division. There can be nothing of the nature of conflict or change with God (Ps. cii. 26, 27).

without passions (impassibilis), *i.e.*, incapable of suffering. Whatever suffers does so from some agent stronger than itself; this therefore follows from the infinite power of God.¹

(3) GOD'S RELATION TO THE UNIVERSE.

"The Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible."

The relation of God to the universe is twofold. He is—

(a) **Maker**. The universe is not eternal, or self-originated, neither is it an involuntary development of the Divine Nature, but it is dependent for its existence upon the Will of God, having been called into being at a definite point of time by Him (Gen. i. 1; Acts iv. 24; Col. i. 16; Rev. iv. 11). Pantheism therefore, which confounds God with the universe, is not a true account of things.

(b) **Preserver**. Having created the world, God did not leave it to go on of itself, but He is omnipresent,

¹ It should be noted that the English rendering of the last two attributes suggests a different sense:—

'without parts'—*i.e.*, face, hands, eyes, &c.

'without passions.' (See Num. xxiii. 19; Acts xiv. 15; S. James v. 17.)

The organs and feelings of man are indeed often attributed to the Deity in Holy Scripture (*e.g.*, Prov. xv. 3; Exod. xx. 5), but this is done by a figure of speech, in accommodation to human understanding.

immanent, guiding, controlling, and directing (S. John v. 17). We speak sometimes of the universe as governed by natural laws. Scientific research may discover certain general laws according to which the course of nature is ordered. Such laws are but the expression of the Divine will (Col. i. 17; Acts xvii. 28). Deism therefore, which separates the universe from God, so far as its present operations are concerned, is not a true account of things.

(4) THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY.

"And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

Person—an individual moral agent.

Substance (essentia)—the nature or essence whereof one or more persons subsist.

"*Trinity*" is the word used by the Church to express shortly the Revelation of the Being of God contained in the New Testament, that blessed Revelation which makes the New Testament what it is, *viz.*, a new Covenant of God with man, through Jesus Christ the Redeemer, and the Holy Spirit the Sanctifier. Whilst the doctrine is not philosophically developed in the books of the New Testament, it is involved in the very substance of its teaching; *e.g.*, the formula of Baptism given by our Lord Himself (S. Matt. xxviii. 19) clearly implies in the Godhead, (a) Distinction of Persons, (b) Equality of Persons, and (c) Unity of Persons, for it is said *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* in the singular. God then is "Three in One," we must not "confound the Persons"¹ (S. John xiv. 16); yet He is "One in Three," we must not "divide the Substance"¹ (S. Matt. xxviii. 19; *cf.* S. John x. 30).²

This doctrine is opposed to—

(a) *Tritheism* or *Polytheism* of any kind.

"We are forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say there be three Gods."¹

(b) *Sabellianism*, according to which God, Who is one person, reveals Himself at one time in the character of the Father, at another in that of the Son, at another in that

¹ Athanasian Creed.

² In the latter passage notice the neuter *ἐν*, implying 'one essence,' not 'one person.'

of the Holy Spirit. But thus the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit would be personations rather than persons.

(c) *Arianism*, and kindred doctrines such as *Unitarianism*, *Socinianism*, &c., according to which the Father alone is God in the full and proper sense of the term.

The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is no mere abstract doctrine, or dark speculation without practical value, but as it is fundamental to theology, so also it is to practical piety, having an intimate bearing upon the Christian life. We are baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity, and it is our blessed privilege to rejoice in the knowledge of the Father's love (1 S. John iv. 19), and to experience the power of the Son, through His death and resurrection, to cleanse us from sin and keep us in newness of life (Phil. iii. 10), a power which we share through the presence of the Holy Spirit with us, Who brings us ever into closer union with the living Christ (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

ARTICLE II

OF THE WORD, OR SON OF GOD,
WHICH WAS MADE VERY MAN.

DE VERBO, SIVE FILIO DEI, QUI
VERUS HOMO FACTUS EST.

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

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

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Mainly from the Augsburg Confession, Part I., Art. III., through the medium of the XIII. Articles. The clause in **thick type** was added in 1563 from the Wurtemberg Confession, Art. II.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The doctrinal excesses of the Anabaptists made it necessary for the Church, at the time of the Reformation, to reaffirm the Catholic doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation. The prevalence of heresies on this central doctrine of the Christian faith is clear from the following evidence:—

By Stat. 32 Hen. VIII. c. 49, § 11, those were excluded

from the king's pardon who held "that Christ took no bodily substance of our blessed lady."

Hooper, writing to Bullinger from London, June 25, 1549, says:—

"The Anabaptists flock to the place (*i.e.*, of public lecture), and give me much trouble with their opinions respecting the Incarnation of the Lord; for they deny altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh."—*Original Letters*, vol. i. p. 65.

Martin Micronius, in a letter to Bullinger, dated London, May 20, 1550, writes:—

"And indeed it is a matter of the first importance that the Word of God should be preached here in German, to guard against the heresies which are introduced by our countrymen. There are Arians, Marcionists, Libertines, Danists, and the like monstrosities, in great numbers. A few days since, namely, on the 2nd of May, a certain woman was burnt alive for denying the Incarnation of Christ."¹—*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 560.

Micronius, writing again to Bullinger from London, August 14, 1551, says:—

"We have not only to contend with the Papists, who are almost everywhere ashamed of their errors, but much more with the Sectaries and Epicureans, and pseudo-evangelicals. In addition to the ancient errors respecting paedobaptism, the Incarnation of Christ, the authority of the magistrate, the lawfulness of an oath, the property and community of goods, and the like, new ones are rising up every day, with which we have to contend. The chief opponents, however, of Christ's Divinity are the Arians, who are now beginning to shake our Churches with greater violence than ever, as they deny the conception of Christ by the Virgin."—*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 574.

Richard Hilles writes to Bullinger from London, March 8, 1571:—

"But I grieve very much that the pestiferous sect of Arians is budding forth again in many other places besides Switzerland."—*Zurich Letters*, vol. ii. p. 182.

See also Ridley's letter to Bradford, quoted above, pp. 23, 24, and compare 'Reformatio Legum,' De Haeresibus, cap. 5:—

"Circa duplicem Christi naturam perniciosus est et varius error: ex quibus alii sunt ex Arianorum secta, Christum ita ponentes

¹ The woman referred to is Joan Bucher, sometimes called Joan of Kent.

hominem ut Deum negent. Alii eum sic Deum judicant ut hominem non agnoscant, et de corpore nugantur de cælo divinitus assumpto, et in virginis uterum lapso, quod tanquam in transitu per Mariam quasi per canalem aut fistulam praeterfluxit."

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1) THE NATURE OF THE SON OF GOD.

"The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father."

the Word (S. John i. 1). The significance of the title as applied to the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity is that as a word declares thought, so does the Son reveal the Father (S. John i. 18); as a man makes known his will by word of mouth, so God reveals His will by His Son (Heb. i. 1).

begotten expresses here not an event, but a relationship which has subsisted from everlasting. He is "begotten" or else He would not be "Son," but "from everlasting" or else He would not be God (Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 5-12).

very and eternal God. Christ is not metaphorically but properly and truly called God (Rom. ix. 5; ¹ S. John i. 18; ² v. 26; 1 S. John v. 20).

of one substance with the Father (*Patri consubstantialis*). These words correspond to the well-known clause of the Nicene Creed, *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ*. "Of one essence" would be a better representation of the meaning in English (S. John x. 30; v. 26).

(2) THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION.

"Took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man."

Took man's nature (Phil. ii. 6-8). An important statement. The Divine Nature did not become human, neither did the Son of God take a man's nature, but man's nature, *i.e.* human nature, assuming the same

¹ The doxology in this passage is doubtless rightly taken as referring to Christ.

² Note that the reading of this passage according to NBCL is *ὁ μονογενὴς θεός*.

nature which is in all other men, assuming it in its first original element before it had come to have any personal subsistence (Heb. ii. 16).

in the womb of the Blessed Virgin (S. Matt. i. 20; S. Luke i. 30-35; Gal. iv. 4). The Divine Nature did not descend upon the man Jesus at some period of his earthly life, as Nestorians taught, but He Who was born of Mary was really God, so that the Blessed Virgin may be called θεοτόκος.¹ Cf. the Apology of Aristides,² § II., "God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew Virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God."

The followers of Cerinthus and the Ebionites are thus excluded, who held that Jesus Christ had no existence before His Mother.

so that two whole and perfect natures . . . were joined together in one person, never to be divided.

There were four great heresies on this subject in early times.

- (a) Arians denied the Divinity of Christ.
- (b) Apollinarians tampered with His Manhood.
- (c) Nestorians divided the Divinity and the Manhood, making Christ two Persons.
- (d) Eutychians confounded the two natures, so as to make from them one composite nature, neither human nor Divine.

The Church defended the faith at four General Councils.

- (a) At Nicæa, A.D. 325, affirming that Christ is truly (ἀληθῶς) God.
- (b) At Constantinople, A.D. 381, affirming that He is perfectly (τελῶς) man.
- (c) At Ephesus, A.D. 431, declaring that the two natures are indivisibly (ἀδιαπέτως) united.
- (d) At Chalcedon, A.D. 451, laying down that at the same time He is distinctly (ἀσυγχύτως) God and man.

See Rev. i. 5, 6, 17, 18; Acts xx. 28.

¹ The title was authoritatively adopted at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, Nestorius having raised an objection to it. It is the common title of the Blessed Virgin in the Eastern Church at the present day.

² An Apology for Christianity presented to the Emperor Antoninus Pius by Aristides, an Athenian philosopher. It was written between 120 and 140 A.D., and recovered in a Syriac Version at the Convent of S. Katherine, Sinai, by Mr. Rendel Harris, in 1889.

We have seen that the two natures are joined together in Christ, but not confused: He has two natures, each of which still remains entire, but is one Person,¹ of the whole of which Person that is sometimes predicated which is proper only to one of the natures; see, *eg.*, Acts xx. 28. This manner of expression is called "*communicatio idiomatum*" (*i.e.*, sharing of properties). By this it is not meant that there is ever any mutual participation of both natures, but always a co-operation and association of the two.

The words "never to be divided" are important. The humanity was not laid aside at the Ascension.

(3.) THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

"Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a Sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men."

truly suffered. Thus are excluded all forms of the Docetic heresy, which teach that the Son of God became man in appearance only, and that His humanity, His sufferings, &c., were therefore unreal.

to reconcile . . . to be a sacrifice.

When treating of the change brought about in the relation of man to God by the death of Christ, the following words are used in the New Testament:—

(a) καταλλάσσειν and cognate words.

Man was in a state of enmity against God (Eph. ii. 3), but Christ reconciles the two (Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18-20; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20). We should notice that while the Article speaks of God being reconciled to us by the death of Christ,² on the other hand in the passages of Scripture

¹ This is called the "*hypostatic union*," a technical term of theology denoting the joining of the two natures in one *ὑπόστασις*.

² The expression of the Article "*ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret*" is taken, as stated above, from the Augsburg Confession; the same manner of presenting the truth is also found in the SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XI. :—

"Porro passione et morte sua, omnibusque adeo quae a suo in carne adventu nostra causa fecit et pertulit, reconciliavit omnibus fidelibus Dominus noster Patrem caelestem."

See also the HOMILY OF REPENTANCE, First Part, p. 564 :—

"We have need of a Mediator for to bring and reconcile us unto Him, who for our sins is angry with us. The same is Jesus Christ; who, being true and natural God, equal and of one substance with the Father, did at the time appointed take upon Him our frail nature, in the blessed Virgin's womb, and that of her undefiled substance; that so He might be a Mediator betwixt God and us, and pacify His wrath."

referred to the enmity is represented as on man's side, and man is spoken of as reconciled to God. Though the expression is not used, nevertheless, in the New Testament, God is thought of as being reconciled to man; we read of an *ὀργή θεοῦ* (Rom. i. 18; Eph. ii. 3, v. 6), which must not be considered merely as an anthropomorphic mode of expression, but as representing something real in the nature and disposition of God towards man in his natural state.

(b) *ἀπολύτρωσις, λύτρον*, and cognate words.

These give the idea of deliverance as from slavery (S. Matt. xx. 28; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14). Man was in a condition of slavery to sin (Rom. vii. 14; cf. S. John viii. 34), but Christ paid the ransom (1 Tim. ii. 6) and redeemed him (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Acts xx. 28).

(c) *ἱλαστήριον, ἱλασμός*.

These words have in the New Testament the sense of "expiation" which takes place by means of sacrifice or offering (Rom. iii. 25; 1 S. John ii. 2).¹

(d) *προσφορά, θυσία*.

See Eph. v. 2, where these words are used of Christ's death, signifying its virtue as a propitiatory sacrifice.

The Article, within Holy Scripture, strongly insists on Christ's Death as an atoning sacrifice; thus our Church discards any merely exemplary view of the Death of Christ, as also the theory which sees in it only an impressive moral exhibition.

for original guilt. See notes on Art. IX.

for all actual sins of men.

The omission of the word "all" in some modern copies is entirely without authority. The wording is important because strongly anti-Calvinistic,² Calvinism teaching that Christ did not die for all sins, but for those of the elect only. That the Calvinistic party considered the word "all" hostile to their doctrine is proved by the fact that

¹ *ἱλαστήριον* in LXX. generally represents the Hebrew *הַכִּפָּיִת*, the Cover of the Ark, the Mercy-Seat (cf. Heb. ix. 5).

² The English Church emphatically asserts the sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice "for the sins of the whole world." (Cf. Art. XXXI., where see notes.)

in the text as revised by the Westminster divines it is wanting.¹

Original guilt and actual sins are both mentioned in the Article in order to emphasise the truth that the effect of the Atonement wrought by Christ's Death is utterly to abolish all sin.

¹ See Appendix IV. ; and cf. WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, xi. 4 :—

"God did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins."

ARTICLE III

OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST
INTO HELL.

DE DESCENSU CHRISTI
AD INFEROS.

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

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

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This Article was composed by the English Reformers. It was a good deal longer as it stood in the XLII. Articles, being continued as follows:—

For the bodie lay in the sepulchre, untill the Resurrection: but his Ghoste departing from him, was with the ghostes that were in prison, or in Helle, and didde preache to the same, as the place of S. Peter dooeth testifie.

Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, Spiritus ab illo emissus, cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque praedicavit, quemadmodum testatur Petri locus.

This paragraph was omitted in 1563.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The doctrine of our Lord's descent into Hell seems to have been much agitated in this country. Micronius, writing to Bullinger from London, May 20, 1550, says:—

“They are disputing about the descent of Christ into Hell.”—*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 561.

The violence of the controversy on this subject, and especially concerning the bearing of the text of S. Peter referred to on the doctrine, was most likely the cause of Convocation dropping the latter part of the Article in 1563. Alley, Bishop of Exeter,

drew up papers for this Convocation, in which he thus alludes to the subject:—

“First for matters of Scripture, namely, for this place which is written in the Epistle of S. Peter, that Christ went down into hell and preached to the souls that were in prison. There have been in my diocese great invectives between the preachers one against the other.”¹

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

The use of the word *hell* in the Article, as in the Apostles' Creed, is a little unfortunate, because it is often used to signify the place of torment. Here it is used in the sense of the Greek ἄδης, or the Hebrew לִישׁוֹן, meaning the place of departed spirits. The purport of the Article, therefore, is that our Lord was true man as well in death as in life; that His Body lay in the grave, and His Spirit went to the place of departed spirits (*cf.* S. Luke xxiii. 43).

For Scripture testimony see the following passages:—

(a) Acts ii. 25–31, where S. Peter quotes the words of the Psalmist, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption” (Ps. xvi. 10), and applies them to the Resurrection of our Lord, “Whose soul was not left in hell.” This argument implies that the soul of Christ had been in hell.

(b) 1 S. Peter iii. 18, 19. This famous passage represents the soul of Christ as acting, after the death of the body, among the souls who were in the place of departed spirits, those especially being mentioned who were disobedient at the time of the flood. Christ is said to have preached (ἐκήρυξεν) to these. The word is one generally used in the Gospels of the work of Christ in proclaiming the Gospel of the Kingdom, preaching repentance (*e.g.*, S. Matt. iv. 17, 23). If we so understand the passage our interpretation is confirmed by a comparison with 1 S. Peter iv. 6—all are to be on the same footing at the Judgment; therefore all, dead as well as living, have the offer of the salvation of Christ.²

¹ Strype, “Annals,” i. 348 (ed. 1725).

² Of course, when thus interpreted, the passage does not support the idea that those who have had the offer of Christ's salvation in this life, and refused it, will have another chance after death. Inadequate explanations of S. Peter's meaning are—(a) that given by Bishop Pearson, viz., that the Spirit of Christ

We have seen that the disputes as to the meaning of the passage in S. Peter caused the reference to it in the Article to be struck out. Our Church, however, has expressed her view of its meaning by appointing the passage to be read as the Epistle on Easter Even.

preached by the mouth of Noah to the ante-Diluvians; (b) that the proclamation spoken of was one of condemnation.

ARTICLE IV

OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

DE RESURRECTIONE CHRISTI.

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

Christus vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanae naturae pertinentibus, recepit, cum quibus in coelum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad judicandos homines reversurus sit.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

This Article is supplementary to the Second and Third, affirming the true and proper Manhood of our risen and ascended Lord, and thus excluding the theories of certain sectaries of the Reformation period who inclined to the Docetic heresy; *e.g.*, Caspar Schwenkfeld, a Silesian nobleman (1528), contended that the flesh of Christ had never been the flesh of a created being, and is now, since the Ascension, so deified as to retain no semblance of humanity.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Christ did truly rise again from death.

See S. Matt. xxviii. 6; Acts x. 40, 41; I Cor. xv. 1-20.

and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature.

See S. Luke xxiv. 39, 40; S. John xx. 27. The Lord's Body after the Resurrection was the identical Body in which He suffered, but in some measure spiritualised (S. John xx. 19-27).

The Resurrection is represented as God the Father's testimony to the claim of Jesus. He had been condemned by the Sanhedrin because of His claim to be the Son of God (S. Matt. xxvi. 63-66). The Resurrection was the Divine vindication of this claim (Rom. i. 4; Acts xiii. 33). The chief work of the Apostles was to bear witness to its literal truth as an historical fact (Acts i. 22; ii. 32; iv. 33); thus it occupies the central position in Apostolic preaching (Acts ii. 32; x. 40; xiii. 30; xvii. 18), and is set forth as the very basis of our Religion (1 Cor. xv. 14-17). It must be admitted on all hands that Christianity would never have become the Religion it is without belief in the Resurrection of Christ.¹ We put a vital question, therefore, when we ask, "Is the belief in the Resurrection well grounded?"

(a) It is sometimes urged that the age was a superstitious, a credulous one; that the Apostles would readily imagine that they saw their Master, and would believe that He had risen. But the Evangelists seem to take special pains to make it clear that the followers of Christ were by no means prepared for His Resurrection, nor were they at first even willing to believe it; on the other hand, it was quite a difficult matter to convince them of its truth. (See S. Matt. xxviii. 17; S. Mark xvi. 11, 13, 14; S. Luke xxiv. 11, 41; and note especially the case of S. Thomas, S. John xx. 24-29). Further, it is scarcely credible that the five hundred brethren who saw the risen Lord at once (1 Cor. xv. 6) could have been the victims of illusion.

(b) It is said, again, that Christ, after His Resurrection, appeared only to friends (Acts x. 41), and that this makes us suspect collusion. But the testimony of the enemies of Christ to the Resurrection should not be overlooked (S. Matt. xxviii. 11-15); neither should we forget that on one memorable occasion Christ did appear to an enemy, viz., to Saul the persecutor (Acts ix. 3 *et seqq.*, xxii. 14; 1 Cor.

¹ Thus Strauss admits that "Christianity in the form in which Paul, in which all the Apostles understood it, as is presupposed in the Confessions of all Christian Churches, falls with the resurrection of Jesus." (See Oosterzee, "Christian Dogmatics," p. 565). Again, the Rev. C. J. H. Fletcher of Oxford, in a sermon the main purpose of which seems to be to proclaim the "failure" of the historical evidence of the Resurrection, has the following passage:—"Would the disciples have rallied from the shock of their Master's unexpected death without a supernatural reassertion of His life? Could they have been transformed into enthusiastic death-defying Apostles unless they had believed they had seen their risen Lord? No" ("The Taking Away of the Veil," p. 15).

xv. 8), and the fact that when He did appear to an enemy, that enemy became a friend, an Apostle, a martyr, is surely strong testimony to the fact of the Resurrection.

(c) There are yet other theories which see the real and profound cause of faith in Christ's corporeal Resurrection in the ineffaceable impression which His religious grandeur had left on the minds of His faithful followers,¹ and which hold that the story of the Resurrection is a parable of the immortality of the influence of Christ, and typical of the spiritual death and resurrection of humanity.² But any such substitution of the abiding influence of the life of Christ, or the onward progress of mankind, for the literal fact that "Christ did truly rise from death," would render many undisputed facts of history unaccountable,³ and reduce Christianity itself to the impossible position of an effect without a cause. The evidence, indeed, is such that a great scholar, himself born and brought up in the Jewish Religion, was constrained to say, "The Resurrection may be unhesitatingly pronounced the best-established fact in history."⁴

(2.) THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST.

wherewith He ascended into Heaven.

We have three accounts of the Ascension in the New Testament: S. Mark xvi. 19; S. Luke xxiv. 50, 51; Acts i. 9; *cf.* also 1 S. Peter iii. 22. S. Stephen, when arraigned before the Council, saw our Lord in Heaven at the right hand of the Father (Acts vii. 56).

and there sitteth (Ps. cx. 1). The word conveys two ideas—

(a) That of dwelling, abiding, in glory at the right hand of God (Heb. x. 12, "for ever sat down").

(b) That of reigning, sitting enthroned, sharing the Father's royal power (Eph. i. 20-22).

¹ Réville, "History of the Dogma of the Deity of Jesus Christ," Chap. ii.

² Strauss, at the conclusion of his "Leben Jesu" (first edition), writes:—"Humanity it is that dies, and rises again, and ascends to Heaven. . . . Through faith in this Christ, specially in His death and resurrection, man is justified before God."

³ *e.g.*, The startling rise and spread of the Christian Church, the institution and observance of the Lord's Day (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10), and the acceptance and observance of the Holy Eucharist. If that rite be only a reminder of the utter disappointment of the first disciples, how shall we explain its unceasing celebration from the earliest times? How shall we account for the manner in which it has so completely superseded the ancient sacrificial system? (See Maclear's "Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist.")

⁴ Edersheim, "Jesus the Messiah," vol. ii. p. 626 (first edition).

We must not suppose that inaction is implied in the word "sitteth." A glance at those passages where we have accounts of appearances of Christ after His Ascension will prevent misunderstanding on this point. In Acts vii. 55, 56, we read that S. Stephen "looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus *standing* on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man *standing* on the right hand of God." Again, the Lord appeared to S. John in Patmos, *walking* in the midst of the golden candlesticks (Rev. ii. 1). Cf. also S. Mark xvi. 20, where it is said that after the Ascension the Apostles "went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord *working with them*."

It is in the Revelation of S. John and in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the activity of the Ascended Christ is especially brought before us. In his exile for the testimony of Jesus Christ, S. John sees a vision of the Lord in glory (Rev. i. 13-20), and the very object of His appearing is, that He may send messages to the Churches of Asia. He knows the circumstances of each Church (Rev. ii. 2, 9, 13, &c.), watches over it, and over individual members of it (ii. 13); He warns, encourages, and directs. In the same book He is seen in Heaven as the Lamb that was slain, before the throne of God He bears the marks of His wounds, pleading His Sacrifice (v. 6, 9, 12, &c.). Cf. Rom. viii. 34, where Christ is referred to as interceding for us at the right hand of God. But it is in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the thought of Christ exercising His High Priestly Office in Heaven is most dwelt upon (see Heb. vii. 24-28; ix. 24-26).¹

(3.) THE RETURN OF CHRIST.

until He return (Acts iii. 21; Heb. ix. 28).

Our Lord Himself spoke of His return to earth in glory (S. Matt. xxiv. 30; S. John xiv. 3). At His Ascension the attendant angels gave a promise to the wondering disciples that He should return (Acts i. 11); accordingly we find the Apostolic writers continually looking forward to His coming again (Phil. i. 6, 10; 1 Thess. iii. 13, iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 14), which is generally regarded as close at hand (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 1 Thess. iv. 17); but the exact time of the second Advent is

¹ It may be noted in this connection that the dress in which the Lord appears to S. John (Rev. i. 13) is that of a priest engaged in active service.

uncertain, so that it will come unexpectedly upon those who are not constantly watching (1 Thess. v. 2, 3; 2 S. Peter iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3; cf. our Lord's words in S. Matt. xxiv. 36-44, xxv. 13; S. Luke xii. 35-40).

(4.) THE LAST JUDGMENT.

to judge all men at the last day.

Judgment is the issue of Christ's second coming (S. Matt. xvi. 27; 2 Tim. iv. 1). Three points are clearly brought out in Holy Scripture in this connection:—

- (a) Christ Himself is to be the Judge (S. John v. 22, 27; Acts x. 42, xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16).
- (b) All men are to be judged (Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10; Heb. ix. 27; 1 S. Peter iv. 5), both quick and dead.
- (c) The works done in the body form the ground of judgment (S. Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 5, 6; Rev. xx. 12, xxii. 12).

It should be noted that in this last clause of the Article there is implied the truth of a resurrection and a future state for man.

ARTICLE V

OF THE HOLY GHOST.

DE SPIRITU SANCTO.

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

Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiae, majestatis, et gloriae, verus, ac aeternus Deus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This was one of the new Articles added in 1563. It is found, word for word, in the third Article of the Wurtemberg Confession, from which it was no doubt derived.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

This Article seems to have been added to make the dogmatic statements of the Church against the Arians more complete.¹ Considerable danger, we know, threatened the Church from this quarter in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign. See, *e.g.*, a letter of Archbishop Parker in which he says, "They say that the realm is full of Anabaptists, Arians, Libertines, Free-will men, &c., against whom only I thought ministers should have needed to fight in unity of doctrine" (*Parker's Correspondence*, p. 61).

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE TWOFOLD PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son.

The title "Holy Spirit" is used by our Lord Himself of "the Comforter" Whom the Father would send (S. John xiv. 26), and is also found twice in the New Testament in the mouth of an angel from heaven (S. Matt. i. 20; S. Luke i. 35), in each instance with reference to the Incarnation.

¹ That at the Reformation period some denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost appears from Ridley's letter, quoted pp. 23, 24.

That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father is clear from the words of our Lord in S. John xiv. 16, xv. 26, and elsewhere. For the Procession from the Son we may refer to S. John xvi. 7; Acts xvi. 7;¹ Rom. viii. 9; Phil. i. 19; 1 S. Peter i. 11; see also S. John xx. 22, where the Holy Spirit is bestowed by the Son upon the Apostles.

The Creed of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) simply said, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) added 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." The Western Church has further added the famous *Filioque* clause, which is traceable as far back as the Council of Toledo (A.D. 589), but did not win general acceptance in the Latin Church until the middle of the ninth century, when, during the Pontificate of Nicholas I., it was adopted at Rome. The controversy upon this ended, in the eleventh century, in the schism between East and West, not yet healed.² While we hold that the word *Filioque* expresses a Scriptural truth, at the same time we are bound to admit that its insertion in the Nicene Creed, without (Ecumenical authority, is on no ground justifiable.

(2.) THE DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

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

The true and proper Divinity of the Holy Spirit is indicated by the fact that Divine homage is rendered to Him in the formula of Baptism (S. Matt. xxviii. 19) and in S. Paul's Benediction in 2 Cor. xiii. 14. There are not wanting, moreover, passages in Holy Scripture which directly testify to His Godhead; see especially 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; Acts v. 3, 4.

¹ In this passage the correct reading is τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ; so Revised Version following the oldest extant MSS., NABCD E; and Vulgate, "Spiritus Jesu."

² With regard to the Procession of the Holy Spirit, the *Orthodox Confession* of the Greek Church speaks thus, διδάσκει (scil. ἐκκλησία) πὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς ὡς πηγῆς καὶ ἀρχῆς τῆς θεότητος.

ARTICLE VI

OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY
SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION.

DE DIVINIS SCRIPTURIS QUOD
SUFFICIENT AD SALUTEM.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Scriptura Sacra continet omnia quae ad salutem sunt necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur, neque inde probari potest, non sit a quoquam exigendum, ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur, aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur. **Sacrae Scripturae nomine eos Canonicos libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum auctoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.**

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.
Joshua.
Judges.
Ruth.
The First Book of Samuel.
The Second Book of Samuel.
The First Book of Kings.
The Second Book of Kings.

The First Book of Chronicles.
The Second Book of Chronicles
The First Book of Esdras.
The Second Book of Esdras.
The Book of Esther.
The Book of Job.
The Psalms.
The Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes, or Preacher.
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon.
Four Prophets the greater.
Twelve Prophets the less.

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

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

The Third Book of Esdras.
The Fourth Book of Esdras.
The Book of Tobias.
The Book of Judith.
The rest of the Book of Esther.
The Book of Wisdom.
Jesus the Son of Sirach.

Baruch the Prophet.
The Song of the Three Children.
The Story of Susanna.
Of Bel and the Dragon.
The Prayer of Manasses.
The First Book of Maccabees.
The Second Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them Canonical. | Novi Testamenti omnes libros (ut vulgo recepti sunt) recipimus et habemus pro Canonicis.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

As it stood in the XLII. Articles of 1553 this Article commenced as follows:—

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation: So that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although it be sometime received of the faithful, as godlie, and profitable for an ordre and comeliness: yeat no manne ought to bee constreigned to believe it, as an article of faith, or repute it requisite to the necessitie of Saluation.”

The wording was altered to its present form in 1563, and at the same time the clause in **thick type** was added from the Article “De Sacra Scriptura” in the Wurtemberg Confession.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

(a) This Article enunciates the great principle which underlay the Reformation,¹ the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as

¹ With the statement of our Article we may compare the following:—

TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSION, Cap. I., De Materia Concionum:

“Mandavimus iis, qui concionandi apud nos munere fungebantur, ut nihil aliud quam quae sacris literis aut continentur, aut certe nituntur, e suggestu docerent.”

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. V.:

“Cumque haec sit omnis veritatis summa, complectens quicquid ad cultum Dei et salutem nostram requiritur, neque hominibus, neque ipsis etiam Angelis fas esse dicimus, quicquam ei verbo adjicere vel detrudere, vel quicquam prorsus in eo immutare.”

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XIX., Scripturarum Auctoritas:

“Credimus et confitemur Scripturas Dei sufficienter instruere, et hominem Dei perfectum reddere.”

BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. VII.:

“Credimus autem sacram hanc scripturam perfectissime omnem Dei volun-

containing all things necessary to salvation. Our Church thus repudiates scholastic errors on the subject of the "unwritten Word."¹

(b) The Article also condemns the sectaries of the period who disparaged the authority of the Bible, as compared with the immediate inspiration of which they conceived themselves to be the channel.²

It is worthy of remark that the Helvetic Confessions and the Westminster Confession³ put an Article on the Holy Scriptures in the first place, beginning by laying down the authority upon which they relied in their departure from the historic Church. The XXXIX. Articles follow the order of the ancient Creeds in opening with a declaration of faith in God. This latter is the logical order; we first say, "I believe in God," before we acknowledge Holy Scripture as the Word of God.

tatem complecti, et in illa abunde ea omnia doceri, quaecunque ab hominibus credi necesse est, ut salutem consequantur."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. I.:

"Et in hac Scriptura sancta habet universalis Christi ecclesia plenissime exposita quaecunque pertinent, cum ad salvificam fidem, tum ad vitam Deo placentem, recte informandam. Quo nomine distincte a Deo praeceptum est, ne ei aliquid vel addatur vel detrahatur."

¹ Contrast the decree of the COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session IV. (April 1546):

"Synodus . . . perspicuensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ex ipsis Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt; orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietate affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur."

See also the ORTHODOX CONFESSION of the Greek Church, p. 18:

Φανερόν πῶς τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς πίστεως ἔχουσι τὸ κύριον καὶ τὴν δοκιμασίαν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἁγίαν γραφὴν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν. . . . Ἦγουν δύο λογίων εἶναι τὰ δόγματα. Ἄλλα παραδίδει ἡ γραφὴ, τὰ ὁποῖα περιέχονται εἰς τὰ θεολογικὰ βιβλία τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς, καὶ ἄλλα εἶναι δόγματα παραδιδόμενα ἐκ στόματος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, καὶ τούτα ἐρμηνεύθησαν ἀπὸ τὰς συνόδους καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πατέρας, καὶ εἰς τὰ δύο τούτα ἡ πίστις εἶναι τεθεμελιωμένη.

² Cf. CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, I. ix. 1:

"Emerserunt nam nuper vertiginosi quidam, qui Spiritus magisterium factuosissime obtendentes, lectionem omnem ipsi respuunt, et eorum irrident simplicitatem qui emortuam et occidentem, ut ipsi vocant, literam adhuc consecretantur."

³ So also the Irish Articles of 1615. See Appendix VI.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE RULE OF FAITH—HOLY SCRIPTURE.

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

Thus does our Church unmistakably lay down the principle that Holy Scripture contains, explicitly or implicitly, all things necessary relating both to faith and practice, beyond which God requires nothing from us (2 Tim. iii. 15-17). We may compare the words of S. Cyprian, "Unde est ista traditio? Utrumne de dominica et evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quae scripta sunt" (Ep. lxxiv. p. 223, ed. Goldhorn).

We should notice how, in accordance with what is here laid down, Scripture is constantly referred to as the basis of doctrine in the Articles themselves; see Articles VIII., IX., XIV., XV., XVII., XVIII., XX., XXI., XXII., XXIV., XXV., XXVIII., XXXII., XXXIV., XXXVII., XXXIX.

(2.) WHAT IS TO BE RECKONED AS SCRIPTURE, AND UPON WHAT GROUND IS IT SO RECKONED?

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

According to the first clause of our Article, the Church's teaching must be founded on, or provable by, Holy Scripture; in the second clause, now under consideration (which was borrowed, as we have already seen, from the Wurtemberg Confession), it is asserted that what constitutes Holy Scripture is determined by the general consent of the Church. The Gospel teaching was at first oral (S. Luke i. 4), and the deposit of sound doctrine was transmitted by word of mouth in the earliest times (2 Tim. i. 13; 1 Tim. i. 10, 11; Tit. i. 9), but the consent of the Christian community as a whole soon singled out certain writings of Apostles and Apostolic men as embodying in permanent form the great truths of the Gospel for the use of the

whole Church. These books, which were thus stamped as authoritative, constitute the New Testament Canon, and are spoken of as the "Canonical Books." The word "Canon" properly signifies a rule or standard; hence "Canonical" as applied to the books of Scripture means authorised by the general consent of the Church as a standard of Divine Truth.

When it is said in the Article "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," we must of course understand "the Church Universal," because in some parts of the Church there was for a time a doubt concerning some of the books we account Canonical, *e.g.*, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of SS. James and Jude, 2 and 3 S. John, and 2 S. Peter, as well as the Revelation.

In referring to the consent of the Church as determining the Canon of Scripture, the Church of England altogether parts company with those bodies which were influenced by the teaching of Zwingli, Calvin, and their school, and with which, in the reign of Edward, she had been so closely associated. The insertion of the clause from the Wurtemberg Confession is one of the many indications of a desire on the part of the authorities of the English Church in the early years of Elizabeth to return to a more Catholic position.

Contrast with our Article the following extracts from formularies of the Swiss School:—

CALVIN, INSTITUTES, I. vii. 1 :

"Invaluit autem apud plerosque perniciosissimus error, Scripturae tantum inesse momenti, quantum illi Ecclesiae suffragiis conceditur; ac si vero aeterna inviolabilisque Dei veritas, hominum arbitrio niteretur."

Ibid., I. vii. 5 :

"Maneat ergo hoc fixum, quos Spiritus sanctus intus docuit, solide acquiescere in Scriptura, et hanc quidem esse ἀπόκριστον,¹ neque demonstrationi et rationibus subijci eam fas esse; quam tamen meretur apud nos certitudinem, Spiritus testimonio consequi."

FRENCH CONFESSIO, Art. IV. :

"Hos libros agnoscimus esse Canonicos, id est, ut fidei nostrae normam et regulam habemus, idque non tantum ex communi Ecclesiae consensu, sed etiam multo magis ex testimonio et intrinseca Spiritus sancti persuasione: quo suggerente docemur, illos ab aliis libris ecclesiasticis discernere."

¹ *i.e.*, Self-authenticated.

SCOTCH CONFESSIO, Art. XIX. :

"Asserimus itaque quod qui dicunt Scripturas non aliam habere auctoritatem, sed eam quam ab Ecclesia accepit, sunt in Deum blasphemii, et verae Ecclesiae injuriam faciunt."

BELGIC CONFESSIO, Art. V. :

"Hosce libros solos recipimus tanquam sacros et Canonicos, quibus fides nostra inniti, confirmari, et stabiliri possit. Et credimus absque ulla dubitatione ea omnia, quae in illis continentur, idque non tam quod Ecclesia illos pro Canonicis recipiat et comprobet, quam quod Spiritus Sanctus nostris conscientiiis testetur illos a Deo emanasse: et eo maxime quod ipsi etiam per se sacram hanc suam auctoritatem et sanctitatem testentur atque comprobent."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSIO, Art. I. :

"Credimus et confitemur Scripturas sanctorum prophetarum et apostolorum utriusque Testamenti, ipsum verum esse verbum Dei; et auctoritatem sufficientem ex semetipsis non ex hominibus habere. Nam Deus ipse loquutus est patribus, prophetis et Apostolis, et loquitur adhuc nobis per Scripturas sanctas."

The Westminster Divines, in their revision of the Article, omitted altogether the clause referring to the general consent of the Church,¹ and gave expression to their own views in the

WESTMINSTER CONFESSIO, Art. I. § iv. :

"The authority of the Holy Scripture for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God (Who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God."

(3.) ESTIMATION OF THE APOCRYPHA.²

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

The Apocryphal Books (commonly so called) are not classed with the Canonical Books, because they do not stand the test laid down, *viz.*, acceptance by the general consent of the Church. At the same time it is distinctly affirmed that these books have a value of their own. The Council

¹ See Appendix IV.

² The precise signification of the title *Apocrypha* is uncertain. The Greek word literally means "hidden." The books in question may have been so called (a) on account of the obscurity of their origin, or (b) because they were relegated by the Church to comparative obscurity.

of Trent in a decree of the Fourth Session (April 1546) places Tobias, Judith, Baruch, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 1 and 2 Maccabees in the Old Testament Canon. The Apocryphal Books were not formally included in the Canon of Scripture by the Eastern Church until 1692. The value set upon the Apocrypha by the English Church may be gathered from the following facts:—

- (a) The *Benedicite* from the Apocrypha is appointed as a Canticle for use at Morning Prayer.
- (b) *Lessons* are appointed from the Apocrypha at Morning and Evening Prayer. See the Prayer Book Calendar, October 27–November 18, Holy Innocents Day, and the feasts of S. Luke and All Saints.
- (c) Two of the *Offertory Sentences* in the Communion Service are taken from the Book of Tobit.
- (d) In the *Homilies* the Apocrypha is very often quoted, and is even spoken of as the Word of God, *e.g.*:—

“And Almighty God by the Wise man saith, That man which sweareth much shall be full of sin, and the scourge of God shall not depart from his house.”—Eccclus. xxiii. 11.

(Against Swearing, p. 75.)

“The invention of them was the beginning of spiritual fornication, as the Word of God testifieth, Sap. xiv.”—Wisdom xiv. 12.

(Against peril of Idolatry, p. 258.)

“The same lesson doth the Holy Ghost also teach in sundry places of the Scripture, saying, Mercifulness and almsgiving purgeth from all sins,” &c.—Tobit iv. 10.

(Of Almsdeeds, p. 414.)

“Let us learn also here (Wisdom vi. 1–3) by the infallible and undeceivable Word of God.” (Of Obedience, p. 111.)

Other examples may be seen on pp. 103, 119, 189, ed. S.P.C.K.

The passage of S. Jerome to which reference is made in the Article occurs in the Preface to the Books of Solomon:—

“Sicut ergo Judith et Tobiae, et Machabæorum legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit; sic et haec duo volumina legat ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.”

ARTICLE VII

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

DE VETERI TESTAMENTO.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man.

Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth: yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

Testamentum Vetus Novo contrarium non est, quandoquidem tam in veteri quam in novo, per Christum, qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et homo, aeterna vita humano generi est proposita.

Quare male sentiunt, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt.

Quanquam lex a Deo data per Moesen, quoad Ceremonias et Ritus, Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus praecepta in aliqua republica necessario recipi debeant: nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum, quae moralia vocantur, nullus (quantumvis Christianus) est solutus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

We owe the form of this Article to the English Reformers. The latter part, printed in **thick type** in the Latin Version, was added in 1563, being taken from the 19th of the XLII. Articles of 1553.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The Article is directed against Anabaptist opinions concerning the Old Testament, which were rife at the Reformation period. See “Reformatio Legum,” De Haeresibus, c. 4:—

“Multi nostris temporibus inveniuntur, inter quos Anabaptistae praecipue sunt collocandi, ad quos si quis Vetus Testamentum

alleget, illud pro abrogato jam et obsoleto penitus habent, omnia quae in illo posita sunt ad prisca majorum nostrorum tempora referentes. Itaque nihil eorum ad nos statuunt pervenire debere."

Some (*e.g.*, Servetus and his followers) denied the vital connection of Judaism with Christianity,¹ and maintained that the Old Testament saints had no hope of life beyond the present. *Cf.* Calvin, "Institutes," II. x. 1:—

"Quinetiam quod utilissimum alioqui futurum erat, necessarium nobis fecerunt prodigiosus nebulo Servetus ac furiosi nonnulli ex Anabaptistarum secta, qui non aliter de Israelitico populo sentiunt quam de aliquo porcorum grege, utpote quem nugantur a Domino in hac terra saginatum, citra spem ullam cœlestis immortalitatis."

The latter part of the Article excludes the Antinomianism prevalent amongst the sectaries of the time, as is shown by the words which followed when the latter half of our present Article stood as a separate Article:—

"Wherefore thei are not to be harkened unto, who affirme that holie Scripture is geuen onlie to the weake, and do boaste themselves continually of the spirit, of whom (thei sai) thei haue learned soche things as thei teache, although the same be most evidently repugnaunt to the holie Scripture."—Art. XIX., 1553.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE UNITY AND VITAL CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ.

Our Lord Himself declared that He came, not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law (S. Matt. v. 17, 18); the Old Testament does not, therefore, stand to the New in the relation of an opposed dispensation, but in that of a preparation. The Law pointed forward and led up to Christ and His Dispensation (Gal. iii. 24; Acts x. 43; Rom. iii. 21), its ordinances, sacrifices, &c., deriving their spiritual efficacy

¹ It will be remembered that the Old Testament was set in opposition to the New by the Gnostic heretics of the second century, being ascribed to a being inferior, or even hostile, to the Supreme Deity. The Old Testament was thus regarded, *e.g.*, by Saturninus, Basilides, and Marcion, and by such sects as the Cainites and Ophites.

from the Sacrifice of Christ, His death redeeming the transgressions of those who lived under the Old Dispensation (Heb. ix. 1–15; x. 1–14). The prophets spoke beforehand of His Kingdom, His Work and Sufferings (S. Luke xxiv. 27, 44; S. John v. 39, 46; Acts xviii. 28, xxvi. 22, xxviii. 23), and the promises given through the inspired writers of the Old Testament have reference not merely to temporal welfare, but spiritual and eternal blessings are promised to men, and in both Old and New Testament alike are connected with the work of the Messiah (*per Christum*); see, *e.g.*, Job xix. 25–27; Ps. xvi. 8–11; Isa. xxvi. 19.

We might exhibit the unity of the Old and New Testament under two main heads:—

- (a) *Unity of doctrine* runs through both. Both proceed from the One God (Heb. i. 1, 2); both tell of His Unity and Personality, His government of the world, His holiness, His choice of certain to be in a special relation with Himself.
- (b) *Testimony to Christ*. Both tell of Him, the Old Testament being typical in character, its rites, ordinances, and even its history, pointing onward to Him. It is in the Epistle to the Hebrews especially that this aspect of the Old Testament is enlarged upon.

Who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man.

Moses is called a mediator (Gal. iii. 19), as being the agent through whom the Law was given to the tribes of Israel. He represented the people to God, and was divinely commissioned as a servant (Heb. iii. 5) to represent God to the people. The Incarnate Son of God, being perfect man, is qualified to represent human nature in its perfection before God, and at the same time, being very God, to represent God to man in an infinitely higher and fuller manner than it was possible for the servant to do. Thus, in Christ, God and the human race are brought together in a wonderful and transcendent way, and by virtue of union with Him mankind is brought into such near relation with God as would not be possible without His mediating work. He has wrought the Atonement which none other could effect, and is therefore the only Mediator between God and Man.

Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

That holy men of old understood the spiritual and eternal significance of the promises made to them under the Old Dispensation is distinctly asserted by our Lord Himself (S. John viii. 56) and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. xi. 10, 14, 26).

Our Church thus insists on the great value of the Old Testament Scriptures (*cf.* Rom. xv. 4), and especially shows her sense of their value by appointing Lessons from the Old Testament to be read daily at Morning and Evening Prayer, side by side with the New Testament. But it must not be inferred from this that the two are exactly on a level. Christ is *τέλος νόμου* (Rom. x. 4); *i.e.*—

(a) To Christ the Law pointed forward, so that there is a vital connection between the Law and the Gospel.

(b) With Christ the Law ended, so that the Law and the Gospel are not on the same level for Christians (Rom. vi. 14).

(2.) THE FORCE WHICH THE PRECEPTS OF THE MOSAIC LAW HAVE FOR CHRISTIANS.

The precepts of the Law are treated in the Article under three heads; it is stated that—

(a) *Ceremonial Laws do not bind Christian men.*

(b) *Civil precepts ought not of necessity to be received in any commonwealth.*

See Jer. xxxi. 31, 32; Acts xv. 10, 11; Gal. v. 1; Col. ii. 16, 17; Heb. vii. 12.

But with regard to (c) *Moral Commandments*, it is laid down that no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral. (See especially S. Matt. v. 17–20.)¹

The question may here be asked, How then are we to explain those passages of S. Paul which speak of the Moral Law as the occasion of sin, and represent the Christian as free from it? *Cf.* Rom. iii. 20; iv. 15; v. 20; vii. 7–13.

¹ *Cf.* WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, Art. XIX. § v. :

"The moral law doth for ever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof: and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God, the Creator, Who gave it. Neither doth Christ in the Gospel in any way dissolve, but much strengthen this obligation."

The Apostle represents the Law as—

(i.) *Intensifying the sense of sin* (Rom. vii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 56).

God's holiness is therein set forth clearly (*cf.* Lev. xi. 45). He is righteous, loves righteousness, and demands it from man (Lev., *ibid.*). Thus the Law is νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι (Eph. ii. 15); it said to man, "Thou shalt" . . . "Thou shalt not" . . . but this only made him contrast the requirements of God with his own shortcomings, and brought his sin into relief.

(ii.) *Bringing man into condemnation.*

The very prohibitions of the Law excited opposition between the flesh and the spirit (Rom. vii. 7–11); the inward man approved the Law, the conscience recognising the justice of its demands (Rom. vii. 22), but the flesh could not act up to it, and man, finding himself powerless to perform that which he knew to be good, stood condemned (Rom. vii. 18–23). The Law itself gave no help by which the spirit might overcome the flesh, and hence it is called "the ministration of condemnation" (2 Cor. iii. 9), "the ministration of death" (2 Cor. iii. 7), and "the letter that killeth" (2 Cor. iii. 6; Rom. vii. 9–11); the result was a sense of misery, and of the impossibility of fulfilling the Law (Rom. vii. 21–24).

What man needed, therefore, was pardon for the past (Acts xxvi. 18), and for the future not merely moral teaching, but power to enable him to carry out such teaching in his life. Christ has satisfied the need (Rom. vii. 23–25), bringing to man a new power—Divine grace (Rom. vi. 14)—and delivering him from his condition of helplessness under the Old Dispensation; thus it is that S. Paul speaks of Christ as having redeemed us from being under the Law (Gal. iv. 4, 5), and of Christians who are led by the Spirit as being under the Law no longer (Gal. v. 18).

At the same time the Apostle emphatically repudiates Antinomianism (Rom. vi. 15). In one sense the Law is re-established (Rom. iii. 31), no longer, however, as an external command, but as an indwelling principle. Christian obedience is not like that of a slave, but is the obedience of a son who delights to do his father's will (Rom. viii. 14–16), and, being thus a matter of grace, completely fulfils the ideal of righteousness of which the Law was

the expression (Rom. viii. 1-4). Not merely, therefore, does the outward obedience of a Christian fulfil the bare letter of the Law, but the thoughts and intents of his heart are, through the indwelling Spirit, brought into harmony with the will of God, Who gave the Law.

Thus the Law of Christ is not merely a ratification of the Moral Law, but goes far beyond it. (See especially S. Matt. v. 20-48.) Luther developed S. Paul's teaching into Antinomianism; *e.g.*, in his Commentary on Galatians he maintains that the Ten Commandments have no right to accuse or alarm the conscience wherein Christ reigns. Even the more cautious Melancthon, too, seems to have held that the Law may not condemn the Christian although it is not fulfilled by him. Our Article is directly opposed to such dangerous teaching, and simply reaffirms the teaching of the Schoolmen, and, as we have seen, of Scripture on the subject.

ARTICLE VIII

OF THE THREE CREEDS.

DE TRIBUS SYMBOLIS.

The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's 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.

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

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3. We may compare the first of the X. Articles of 1536, which declares that the fundamentals of religion are—

“Comprehended in the whole body and canon of the Bible, and also in the three Creeds or Symbols; whereof 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 ‘Quicunque vult.’”

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To assert the Catholic character of the English Reformation the three ancient Creeds of Catholic Christendom are retained without addition or alteration. By thus accepting the three Creeds, all those heresies, whether of ancient or of modern growth, are condemned which assail the cardinal truths of the Christian Religion. The order in which the Creeds are named in the Article is not without significance. The Nicene Creed appropriately stands first as being the most ancient, and also the most universally used.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(I.) THE THREE CREEDS ARE TO BE RECEIVED.

The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles', ought thoroughly to be received and believed.

From the very earliest times those who were baptized were required to make public profession of their faith. The early addition to the New Testament text in Acts viii. 37¹ affords an example of a formula of this kind:—

Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος “Εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ἔξοστιν.” Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε, “Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.”

Traces of early Creeds are also discernible in the following passages of the Epistles:—

I Cor. viii. 6—ἡμῖν εἰς Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.

I Cor. xv. 3–5—Παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.

I Tim. iii. 16—^aὉς² ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

The recently recovered Apology of Aristides (second century) contains a passage which reads like a quotation from a Christian Creed of that period, or at any rate indicates that the Apologist was familiar with some form of Creed:—

“The Christians then reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, Who is named the Son of God Most High, and it is said that God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God. This Jesus, then, was born of the tribe of the Hebrews: and He had twelve disciples, in order

¹ The passage is not found in the MSS. NABC, and was probably inserted from an early form of baptismal profession.

² This is the reading of NAC, and is adopted in the Revised Version. Other MSS. give Θεός.

that a certain dispensation of His might be fulfilled. He was pierced by the Jews: and He died and was buried: and they say that after three days He rose and ascended into heaven.”

References to statements of doctrine as being in use in Apostolic times may be seen in such passages as I Tim. iv. 6, vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 13 (ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων).

The earliest name given to the form of profession of Christian faith was σύμβολον¹—i.e., a sign or watchword by which believers were distinguished from those who did not accept Christianity. Such forms were at first no doubt very simple; but with the spread of the Church, the Christianising of Greek thought, and the rise of false teachers, came the necessity for precise and detailed statements of the Faith; hence our Creeds in their present form.

The Nicene Creed.

The Council of Nicaea was summoned in 325 A.D. by the Emperor Constantine, with the view of allaying the dissensions in the Church to which the heresy of Arius had given rise. Eusebius of Cæsarea presented to the Council the Confession of Faith which had been in use for very many years in the churches of Palestine:—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητὴν.

Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός, Ζωὴν ἐκ Ζωῆς, Υἱὸν 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 ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἕξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον.

This Creed, however, seemed to the Council not to speak decidedly enough on the very point in dispute; certain clauses were therefore added by the assembled bishops,² under the guidance of Athanasius, in order to affirm in

¹ See the Latin Version of the Article.

² The bishops present at the Council of Nicaea numbered three hundred and eighteen in all, besides their attendant clergy.

unmistakable language that the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity is true God, of one essence with the Father. These clauses were:—

ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς.
ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ.
ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ.

At the same time an anathema was appended which ran as follows:—

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, Ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε 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.

The Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), at which one hundred and fifty bishops were present, added clauses treating of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, in view of the false teaching of Macedonius. The concluding clauses were also adopted at the same time, while the anathema was omitted, and a few unimportant changes were made in the wording of the earlier part of the Creed. As supposed to have been put forth by the Council of Constantinople the Creed ran thus:—

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 Φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ 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 γραφάς. Καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, 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 προφητῶν.

Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.
Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

Προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν.
Καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

The form of the Nicene Creed in use in the Western Church differs from the above in that it has two additional clauses, both traceable as far back as the third Council of Toledo, A.D. 589:—

(a) *Deum de Deo* after γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων.

The words added, however, do not express any truth not before contained in the Creed, being covered by the clause, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ.

(b) *Filioque*, giving expression to the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, and never accepted by the Eastern Church.

(See notes on Art. V. p. 45).

The Athanasian Creed.

In the rubric in the Prayer Book enjoining its use this Creed is entitled a "Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius." The authorship is thus not directly ascribed to him, and although we meet with the ascription of its composition to Athanasius as early as the sixth century, there is every reason for concluding that it was not composed by him, but was called Athanasian rather because it contains and enforces the great truths which that Father spent his life in defending. Internal evidence points to the period between 420 and 450 A.D. as the time of the composition of this Creed.

(a) Its form and style indicate that the Creed was originally drawn up by a Latin writer, and that it originated, not in the Eastern, but in the Western Church. The facts that the earliest traces of its public use are found in the Gallican Church, and that the oldest MSS. have been found in France, support this conclusion.

(b) The phraseology is evidently borrowed in several places from the writings of S. Augustine of Hippo. In view of

this it would be difficult to suppose that the Creed was composed much before 420 A.D.

- (c) On the other hand, although the language of the Creed excludes Eutychianism,¹ there is no express or distinct condemnation of that heresy; we may fairly argue, therefore, that it was drawn up before the Eutychian heresy came to a head and was condemned at the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), since otherwise we should expect the doctrine of the two distinct Natures in Christ to be more distinctly stated.²

To the question, "Who wrote this Creed?" no certain answer can be given, but scholars have associated it with the names of the following writers of note in the Western Church:—

Hilary, Bishop of Arles, 429.

Vincentius of Lerins, 434.

Vigilius of Tapsus, 484.

It should be noted that the Athanasian Creed is very different, as well in its origin as in its character, from the other two Creeds which are named with it in the Article. It did not grow out of the form of profession made by Christian converts at Baptism, nor was it drawn up by any Council; and, as the title given to it in some MSS. indicates,³ it partakes more of the nature of a Hymn or Psalm, than of a Creed in the proper sense of the word. It does not simply lay down the outlines of the Christian Faith, but it is rather the outpouring of a devout and thoughtful soul, pondering, and with loving faith dwelling and enlarging upon, the deep mysteries of the Triune Being of God, and of the Incarnation.

The Apostles' Creed.

In its present form this Creed is not traceable further back than about the middle of the eighth century, when we meet with it in the writings of Pirminius,⁴ who gives it as the form used in the Baptismal Service. Though it

¹ See v. 34:—

"Unus omnino, non confusione Substantiae."

² Cf., e.g., v. 33:—

"Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem
Sed adsumptione Humanitatis in Deum."

³ "Hymnus S. Athanasii de Trinitate."

⁴ Very little is known of Pirminius, but he is said to have laboured as a missionary in Germany.

does not appear till about 750 A.D. in the precise form with which we are familiar, the Creed is in reality the product of a much earlier age, having grown up in the Western Church within the first four centuries. We meet with the substance of it in the writings of Irenæus and of Tertullian.

The Creed given by Irenæus¹ (A.D. 180) as expressing the faith of the Church in Germany, Spain, the Celtic nations, the East, Libya, Egypt, and in "the central parts of the earth," runs as follows:—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν
πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας,
καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν
σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας

Καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς
τὰς οἰκονομίας, καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις,

Καὶ τὴν ἐκ Παρθένου γέννησιν, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὴν
ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς
ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου
ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς
παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα,
καὶ ἀναστῆσαι πᾶσαν σάρκα πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος.

Tertullian, in his treatise "De Virginibus Velandis," gives the following Articles of Christian belief:—

"In unicum Deum Omnipotentem, Mundi conditorem;
Et Filium Ejus, Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine
Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resus-
citatum a mortuis, receptum in caelis, sedentem nunc
ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mor-
tuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem."

S. Augustine, in his treatises "De Fide et Symbolo" and "Sermo ad Catechumenos," has preserved the Baptismal Creed as used in his day (the close of the fourth century). In the "De Fide et Symbolo" it is thus given:—

"Credimus in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem.

"Et in Jesum Christum, Filium Dei Patris unigenitum,
Dominum nostrum, qui natus est per Spiritum Sanc-
tum ex Virgine Maria. Sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus
est, et sepultus. Tertio die resurrexit a mortuis; in

¹ Adv. Haer. III. iii. § 4.

coelum ascendit; sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus et iudicaturus vivos et mortuos.

"Credimus in Spiritum Sanctum: sanctam Ecclesiam utique catholicam; remissionem peccatorum, et carnis resurrectionem."

The Creed given in the "Sermo ad Catechumenos" differs little from the above. Besides a few minor variations, the clause on the Passion is rather fuller:—

"Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus."

There is also an additional clause at the conclusion:—

"In vitam aeternam."

From the Commentary of Rufinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, we gather two forms of the Creed as used about the end of the fourth century in the Churches of Aquileia and Rome respectively. It is in the Aquileian Creed as given by Rufinus that we first meet with the clause "Descendit ad inferna."

About the middle of the sixth century we have a rather fuller form of the Creed which appears in sermons ascribed to Eusebius Gallicanus. The most important variations from the earlier forms given above are:—

- (i.) The addition of the words "*conceptus est*":
"Conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto."
- (ii.) The expansion of the clause on the Ascension:
"Sedet ad dexteram *Dei Patris Omnipotentis*."
- (iii.) The addition of the article, "*Sanctorum communionem*."

From the foregoing sketch it appears that the Apostles' Creed has reached its present form by a gradual process, but that its main substance is traceable to the Baptismal profession of very early times. While it is post-Apostolic as regards its present form, in its contents it is truly Apostolic, summarising as it does for the use of the faithful the doctrines taught by the Apostles. We do not, therefore, inappropriately name it the Apostles', or the Apostolic, Creed. Historically there may be another reason for the application of the name. The gradual expansion of the Creed is to be traced in the Western Church, and in this part of the Church it has always been most frequently used. Rome was from an early period the leading see of the West, and often spoken of as the Apostolic See, being the only Church of Western Christendom which was considered to have been founded by an

Apostle. It would thus naturally come about that the Creed most frequently used by it should be entitled the Apostolic, or the Apostles', Creed.

(2.) THE GROUND OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE THREE CREEDS.
For they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

This clause is added to show that, in enjoining the three Creeds upon her members to be "thoroughly received and believed" by them, our Church is acting in accordance with the principle already laid down in Article VI., that nothing is to be required "that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith" save what is read in Holy Scripture or "may be proved thereby" (see notes on Art. VI.).

The Church provides for the continual recitation of the Creeds:—

The Nicene Creed in the Communion Service.

The Athanasian Creed on certain stated Festivals and Holy Days.

The Apostles' Creed in daily Morning and Evening Prayer.

This last is also used as the Baptismal Profession of Faith, and is given in the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick" as the rule of faith by which the sick person should prove himself whether he believe as a Christian man should.

ARTICLE IX

OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.

DE PECCATO ORIGINALI.

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.

Peccatum originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium et depravatio naturae 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 haec naturae depravatio; qua fit, ut affectus carnis, Graece *Φρόνημα σαρκός*, (quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studium, carnis interpretantur) legi Dei non subjiciatur. Et quanquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam fatetur Apostolus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This Article is based to a certain extent upon the second Article of the first part of the Augsburg Confession ("De Peccato Originis"), through the medium of the XIII. Articles, but none of the clauses are taken verbatim from that formulary. The expression "originalis justitia," which occurs in our Article, and

in the XIII. Articles, is not found in the Augsburg Confession. The Pelagians are mentioned by name in all three formularies, and their tenets rejected.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The Article is expressly intended to exclude Pelagianism, which had been revived at the time of the Reformation by the Anabaptists.¹ In the Article as it stood in 1553 the Anabaptists were also referred to by name, "ut fabulantur Pelagiani, et hodie Anabaptistae repetunt."

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

A Short Account of Pelagianism.

Pelagius² himself was a monk of British origin. The lax conduct of professing Christians at Rome, who excused their shortcomings upon the ground of the infirmity of human nature, is said to have been the immediate cause of his error; he assured them that, if they would, they could live perfect lives, and was led to the opposite extreme of attributing too much to unaided human nature. A Council held at Carthage (A.D. 412) condemned Coelestius, a friend and follower of Pelagius, who had been spreading his opinions in the North African Church. The Pelagian tenets condemned by this Council were seven in number:—

- (i.) That Adam was created mortal, and would have died even if he had not sinned.
- (ii.) The sin of Adam injured himself only, and not the human race.
- (iii.) That the Law had the same effect as the Gospel in sending men to the Kingdom of Heaven.
- (iv.) That even before Christ's coming there had been sinless men.
- (v.) That infants when born are in the same state as Adam before his transgression.
- (vi.) That all mankind does not die in Adam, or rise in Christ.
- (vii.) That unbaptized infants would have eternal life.

A brief consideration will show us that these seven propositions

¹ See Ridley's letter quoted above, pp. 23, 24.

² The name Pelagius is thought to be a Grecised form of his native name, Morgan.

are logically connected. Pelagius began by arguing somewhat in this way: 'We cannot imagine that God would be so foolish as to create man to keep a Law, which yet by the very constitution of his nature he cannot keep; we must therefore conclude that man can keep God's commandments if he will.' Notice here that the Fall, with its consequences, by which man lost his original power of keeping God's commandments, is entirely overlooked; we are, according to Pelagius, at birth in the same state in which Adam was before he fell. If we admit this, it follows of course that Adam's transgression hurt only himself and not the human race. But here a difficulty arises: death has passed upon all men, even upon unconscious infants—does not this fact indicate that all partake in sin? Pelagius solved the difficulty by denying the connection of death with sin: "Adam was created mortal, and would have died even if he had not sinned."

This position has now been reached:—Adam need not have sinned; we at birth are all of us in the same condition that Adam was in before the Fall; therefore no man need sin. Pelagius went further, and affirmed that he could mention many who never had sinned. Now comes the important question, "In virtue of what power were such men sinless?" Pelagius said, by the exercise of their own free-will under the guidance of God's Moral Law; *i.e.*, in order to attain perfection man needs simply to be told what to do, and he will do it; he needs no power to enable him to act up to that which his conscience approves. If Moral Teaching thus suffices for man's need, it follows that the Gospel is in reality no advance upon the Law, but both "have the same effect in sending men to the Kingdom of Heaven."

In consequence of the conclusions already arrived at, Pelagius was obliged to take the text, "As in Adam all die," in an unreal sense; he explained it as meaning, not that all die in Adam, but that all those who do die, die in Adam; in other words, all men do not sin, but if a man happen to sin, he is following the example of Adam.

Holding these opinions, Pelagius was of course obliged to give up the doctrine of the Church with regard to Baptism. If infants at birth are sinless, there can be no need of Regeneration. The custom of baptizing infants was, however, retained by him, as a ceremony of dedication to God.

The root of the evil in Pelagius' system is his totally inadequate conception of the nature of sin. With him "sin" is

only a name for an act, which, once committed, is over and done with, and leaves no effect behind; so that human nature, whether in the individual or in the race, is uninfluenced by past sins, and is in the same condition as at the creation of Adam. Universal human experience, however, gives the lie to such theorising. We know that it is by repeated acts that habits take shape, and that character is formed. The power to be righteous did, indeed, belong to our nature as originally constituted, but Pelagius was wrong in supposing that no act of man can remove that power, and in confining the need of a special grace over and above natural endowment to some only of mankind.¹

We will now consider the Article in detail; it defines—

(I.) THE NATURE OF ORIGINAL 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. (See Rom. v. 12-19.)

When we speak of Original Sin we do not mean merely that Adam first set the example of sinning, an example which most men follow (*Peccatum originis non est in imitatione Adami situm*)—this was the theory of Pelagius; but we understand by it a *vitium et depravatio naturae*. The nature of the race as a whole is faulty and corrupted, owing to the sin of the progenitor.

Cf. what is said in the REFORMATIO LEGUM, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 7:

"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 haeserit, et non ad posteros transierit, nec ullam afferat naturae nostrae perversitatem, nisi quod ex Adami delicto propositum sit peccandi noxium exemplum, quod homines ad eandem pravitatem invitat imitandam et usurpandam."

The AUGSBURG CONFESSION (Part I. Art. II.) speaks of Original Sin as "morbus seu vitium originis."

¹ The account here given of Pelagian teaching has been carefully gathered from S. Augustine's treatment of the Pelagian heresy in his treatises, "De Spiritu et Littera," "De Natura et Gratia" (which is especially valuable because it contains a review of a lost work by Pelagius), and "De Gestis Pelagii" (ed. Bright; Clarendon Press).

The BELGIC CONFESSION (Art. XV.) gives this definition :—

“Est autem peccatum originis corruptio totius naturae, et vitium haereditarium, quo et ipsi infantes in matris utero polluti sunt.”

A Calvinist would describe Original Sin as the “*imputation*” of Adam’s guilt.¹

Cf. WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, VI. iii. :

“They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed.”

In their revision of the ninth Article the Westminster divines inserted a clause in the definition of Original Sin :—

“Together with his first sin imputed, it is the fault and corruption of the nature,” &c.²

(2.) THE EXTENT OF ORIGINAL SIN.

of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam ; (Ps. li. 5.)

Thus our Church emphatically excludes Pelagianism, and affirms that Adam’s sin affected not himself only, but the whole human race.

Cf. COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session V. :

“Si quis Adae praevaricationem sibi soli et non ejus propagini asserit nocuisse, et acceptam a deo sanctitatem et justitiam, quam perdidit, sibi soli et non nobis etiam eum perdidisse, aut inquinatum illum per inobedientiae peccatum mortem et poenas corporis tantum in omne genus humanum transfudisse, non autem et peccatum, quod mors est animae : anathema sit.”

A Socinian would include Jesus Christ among men born in sin ; but our Lord is expressly excluded by the wording of the Article, since He was “*supernaturally engendered*” (S. Luke i. 34, 35).

¹ It should be remembered, however, that Calvin himself did not teach this. Cf. INSTITUTES, II. i. 8 :

“Atque ideo infantes quoque ipsi, dum suam secum damnationem afferant, non alieno, sed suo ipsorum vitio sunt obstricti.”

He thus defines Original Sin :

“Videtur ergo peccatum originale, haereditaria naturae nostrae pravitas et corruptio in omnes animae partes diffusa, quae primum facit reos irae Dei, tum etiam opera in nobis profert, quae Scriptura vocat opera carnis.”

² The text of the Article as revised is given in full in Appendix IV.

(3.) THE RESULT OF ORIGINAL SIN.

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 ;

The consequence of the Fall is here represented as twofold :—

(a) A *Privation*, the loss of that life of intimate communion with God which man had before the Fall, with a wide departure from original righteousness¹ (Rom. vii. 18).

(b) A *Depravation*, the introduction of an element of discord within man himself, the inclination of his nature to evil, so that the lower within him strives against the higher (Gen. viii. 21 ; Gal. v. 17).

The SAXON CONFESSION, like the English Article, sets forth the twofold result of the Fall :—

(a) “*Carentia originalis justitiae.*”

(b) *Depravatio* “*quae lapsum secuta est.*” (Art. II.)

While Pelagianism denies that there is any result at all, so far as the human race as a whole is concerned, Calvinism, on the other hand, lays such stress on the consequences of the Fall as to hold that every spark of original righteousness has been extinguished, and the image of God not merely defaced, but utterly blotted out.²

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. IX. :

... “adeo ut ipsius natura sit prorsus corrupta, et spiritu excaecatus, ac corde depravatus, omnem illam integritatem, sine ulla prorsus exceptione, amiserit. Etsi enim nonnullam habet boni et mali discretionem : affirmamus tamen quicquid habet lucis mox fieri tenebras, cum de quaerendo Deo agitur, adeo ut sua intelligentia et ratione nullo modo possit ad eum accedere.”

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. III. :

“Qua transgressione, quae vulgo dicitur originale peccatum, prorsus deformata est illa Dei in homine imago.”

¹ The expression “original righteousness” is taken from the XIII. Articles, but does not occur in the Augsburg Confession. The phrase was used by the Saxon school of Reformers to signify the sinless state of man before the Fall ; we meet with it in the SAXON CONFESSION, and in the definition of Original Sin given by the FORMULA OF CONCORD :—

... “est privatio concreatae in paradiso justitiae originalis seu imaginis dei, ad quam homo initio in veritate, sanctitate atque justitia creatus fuerat.”

² In the INSTITUTES (Book II.) Calvin himself speaks of the heavenly image as ‘obliterated’ by the Fall, both in Adam and in all his posterity.

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, VI. 2 :

“By this sin they (*i.e.*, our first parents) 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.”

It is evident that the wording of our Article was not strong enough to suit the Westminster divines; in their revision they altered it thus:—

“Whereby man is wholly deprived of original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined only to evil.”¹

(4.) THE PUNISHMENT DUE TO ORIGINAL SIN.

and therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. (Eph. ii. 3; Rom. v. 18.)

Pelagius and his followers denied that any penalty of Adam's transgression passes on to his offspring.

In formularies both of the Saxon and Swiss school the penalty attaching to Original Sin is spoken of as ‘eternal death’; see, *e.g.*:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. II. :

“Docent . . . quod hic morbus, seu vitium originis, vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque aeternam mortem his, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum.”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. VIII. :

. . . “merito nostro, irae Dei obnoxii, poenis subijcitur justis: adeoque a Deo abjecti essemus omnes, nisi reduxisset nos Christus liberator. Per mortem itaque intelligimus non tantum corpoream mortem, quae omnibus nobis semel, propter peccata, est obeunda, sed etiam supplicia sempiterna peccatis et corruptioni nostrae debita.”

(5.) THE EFFECT OF BAPTISM.

And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *Φρόνημα σαρκός* . . . 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.

Baptism removes all condemnation on account of Original Sin (Rom. viii. 1), but does not remove the effects of the

¹ See Appendix IV.

Fall upon our nature (Gal. v. 17), so that there remains, even in the regenerate, the lusting of the flesh against the spirit (Rom. viii. 7), and this ‘concupiscentia’ has of itself the nature of sin (Rom. vii. 7).

Cf. what is said in the sixth of the XIII. Articles:—

“Quia vero infantes nascuntur cum peccato originis, habent opus remissione illius peccati, et illud ita remittitur ut reatus tollatur, licet corruptio naturae seu concupiscentia manet in hac vita, etsi incipit sanari, quia Spiritus Sanctus in ipsis etiam infantibus est efficax, et eos mundat.”

To the same effect also Calvin writes in *INSTITUTES*, IV. xv. 11:—

“Baptismus quidem promittit nobis submersum esse nostrum Pharaonem, et peccati mortificationem; non tamen ita ut amplius non sit, aut nobis negotium non facessat; sed tantum ne superet. Nam quamdiu in hoc carcere corporis nostri clausi degemus, habitabunt in nobis reliquiae peccati; sed si promissionem in Baptismo nobis a Deo datam, fide tenemus, non dominabuntur nec regnabunt.”

Melanchthon, in *LOCI THEOLOGICI* (p. 112), thus states the effect of Baptism:—

“Ideo sic respondemus, in baptismo tolli peccatum, quod ad reatum, seu imputationem attinet, sed manere morbum ipsum.”

Bonner's words in “Profitable and Necessary Doctrine” well express the teaching of our Church:—

“Albeit baptisme be of this great efficacye, yet ye shall vnderstand that there remaineth in us that be baptized a certayne infirmitie, or inclination to synne, called concupiscence, whyche by lustes and desyres doth moue vs many tymes to synnes and wickednes; neuertheless almyghty God of his great mercy and goodnes hath geuen vs such grace in his holye sacrament of baptysme, that such carnall and fleshly lustes and desyres shall not, ne can in any wyse hurte vs, excepte we do first consent unto them.”

When we come to the question whether the concupiscence which remains in the baptized is itself properly sin, we find great divergence in the formularies of the Reformation period. Those drawn up by the theologians of the

Lutheran and 'Reformed' bodies agree in affirming that such concupiscence is truly and properly sin; see, *e.g.* :—

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. II. :

"Hanc malam concupiscentiam dicimus esse peccatum."

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. XI. :

"Affirmamus quoque hoc vitium, etiam post baptismum, esse vere peccatum."

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, VI. 5 :

"Both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin."¹

The COUNCIL OF TRENT, on the other hand, declared that the concupiscence remaining in the baptized is not properly sin. The decree of the Council upon this subject (Session V.) runs as follows :—

"Si quis per Jesu Christi gratiam, quae in baptismo confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat, aut etiam asserit non tolli totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet, sed illud dicit tantum radi aut non imputari, anathema sit, in renatis enim nihil odit Deus. . . . Manere autem in baptizatis concupiscentiam vel fomitem, sancta synodus fatetur et sentit, quae cum ad agonem relicta sit, nocere non consentientibus, sed utiliter per Christi gratiam repugnantibus non valet. Hanc concupiscentiam, quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum appellat, sancta synodus declarat, ecclesiam catholicam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat."

It will be observed that our Article speaks guardedly; while it differs from the decree of Trent in declaring that the concupiscence which remains in the baptized "has the nature of sin" (peccati in sese rationem habet²), yet it does not go so far as to affirm, with the other Confessions above quoted, that it is truly and properly sin.

§ 4.—NOTEWORTHY EXPRESSIONS IN THIS ARTICLE.

(i.) *Φρόνημα σαρκός* (Rom. viii. 6).

The key to the true meaning of *φρόνημα* in this phrase is to be found in the use of the cognate verb in the New Testament. *Cf.* the following passages :—

"Υπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ . . . ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (S. Matt. xvi. 23).

Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν (Rom. viii. 5).

Μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες (Rom. xii. 16).

Οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες (Phil. iii. 19).

Τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Col. iii. 2).

In the light of these passages we understand *φρόνημα σαρκός* to signify the directing of the thoughts and energies to the interests of the flesh.

(ii.) An incidental use of language in the Article is doctrinally important, and should not be overlooked. The way in which *renatis*, which occurs twice in the Latin version, is represented in the one case by "*them that are regenerated*," and in the other by "*them that are baptized*," implies the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

¹ *Cf.* the text of our Art. IX. as revised by the Westminster assembly of divines, Appendix IV.

² See the use of the same Latin phrase in Art. XIII.

ARTICLE X

OF FREE-WILL.

DE LIBERO ARBITRIO.

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.

Ea est hominis post lapsum Adae conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac praeparare non possit. Quare absque gratia Dei (quae per Christum est) nos praeveniente, ut velimus, et cooperante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quae Deo grata sunt et accepta, nihil valemus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

The first part of the Article (printed in thick type in the Latin version) was added in 1563, the words from "ut sese naturalibus" down to "praeparare non possit" being taken from the Article "De Peccato" in the Wurttemberg Confession. The Article of 1553, which forms the second part of our present Article, agrees almost verbatim with words of S. Augustine in his treatise "De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio," Cap. xvii.

The expression "working WITH us" was altered in 1571 from "working in us" of the previous English versions. This change, though slight, is significant, since it brings into prominence the fact that man is not so utterly depraved but that he is able to co-operate with God.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

This Article is really supplementary to the last, stating clearly the necessity of Divine grace, which was denied by the Pelagians and Anabaptists.

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 7:

"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."

In the case of this Article the title scarcely corresponds to the contents. "OF THE NECESSITY OF DIVINE GRACE" would be a more suitable heading.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(I.) MAN'S INCAPACITY FOR GOOD SINCE THE FALL.

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.

In other words, man in his natural state is in a condition of slavery to sin (Rom. vii. 14; viii. 8. *Cf.* S. John viii. 34).

We should keep in mind the distinction in the technical language of theology between 'liberum arbitrium' and 'voluntas.' 'Liberum arbitrium' signifies the power of freely choosing. 'Voluntas' denotes an act of will, the determination of the 'liberum arbitrium' in a particular direction.

S. Augustine, whose writings had great influence with the Reformers, gives the following account of man's will. The 'liberum arbitrium' was—

- (i.) At Creation a *media vis*,¹ capable of being inclined either to good or to evil, but coloured with good.
- (ii.) Since the Fall it has been *captivatum*, and hence in the power of sin.
- (iii.) But through the work of Christ it is now *liberatum*, so that by His grace it may be again turned in the direction of good.

Statements of other formularies of the Reformation period should be compared with the wording of our Article:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Art. XVIII.:

"De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas habeat aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem justitiam, et deligendas res rationi subjectas. Sed non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto effi-

¹ See "De Spiritu et Littera," Cap. xxxiii.

ciendae justitiae Dei seu justitiae spiritualis, quia animalis homo, non percipit ea, quae sunt Spiritus Dei."

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. V. :

"Sed homo nequaquam potest se liberare a peccato, et morte aeterna, viribus naturalibus: sed haec liberatio et conversio hominis ad Deum, et novitas spiritualis, fit per Filium Dei vivificantem nos Spiritu suo Sancto."

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. IX. :

"Item, quamvis voluntate sit praeditus, qua ad hoc vel illud movetur, tamen quum ea sit penitus sub peccato captiva, nullam prorsus habet ad bonum appetendum libertatem, nisi quam ex gratia et Dei dono acceperit."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. IX. :

"Non sublatus est quidem homini intellectus, non erepta ei voluntas, et prorsus in lapidem vel truncum est commutatus: caeterum illa ita sunt immutata et imminuta in homine, ut non possint amplius quod potuerunt ante lapsum. Intellectus enim obscuratus est: voluntas vero ex libera, facta est voluntas serva."

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, IX. 3 :

"Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto."

The teaching of the Roman Catholic Church as laid down at the Council of Trent is as follows (Session VI., Jan. 1547):—

"Declarat synodus . . . oportere, ut unusquisque agnoscat et fateatur, quod cum omnes homines in praevaricatione Adae innocentiam perdidissent, facti immundi . . . usque adeo servi erant peccati . . . tametsi in eis liberum arbitrium minime extinctum esset, viribus licet attenuatum et inclinatum."

Accordingly the Council anathematizes those who say that the 'liberum arbitrium' is 'extinctum' and has become 'figmentum,' 'titulum sine re.'¹ The Council further lays down that free-will without grace cannot make man righteous; that there is no justification without Divine grace. The necessity of preventing grace is also strongly asserted; and they are anathematized who affirm that the free-will of man, when it has been roused and called, does not co-operate with God's grace, but is passive.

¹ Luther had affirmed at Heidelberg (1518) in one of his 'Paradoxes' that free-will after original sin 'res est de solo titulo'—a matter of name only, without any corresponding reality.

(2.) THE NECESSITY OF DIVINE GRACE IN ORDER THAT MAN MAY CHOOSE AND PERFORM THAT WHICH IS GOOD.

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. (See 1 Cor. ii. 14; xii. 3.)

Man can neither form good resolutions apart from God's grace, nor carry them out by his own, unassisted strength. There must be:—

- (a) The grace of God "*Preventing*," i.e., going before: the very first desire to turn to God must come from Him (S. John vi. 44; Acts xvi. 14; Phil. ii. 13).
- (b) The grace of God "*Co-operating*," i.e., working together with man's will, so that our better self is strengthened, but not superseded (Phil. ii. 13).

Note that the Article expressly speaks of the grace of God 'by Christ' (quae per Christum est). Cf. Phil. iv. 13.

All spiritual benefits which God confers upon men He confers through Christ alone, Whose merits extend to all men, in all ages of the world (Rev. xiii. 8).

The teaching of our Article is opposed to—

- (a) *Pelagianism*, which said that man's condition by nature is such that he can keep God's commandments if he will, without any special Divine assistance.

Cf. AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :

"Damnant Pelagianos, et alios, qui docent, quod sine Spiritu Sancto, solis naturae viribus possimus Deum super omnia diligere: item praecepta Dei facere, quoad substantiam actuum."

- (b) *Calvinism*, according to which Divine grace, where it is really given, is irresistible, so that those who are saved are saved of necessity, their own will being superseded. (See the quotations given from Calvin in the notes on Art. XVI. § 3.)

Cf. FIRST BAPTIST CONFESSION, § 23 :

"All those that have this precious faith wrought in them by the Spirit can never finally nor totally fall away."

[After Art. X., in 1553, came an Article on Grace, which was omitted in 1563. It ran thus:—

OF GRACE.

The grace of Christ, or the holie Ghost by him geuen, dothe take awaie the stonie harte, and geueth an harte of fleshe. And although those that haue no will to good thinges, he maketh them to wil, and those that would euil thinges, he maketh them not to wille the same: Yet neuerthelesse he enforceth not the wil. And therefore no man when he sinneth can excuse himself as not worthie to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillinglie, or by compulsion.

DE GRATIA.

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

ARTICLE XI

OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

DE HOMINIS JUSTIFICATIONE.

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.

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.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

In 1553 the Article on Justification was very brief:—

“Justification by onely faith in Jesus Christ in that sence, as it is declared in the homelie of Justification, is a most certeine, and holesome doctrine for Christien menne.”

The wording of this was slightly altered and the first part (printed in **thick type** in the Latin version) prefixed in 1563. The new part agrees with the Art. “De Justificatione” of the WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, from which it was doubtless taken:—

“Homo enim fit Deo acceptus, et reputatur coram eo justus propter solum filium Dei Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum per fidem.”

We may compare the rather fuller statement in the fifth of the much earlier English formulary, the X. ARTICLES:—

“That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared; not as though our contrition or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification: for the only mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely unto us for His Son’s sake, Jesu Christ, and the merits of His Blood and Passion, be the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof.”

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article is directed against theories of human merit so prevalent in the Mediæval Western Church, and so strongly protested against at the Reformation, especially by Luther. It may also be aimed at the tenets of the Anabaptists, whose error is thus alluded to in Archbishop Hermann's CONSULTATIO:—

“They boste themselves to be ryghtuous and to please God, not purely and absolutely for Christes sake, but for theyr owne mortification of themselues, for theyr owne good workes and persecution, if they suffre any.”

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) WHAT IS MEANT BY JUSTIFICATION?

We are accounted righteous before God,

‘Justification’ in the writings of S. Paul signifies the entering by man (who through sin, original and actual, is by nature in a condition of alienation from God) upon a state of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* (Rom. i. 17; iii. 22), *i.e.*, upon a state of righteousness which God considers as such; in other words, the entering into a right relation with God, which is the starting-point of the Christian life.

(2.) THE GROUND OF OUR JUSTIFICATION.

only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings:

The state of *δικαιοσύνη* before God is not attained by any efforts or merits of our own (Rom. x. 3; Phil. iii. 9); nothing that man can do of himself can bring him into right relation with God, but the reconciliation comes from God Himself, Who gave His own Son (Rom. v. 8–10, viii. 32, 33; 2 Cor. v. 21).

(a) *Objectively*, therefore, the ground of our justification is the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (Rom. iii. 24).

It is necessary for man on his part to accept what God has done for him—he must accept the Gospel message and receive Baptism (Tit. iii. 5); this he does by faith.

(b) Thus, considering the matter *subjectively*, the sole requisite for entering upon a state of *δικαιοσύνη* before God is **Faith** (Rom. i. 17, iii. 22, 30, v. 1; *cf.* Acts xiii. 39, xvi. 31; Gal. v. 6; Eph. ii. 8).

On the subject of ‘Justification’ the following extracts should be compared with our Article:—

The COUNCIL OF TRENT understands the term ‘Justification’ in a wider sense than that explained above, taking it to include ‘Sanctification’; thus the decree of the Council (Session VI.) differs from our Article in defining Justification as not merely the “accounting” but the “making” of us righteous:

“Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiae et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus et ex inimico amicus, ut sit haeres secundum spem vitae aeternae . . . justitia dei, qua nos justos facit, qua videlicet ab eo donati renovamur spiritu mentis nostrae et non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur et sumus, justitiam in nobis recipientes.”

AUGSBURG CONFESSIO, Art. IV.:

“Item docent, quod homines non possint justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratisificentur 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 pro justitia coram ipso (Rom. iii. et iv.)”

CONFESSIO VARIATA, Art. “De Fide”:

“Cum igitur dicimus, Fide justificamur, non hoc intelligimus quod justii simus propter ipsius virtutis dignitatem. Sed haec est sententia, consequi nos remissionem peccatorum, et imputationem justitiae, per misericordiam propter Christum.”

SAXON CONFESSIO, Art. III.:

“Hac fide cum erigitur, certum est donari remissionem peccatorum, reconciliationem et imputationem justitiae, propter ipsius Christi meritum.”

FORMULA OF CONCORD (p. 685):

“Vocabulum justificationis in hoc negotio significat justum pronuntiare, a peccatis et aeternis peccatorum suppliciis absolvere propter justitiam Christi, quae a Deo fidei imputatur.”

It will be noticed that three of the formularies just quoted, which express the views of the Saxon, or Lutheran, school of Reformers, speak of the “imputation” of righteousness. Calvin also, in dealing with this subject, uses the term “imputation.” See INSTITUTES, III. xi. 2:—

“Ita nos justificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem qua nos Deus, in gratiam receptos, pro justis habet. Eamque in

peccatorum remissione, ac justitiæ Christi imputatione positam esse dicimus.”

Cf. also the following quotations from Confessions belonging to the Swiss school:—

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :

“Credimus totam nostram justitiam positam esse in peccatorum nostrorum remissione, quæ sit etiam, ut testatur David, unica nostra felicitas. Itaque ceteras omnes rationes quibus homines existimant se coram Deo posse justificari, plane repudiamus: omnique virtutum et meritorum opinione abjecta, in sola Jesu Christi obedientia prorsus acquiescimus, quæ quidem nobis imputatur, tum ut tegantur omnia nostra peccata, tum etiam ut gratiam coram Deo nanciscamur.”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XV. :

“Proprie ergo loquendo, Deus solus nos justificat, et duntaxat propter Christum nos justificat, non imputans nobis peccata, sed imputans ejus nobis justitiam . . . ideo docemus et credimus cum apostolo, hominem peccatorem justificari sola fide in Christum, non lege, aut ullis operibus.”

The Westminster divines, in their revision of the eleventh of the XXXIX. Articles, inserted a clause:—

“His (Christ’s) whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed unto us.”¹

Our Article differs from the great number of Continental Confessions, in that it does not discuss at length the meaning of ‘Justification.’ The only approach to a definition of the term is that which is implied in the wording of the Article, “*justi coram Deo reputamur.*”

The fourth of the XIII. Articles, which were the outcome of an attempt to draw the English and German Reformers together, runs thus:—

“Item de justificatione docemus, quod ea proprie significat remissionem peccatorum et acceptationem seu reconciliationem nostram in gratiam et favorem Dei, hoc est veram renovationem in Christo.”

It is somewhat remarkable that in subsequent English formularies this phraseology is altogether departed from.

¹ See Appendix IV.

- (3.) HAVING SPECIAL REGARD TO THE NEEDS OF THE TIME, THE ARTICLE FURTHER EMPHASISES THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ONLY, AND REFERS TO THE HOMILY ON THE SUBJECT.

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.

It is obvious that the best works of man are faulty and imperfect; if, therefore, God were to enter into judgment with man, no one living would be able to stand before Him (Ps. cxliii. 2), and we might well despair if it were left to us to bring ourselves into right relation to God by our own merits. It is, therefore, most comforting to be assured that we enter into *δικαιοσύνη* before God by accepting in faith what Christ has done for us.

There is no homily with the title “Homily of Justification,” but the “Homily of Salvation,” which deals with the subject, is evidently the one to which reference is made. In illustration of the statements of the Article we may quote a short passage from this homily:—

“And therefore St. Paul declareth here nothing upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and lively faith: which nevertheless is the gift of God and not man’s only work without God. And yet that 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 bounden 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” (pp. 22, 23; ed. S.P.C.K.).

ARTICLE XII

OF GOOD WORKS.

DE BONIS OPERIBUS.

Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

Bona opera quae sunt fructus Fidei et justificatos sequuntur, quanquam peccata nostra expiare et Divini iudicii severitatem ferre non possunt, Deo tamen grata sunt et accepta in Christo, atque ex vera et viva fide necessario profluunt, ut plane ex illis, aequae fides viva cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu judicari.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This was one of the new Articles added in 1563, and appears to have been borrowed to some extent from the Article "De Bonis Operibus" in the WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, in which the following passage occurs:—

"Non est autem sentiendum, quod iis bonis operibus, quae nos facimus, in iudicio Dei, ubi agitur de expiatione peccatorum, et placatione divinae irae, ac merito aeternae salutis, confidendum sit. Omnia enim bona opera, quae nos facimus, sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini iudicii ferre."

§ 2.—OBJECT.

Article XI. emphasises the great Reformation doctrine of Justification by Faith only; Article XII. was drawn up with the view of guarding against the practical evil which had been seen to arise from the misunderstanding of that great doctrine. Luther laid so much stress on faith that he came to depreciate works, and even to deny them their proper place, and to speak of S. James' Epistle, which emphasises the necessity of good

works, as "straminea epistola."¹ Calvin's exaggerated teaching on the subject of Predestination also tended to depreciation of man's work. The matter, of course, did not rest with the authors of these teachings; their followers went much further, with the result that antinomianism became widely prevalent. It was in order to meet this evil outcome of the teaching of some of the Reformers that this Article was framed in 1563.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) GOOD WORKS ARE IN THEMSELVES NOT MERITORIOUS.

Good works . . . cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment:

Two things are here affirmed with regard to good works:—

(a) They cannot put away (expiare) sin.

Only the Blood of Christ can expiate sin (1 S. John i. 7); and it is a fatal error to put human merit in its place, as was too often done in mediæval times.

(b) They cannot endure the severity of God's judgment.

We must all acknowledge that there is something of imperfection even in our best deeds (Ps. cxliii. 2).² Good works, therefore, are not rewarded "*de condigno*," i.e., because of their deserving it.³

With the teaching of the Article on this head we should contrast—

(i.) The doctrine of the Church of Rome, according to which the good works of those who are justified are in themselves meritorious. See COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session VI., Canon XXXII. :—

"Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum

¹ Preface to the New Testament, 1524, p. 105.

² Cf. the Homily "Of the Misery of Man," Part ii. p. 17:

"Neither may we rejoice in any works that we do, which all be so imperfect and impure that they are not able to stand before the righteous judgment-seat of God."

³ As to the meaning of the scholastic phrase "*meritum de condigno*" see notes on Art. XIII. The doctrine expressed by it was repudiated by the Continental, as by the English, Reformers. See, e.g., SAXON CONFESSION, Art. IX.:

"Ideo inanis est imaginatio fingentium obedientiam placere sua dignitate, et esse meritum condigni, ut loquuntur, et justitiam coram Deo, quae sit meritum vitae aeternae."

justificatum bonis operibus, quae ab eo per Dei gratiam et Christi meritum fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiae, vitam aeternam et ipsius vitae aeternae, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriae augmentum; anathema sit."

(ii.) The tenets of Pelagius and his followers, who held that some men have lived perfectly sinless lives,¹ so that their works would be able to endure the severity of God's judgment.

(2.) GOOD WORKS ARE PLEASING AND ACCEPTABLE TO GOD IN CHRIST.

yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ,

Though not meritorious in themselves, yet the good works of Christians are pleasing to God, because of our union with Christ (see 1 S. Pet. ii. 5; Eph. ii. 10; Tit. ii. 14, iii. 8; Heb. xiii. 16, 20, 21). To deny this is to divorce morality from religion. Some of the Reformers, however, did deny it,² and no more severe blow could be struck at Christian morality.

(3.) THE RELATION OF GOOD WORKS TO JUSTIFYING FAITH.

Good works . . . are the fruits of faith, and follow after Justification, . . . and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

The relation of good works to faith is here very clearly and carefully stated:—

(a) Good works are the fruits of faith.

(b) They do spring necessarily out of faith, so that where true faith is we may be sure that good works will also be found, and where good works are wanting faith is certainly dead (S. Matt. vii. 16-20; Tit. ii. 14; S. Jas. ii. 17-26).

(c) Thus works do not precede faith, so that a man may be justified by them, but follow after justification (*justificatos sequuntur*)—Eph. ii. 8-10.

The "Homily of Salvation," referred to in the last Article, lays down in similar language the proper relation of good works to faith:—

¹ See notes on Art. IX.

² Luther, *e.g.*, in 1518 offered to maintain this proposition at Heidelberg against all comers: "Non ille justus est qui multum operatur, sed qui sine opere multum credit in Christum."

"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" (p. 25). . . .

"It followeth necessarily that some other thing should be required for our salvation than the law; and that is a true and lively faith in Christ, bringing forth good works and a life according to God's commandments" (p. 28). . . .

"Our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly after that we are baptized or justified, not caring how few good works we do to the glory of God and profit of our neighbours: much less it is our office, after that we be once made Christ's members, to live contrary to the same" (pp. 29, 30).

Some examples may be given to show how this question of the relation of good works to faith is treated in the Confessions of the Protestant and Reformed bodies on the Continent:—

AUGSBURG CONFSSION, Part I. Art. XX.:

"Falso accusantur nostri, quod bona opera prohibeant. . . .

"Principio, quod opera nostra non possint reconciliare Deum, aut mereri remissionem peccatorum, et gratiam et justificationem, sed hanc tantum fide consequimur. . . .

"Praeterea docent nostri, quod necesse sit bona opera facere, non ut confidamus per ea gratiam mereri, sed propter voluntatem Dei. Tantum fide apprehenditur remissio peccatorum ac gratia. Et quia per fidem accipitur Spiritus Sanctus, jam corda renovantur, et induunt novos affectus, ut parere bona opera possint."

TETRAPOLITAN CONFSSION, Cap. III. and Cap. V.:

"Primum igitur cum jam aliquot annis, ad justificationem hominis, requiri propria ejus opera traditum sit, nostri hanc totam divinae benevolentiae, Christique merito acceptam referendam, solaque fide percipi docuerunt. . . .

"His bona opera, tam non rejicimus, ut prorsus negemus quoniam plene posse salvum fieri, nisi huc per spiritum Christi evaserit, ut nihil jam bonorum operum in eo desyderetur, ad quae quidem Deus illum condidit."

BOHEMIAN CONFSSION, Articles IX. and X.:

"Salvifica fides . . . ita per charitatem operatur quaevis bona et sancta opera, ex quibus tanquam arbor ex fructibus cognoscitur. Sicut enim ignis absque calore, et sol absque splendore: ita etiam vera fides et Christi particeps, sine renovatione et sine charitate, adeoque sine multis sanctis et bonis operibus nunquam et nusquam esse potest. . . .

"Et talia bona opera placent Deo, non propter propriam ipsorum dignitatem et perfectionem . . . sed placent Deo per solum Christum Iesum in persona vel homine, qui prius a Christo Domino per fidem in ipsum justificatus, et Deo acceptus redditus est, quando credit."

BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. XXIV.:

"Fieri itaque non potest ut haec fides sancta in homine otiosa sit. Neque enim loquimur de fide vana atque mortua, sed de ea tantum quae in scriptura dicitur per charitatem operari: quaeque impellit hominem ut in illis sese operibus exerceat, quae Deus ipse in verbo suo praecepit. Haec vero opera a sincera fidei hujus radice emanantia, ideo demum bona et Deo grata sunt, quia per illius gratiam sanctificantur: ad nos autem justificandos nullius sunt prorsus momenti."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XVI.:

"Docemus enim vere bona opera enasci ex viva fide, per Spiritum Sanctum, et a fidelibus fieri secundum voluntatem vel regulam verbi Dei. . . . Damnamus itaque omnes qui bona opera contemnunt, non curanda et inutilia esse blaterant. Interim, quod et antea dictum est, non sentimus per opera bona nos servari, illaque ad salutem ita esse necessaria, ut absque illis nemo unquam sit servatus."

Some difficulty has been caused by the apparent contradiction between the statements of S. Paul and S. James as to the place to be assigned to good works. Contrast Rom. iii. 20; iv. 2, 3; v. 1, with S. Jas. ii. 14, 21, 24, 26. The seeming contradiction may, however, be cleared up by a careful examination of the meaning of the terms used, and by keeping in mind the purpose with which each Apostle is writing.

The Epistle of S. James is a practical letter; he has in mind people who are content with a profession of belief only, and make no attempt to live up to it, and so, like a prophet of the Old Testament, or a practical preacher of our own day, S. James warns people that their life must be consistent with their profession, that mere intellectual acceptance is useless. "The demons believe," he says, but they are none the better; they shudder, and are demons still (ii. 19). The man who relies upon faith is challenged to show his faith apart from works. Such exhibition is, of course, impossible. The test and proof of faith lies in the actions of life (ii. 14-18), so that where good works are found a living faith may be known to exist (*cf.* S. Matt. vii. 16). By deeds, therefore, man will eventually be justified, his works form-

ing the ground of God's judgment at the last day (*cf.* S. Matt. vii. 22, 23; Rom. ii. 5, 6; 2 Cor. v. 10, xi. 15; Rev. xx. 12, xxii. 12).

The Epistle to the Romans is a theological treatise, and therefore the author approaches the subject of the relation of faith and works from a different standpoint. 'Justification,' as we have already seen, means with S. Paul the entering upon a state of *δικαιοσύνη*, the coming of sinful man into a right relation with God, which is the starting-point of a new life. No efforts of man's own can attain this *δικαιοσύνη* for himself, he has no power of himself to help himself, he is only required to accept in faith what God has done for him through Christ; in other words, man is justified (in S. Paul's sense of the term) by faith only, and not by works. At the same time the Apostle makes it clear in his writings that good works follow upon justification (Eph. ii. 10); that faith which justifies is not idle or barren, but issues in obedience (Rom. vi. 16), working by love (Gal. v. 6; 1 Thess. i. 3), and without love is altogether valueless (1 Cor. xiii. 2).

§ 4.—NOTEWORTHY EXPRESSION IN THIS ARTICLE.

The phrase "justificatos sequuntur" should be noted. It is traceable to S. Augustine. *Cf.* "De Fide et Operibus," Cap. xiv. § 31:—

"Sequuntur enim (bona opera) justificatum, non praecedunt justificandum."

This passage of S. Augustine is quoted in the "Homily on Fasting" (p. 292; ed. S.P.C.K.).

ARTICLE XIII

OF WORKS BEFORE JUSTIFICATION. DE OPERIBUS ANTE JUSTIFICATIONEM.

Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

Opera quae fiunt ante gratiam Christi, et Spiritus ejus afflatum, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, minime Deo grata sunt: neque gratiam (ut multi vocant) de congruo merentur: Imo cum non sint facta ut Deus illa fieri voluit et praecepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This Article was composed by the English Reformers. In the XLII. Articles of 1553, as published, the Article runs exactly as at present, but in a previous draft the first clause is slightly different:—

“Opera quae fiunt ante justificationem, cum ex fide,” &c.

The wording was altered to its present form before the Articles were published, but the title remained unaltered. Hence the discrepancy now existing between the title and contents of the Article. A more exact title would be, OF WORKS BEFORE FAITH, or, OF WORKS BEFORE GRACE.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To condemn the scholastic doctrine (expressly referred to in the Article), that the favour of God may be gained by man, and the bestowal of grace merited, as the reward of actions done merely in his own strength, and without any dependence on the Holy Spirit. This Article is thus strongly anti-Pelagian.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

In Article XII. it is laid down that works which follow after, and spring out of, faith are pleasing and acceptable to God. The question now arises, What are we to say of works of man which are done before faith, or before the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit? The Schoolmen spoke of a twofold merit attaching to human actions:—

- (i.) *Merit de congruo*, which they ascribed to such works as man does by his own unaided strength, without God's grace. Such works, they taught, would be rewarded out of God's liberality.
- (ii.) *Merit de condigno*, which they ascribed to such works as are done with the assistance of grace, and to which a reward was held to be due as a matter of justice.

We have seen that in Article XII. the doctrine of merit *de condigno* was rejected; in the Article now under consideration a like emphatic denial is given to the doctrine of merit *de congruo*. Our Article treats, then, only of works done by man in his natural state, by his own unaided strength, and of such works it declares that:—

- (1.) THEY ARE NOT PLEASING TO GOD.

Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, (See Rom. viii. 7, 8; S. John xv. 5.)

- (2.) THEY CANNOT MAKE MEN MEET TO RECEIVE GRACE (or, in the technical language of the scholastic theology, they do not deserve grace of congruity).

neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: (Rom. iv. 2, 6; Tit. iii. 5.)

This is, in reality, only another way of saying that no works or efforts of our own can avail at all for bringing us into a state of favour with, neither can they constitute any claim upon, God.

- (3.) THEY HAVE THE NATURE OF SIN.

yea rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin. (Rom. xiv. 23; Tit. i. 15; Heb. xi. 6.)

This last clause has caused some difficulty, because the Article seems at first sight to class any efforts after goodness

on the part of the heathen as sin. But such a position would be contrary to the teaching of Scripture, as given, *e.g.*, in what is recorded of the Roman centurion Cornelius, who did not belong to God's Covenant people, and yet his good works were acceptable to God (Acts x. 4). The answer to the difficulty in which we here seem to be involved is to be found in the doctrine of 'Preventing Grace': the works of Cornelius, even in his Gentile state, were not done without faith, or apart from the grace of God. We must recognise that God gives to all men their measure of the Holy Spirit; many, indeed, may quench the Spirit, but to His blessed influence is to be attributed whatever of goodness is found in the lives of righteous heathen. There is a "Light which lighteth every man" (S. John i. 9), so that even the heathen are led to seek the Lord, if haply they might find Him (Acts xvii. 27). To this Divine Light we must attribute all that is good in mankind. But good works done without this—*e.g.*, from pride, self-righteousness, love of praise, or other similar motives—are not pleasing to God, and have the nature of sin.

With our Article we should compare the Canons of the 6th Session of the COUNCIL OF TRENT:—

"CANON I.—Si quis dixerit, hominem suis operibus, quae vel per humanae naturae vires vel per legis doctrinam fiant, absque divina per Christum gratia, posse justificari coram Deo: anathema sit.

"CANON III.—Si quis dixerit, sine praeveniente Spiritus Sancti inspiratione, atque ejus adjutorio, hominem credere, sperare, diligere, aut poenitere posse, sicut oportet, ut ei justificationis gratia conferatur: anathema sit.

"CANON VII.—Si quis dixerit, opera omnia, quae ante justificationem fiunt, quacunquē ratione facta sint, vere esse peccata vel odium Dei mereri, aut, quanto vehementius quis nititur se disponere ad gratiam, tanto eum gravius peccare: anathema sit."

It will be seen that the doctrine of the Roman Church, as defined by the Council, agrees in the main with that laid down in the English Article. There is, however, one point of divergence which should not be overlooked. Canon VII. anathematizes those who hold that 'works before justification' are truly and properly sins. Our Article does not, indeed, affirm that such works *are* sin, but it uses with respect to them the same

guarded phrase which we have already noticed in Article IX., and declares that they "have the nature of sin" (*peccati rationem habere*).¹

§ 4.—NOTEWORTHY EXPRESSION IN THIS ARTICLE.

The School-authors.

We may briefly describe Scholasticism as an attempt to unite theology and philosophy by systematising theology upon a philosophic basis. It may be said to date from the time of Charlemagne, the monasteries established by him becoming the schools of a revived study of philosophy; and, since learning and literary skill were in those times chiefly confined to ecclesiastics, it was natural that philosophical activity should show itself chiefly in the domain of theology. From the ninth to the eleventh centuries we have the rise of Scholasticism. During the latter half of the twelfth century came the struggle between the Nominalists and the Realists,² which resulted in the triumph of the latter. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries may be regarded as the prime of Scholasticism, and the three most renowned of the Schoolmen were Albertus Magnus,³ Thomas Aquinas,⁴ and John Duns Scotus.⁵

¹ The formularies influenced by the Calvinistic Theology, which emphasises the total corruption of the natural man, lay stress, as we should expect, upon the sinful character of works done by man in his natural state. See the text of Article XIII. as revised by the Westminster divines, Appendix IV.

² This controversy was with respect to our abstract or general ideas. The Realists contended that an abstraction—*e.g.*, circle, beauty, right—had a *real* existence (apart from round things, beautiful objects, right actions). Those that held the opposite view were called Nominalists, since they held that there is nothing general but *names*; *e.g.*, the name circle is applied to round things, and is merely a general name.

³ Count of Bollstädt, a Dominican, born 1193 or 1205; died 1280.

⁴ A Dominican, born 1224; died 1274. He was the author of the famous 'Summa Theologiae,' and is called the 'Angelic doctor.' His followers inclined rather to Nominalism; they followed S. Augustine on the doctrine of Grace, and were opposed to the teaching which was springing up in some quarters as to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

⁵ A Franciscan, died 1308. The Scotists inclined to Realism, and somewhat to Pelagianism; they strongly upheld the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

ARTICLE XIV

OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

DE OPERIBUS SUPEREROGATIONIS.

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

Opera quae supererogationis appellunt, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate praedicari. Nam illis declarant homines non tantum se Deo reddere quae tenentur, sed plus in ejus gratiam facere quam deberent: Cum aperte Christus dicat: Cum feceritis omnia quaecunque praecepta sunt vobis, dicite: Servi inutiles sumus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To condemn the doctrine of Works of Supererogation taught by some of the later Schoolmen.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) WHAT IS MEANT BY "WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION."

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation.

The term 'Supererogation' is derived from the Latin *super-erogare*. *Erogare* strictly signifies "to vote money out of the treasury," but is also used in the more general sense "to spend." *Supererogare* therefore means "to spend more than is required." The verb is used in the Vulgate, S. Luke x. 35, "quodcumque supererogaveris," *i.e.*, whatever thou shalt have spent over and above.

The distinction had been drawn by the later Schoolmen, and divines of the Roman Church, between the commandments of God, which all men are obliged to keep, and Counsels of Perfection, which are assumed to be over and above God's commandments, and to which it is given to some to attain. Some passages of Scripture were held to favour this distinction; see especially S. Matt. xix. 11, 12, 21; 1 Cor. vii. 1, 7, 25. Thus vows of poverty, or of chastity, being not necessary for all Christians, came to be looked upon as meritorious in themselves, and it was imagined that those who took such vows were doing more for God than was required of them.

In the decrees of the Council of Trent nothing is laid down concerning '*consilia evangelica*' or '*consilia perfectionis*,' but we may judge of current teaching from the writings of Bellarmine. See his '*De Monachis*':—

CAP. VII.—"Consilium perfectionis vocamus opus bonum, a Christo nobis non imperatum, sed demonstratum, non mandatum sed commendatum."

CAP. VIII.—"Sententia est catholicorum omnium, multa esse vere et proprie consilia evangelica, sed praecipue tria, continentiam, obedientiam et paupertatem, quae nec sint praecepta nec indifferentia, sed Deo grata, et ab illa commendata."

CAP. XII.—"Videmus in omnibus bene institutis rebus publicis praeter praemia et poenas . . . esse etiam praemia quaedam decreta heroicis operibus; . . . ita ergo non abhorret a ratione, imo potius conforme est rationi, ut praeter vitam aeternam, promissam observatoribus legis divinae, sint etiam certa praemia et singulares honores pro iis, qui non solum Dei legem servant, sed etiam virtutes heroicis ostendunt."

(2.) THE DOCTRINE OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION IS ARROGANT AND IMPIOUS.

Works of Supererogation cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

What God requires of us is nothing short of this:—to love Him with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the strength, and with all the mind (S. Luke x. 27); that we

should be perfect, even as He is perfect (S. Matt. v. 48). It is obviously impossible to do *more* than fulfil this requirement of God; on the contrary, we all fall far short of it; we all need to pray continually, as our Lord has taught us, "Forgive us our trespasses" (S. Matt. vi. 12; S. Luke xi. 4), and, if there is any truth in us, we shall all acknowledge our own unworthiness (see S. Luke xvii. 10, the passage referred to in the Article). It is not, of course, denied that vows of poverty, chastity, &c., have their place in the Christian Religion; but the mistake lies (so the Article shows us) in considering such works to be over and above God's commandments. To those who feel themselves called to such state of life the so-called 'Counsels of Perfection' become *God's commandments*.

To suppose that there is a certain fixed measure of obedience beyond which it is not necessary to go, that we render unto God as much as we are bound to do, is impiety, since the Perfection of God Himself is our standard. Again, to imagine that we do more than of bounden duty is required is arrogance, because we ourselves, body, soul, and spirit, are entirely God's, so that we owe ourselves and all that we have to His service. Where all is thus owing it is impossible that part can be over-pay.

Concerning the subject treated in this Article we may compare:—

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, Art. 'De Lege':

"Sed quod nonnulli sentiunt hominem posse in hac vita eo pervenire, ut non tantum impleat suis operibus Decalogum, verum etiam possit plura et majora opera facere, quam in Decalogo precepta sunt, quae vocant opera supererogationis, alienum est a prophetica et Apostolica doctrina, et pugnat cum sententia verae Catholicae Ecclesiae."

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, XVI. 4.:

"They who in their obedience attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate, and to do more than God requires, as that they fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do."

ARTICLE XV

OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT
SIN.

DE CHRISTO QUI SOLUS EST SINE
PECCATO.

Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh, and in His spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, Who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in Him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

Christus in nostrae naturae veritate per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato, a quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne tum in spiritu. Venit, ut agnus absque macula esset, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam, tolleret: et peccatum (ut inquit Johannes) in eo non erat. Sed nos reliqui, etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes: Et si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

This Article was drawn up to guard against a prevalent form of Anabaptism. In a letter to Bullinger, dated June 25, 1549, Hooper thus writes of the Anabaptists:—

"They contend that a man who is reconciled to God is without sin, and free from all stain of concupiscence, and that nothing of the old Adam remains in his nature; and a man, they say, who is thus regenerate cannot sin" (Original Letters, p. 65).

Cf. also REFORMATIO LEGUM, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 8:—

"Illorum etiam superbia legibus nostris est frangenda, qui tantam vitae perfectionem hominibus justificatis attribuunt, quantam nec imbecillitas nostrae naturae fert, nec quisquam sibi praeter Christum sumere potest."

See further the notes on Article XVI.

The compilers of the Article may also have had in view scholastic teaching with regard to the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) CHRIST'S TRUE MANHOOD DOES NOT INCLUDE PARTICIPATION IN SIN.

Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh, and in His spirit.

Christ was perfect man. Sin is not part of human nature, but a fault and corruption of it. In sin, therefore, He had no share (S. John viii. 46, xiv. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. iv. 15; 1 S. Pet. ii. 22; 1 S. John iii. 5).

(2.) THE EFFECT OF THE DEATH OF THE SINLESS ONE.

He came to be the Lamb without spot, Who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in Him. (See S. John i. 29; 1 S. Pet. i. 19.)

The fact of our Lord's sinlessness infuses an element of righteousness (2 Cor. v. 21) and sacrificial power (1 S. Pet. ii. 22-24; Heb. ix. 14) into His death. If Christ could have been convicted of one single sin, He would have been disqualified for the altar; He might, indeed, have died as a martyr and left a noble example, but could not have been accepted as the atoning Sacrifice for sin (Eph. v. 2; and cf. 1 S. John iii. 5, the passage quoted in the Article). The Atonement has been already treated in Article II., but we should notice that three points with regard to our Lord's death are here emphasised:—

- (a) Its expiatory character—Who by sacrifice of Himself . . . should take away the sins (1 S. John ii. 2; iv. 10).
- (b) Its unique character; the Sacrifice of Christ was once made, and cannot be repeated¹ (Heb ix. 26).
- (c) That it avails for all sin²—should take away the sins of the world (1 S. John ii. 2).

If any sins remain unforgiven at last, it will not be

¹ Cf. Article XXXI.

² The sufficiency of Christ's Atoning Sacrifice for all sin is several times dwelt upon in the Articles. See notes on Articles IX. and XXXI.

because of any defect or shortcoming in Christ's sacrificial work, but because men have refused to confess and forsake them.

(3.) NO OTHER HUMAN BEING WAS, OR IS, PERFECTLY GOOD.

But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

The words of the Article here are taken from S. Jas. iii. 2 and 1 S. John i. 8.

The subject of the sin of the regenerate is further treated in Article XVI., where see notes.

There is no express allusion in the Article to the question of the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin, but it is very probable that the compilers, in drawing it up, had in mind current teaching upon the subject. The title of the Article itself, "CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN," excludes extravagant doctrine on this point. It would seem to be self-evident that our Lord's Mother, having been born in the usual way, of human parents, must have shared in the taint of Original Sin. Scripture, indeed, speaks of her as "highly favoured" or "full of grace"¹ (*κεχαριτωμένη*), and as "blessed among women" (S. Luke i. 28, 42, 43, 48; xi. 27, 28); and it was a pious opinion in early times that the grace of God did work so mightily in her that she was preserved from actual sin.² Duns Scotus and the Franciscan divines, who followed his lead, began to teach (circ. 1300) her immaculate conception, *i.e.*, her freedom from Original Sin; and the Council of Trent in its decree on 'Original Sin' (Session V.) expressly excepts the Blessed Virgin from what is laid down under that head:—

"Declarat tamen haec ipsa sancta synodus, non esse suae intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam."

The "Immaculate Conception" of our Lord's Mother was not, however, declared to be a doctrine of the Catholic Church until 1854, when Pope Pius IX. issued (December 8th) the famous Bull "Ineffabilis":—

"Declaramus, pronuntiamus et definimus, doctrinam, quae tenet, beatissimam virginem Mariam in primo instanti suae conceptionis

¹ "Gratia plena" is the rendering of the Vulgate in S. Luke i. 28, and with this the Syriac Version agrees.

² See S. Augustine, 'De Natura et Gratia,' § 42.

fuisse singulari omnipotentis Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpae labe praeservatam immunem, esse a Deo revelatam, atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam."

Such doctrine of the absolute freedom of the Blessed Virgin from all participation in sin has no foundation in Holy Scripture, and is implicitly repudiated by our Church in this fifteenth Article. Our Reformers at the same time speak of her with that veneration and respect which is due. See, *e.g.*, the HOMILY OF REPENTANCE, Part I. p. 564:—

"Jesus Christ, Who being true and natural God, equal and of one substance with the Father, did at the time appointed take upon Him our frail nature, in the blessed Virgin's womb, and that of her undefiled substance; that so He might be a Mediator betwixt God and us, and pacify His wrath."

Again, in the HOMILY ON WILFUL REBELLION, Part II. p. 607, we read:—

"The obedience of this most noble and most virtuous lady to a foreign and pagan prince doth well teach us, who in comparison to her are most base and vile, what ready obedience we do owe to our natural and gracious Sovereign."

ARTICLE XVI

OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism.

After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore, they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

DE PECCATO POST BAPTISMUM.

Non omne peccatum mortale post Baptismum voluntarie perpetratum, est peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum et irremissibile. Proinde lapsis a Baptismo in peccata, locus poenitentiae non est negandus.

Post acceptum Spiritum Sanctum, possumus a gratia data recedere atque peccare, denuoque per gratiam Dei resurgere ac resipiscere. Ideoque illi damnandi sunt, qui se quamdiu hic vivant, amplius non posse peccare affirmant, aut vere resipiscentibus veniae locum denegant.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To condemn a very dangerous form of Anabaptist teaching. In the Article 'De Falsa Poenitentia' of the SCHMALKALD ARTICLES certain 'sectarii' are alluded to who said:—

'Fac quicquid lubet, modo credas, nihil tibi nocet, fides omnia peccata delet:' addunt praeterea, 'Si quis post fidem et Spiritum acceptum peccet, eum nunquam Spiritum et fidem vere habuisse.'

Cf. also REFORMATIO LEGUM, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 9:—

"Etiam illi de justificatis perverse sentiunt, qui credunt illos, postquam justi semel facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere, aut si forte quicquam eorum faciunt, quae Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere. Quibus opinione contrarii, sed impietate pares sunt, qui quodcumque peccatum mortale, quod

post baptismum a nobis susceptum voluntate nostra committitur, illud omne contra Spiritum Sanctum affirmant gestum esse et remitti non posse."

That the errors condemned in the Article had found their way into this country is also shown by the fact that in Stat. 32 Henry VIII. c. 49, § 11, they are excluded from the king's pardon who hold "That synners after baptisme cannot be restored by repentaunce." See also Hooper's letter to Bullinger quoted in the notes on Article XV. § 2. After the words there cited he continues:—

"They add that all hope of pardon is taken away from those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin."

[The XLII. Articles of 1553 contained one on "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," which immediately followed the Article on "Sin after Baptism." It was, however, struck out in 1563, most likely from reluctance to define the unpardonable sin:—

BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY
GHOST.

Blasphemie against the holic Ghost is, when a man of malice and stubbornesse of minde, doeth raile upon the trueth of Goddes word manifestlie perceiued, and being enemie thereunto persecuteth the same. And because soche be guilty of Goddes curse, thei entangle themselves with a moste grievous, and hainous crime, wherupon this kinde of sinne is called and affirmed of the Lord, unpardonable.

BLASPHEMIA IN SPIRITUM
SANCTUM.

Blasphemia in Spiritum Sanctum, est cum quis Verborum Dei manifeste perceptam veritatem, ex malitia et obfirmatione animi, convitiis insectatur, et hostiliter insequitur. Atque hujusmodi, quia maledicto sunt obnoxii, gravissimo sese astringunt sceleri. Unde peccati hoc genus Irremissibile a Domino appellatur, et affirmatur.]

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1). AFTER RECEIVING THE HOLY GHOST IT IS POSSIBLE TO SIN—
WE MAY FALL FROM GRACE.

After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin. . . . And therefore they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here. (See S. Jas. iii. 2; 1 S. John i 8, the passages quoted in the last Article).

The numerous exhortations to perseverance contained in Holy Scripture imply that those who have received grace

are liable to fall (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 27; Heb. iii. 6, vi. 4–6, x. 38; Rev. ii. 4, 5). The very figures, too, under which the gift of the Holy Spirit is spoken of in the New Testament indicate the possibility of falling away after having received the gift. Thus the gift of the Spirit is spoken of as—

(a) *A seal* (Eph. i. 13; iv. 30). Now a seal is that which certifies a contract, which is void if both parties do not keep it.

(b) *An earnest* (2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5; Eph. i. 13, 14). An earnest is part payment given in pledge of the full price, which may, however, be forfeited.

Our Church in her services continually assumes the possibility of falling from grace; *e.g.*, in the Collect for the Second Sunday in Advent, we pray "that we may embrace and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life;" and again in the Burial Service, "Suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from Thee."

With the teaching of the Article on this head *cf.* what is said in the Article on Justification in the KING'S BOOK (Formularies of Faith, p. 367):—

"And it is no doubt, but although we be once justified, yet we may fall therefrom by our own freewill and consenting unto sin, and following the desires thereof . . . and here all phantastical imagination, curious reasoning, and vain trust of predestination is to be laid apart."

The formularies of the Saxon School and the Canons of the Council of Trent also agree with our Article:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XII.:

"Damnant Anabaptistas qui negant semel justificatos posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum. Item, qui contendunt quibusdam tantam perfectionem in hac vita contingere, ut peccare non possint."

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XVI.:

"Prorsus enim clare damnamus Catharos et Novatianos, qui finxerunt, nec labi posse electos in delicta contra conscientiam, nec lapsos post emendationem recipiendos esse."

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session VI. Canon XXIII.:

"Si quis hominen semel justificatum dixerit amplius peccare non posse, nec gratiam amittere, atque ideo eum qui labitur et peccat nunquam vere fuisse justificatum; aut contra posse in tota vita peccata omnia, etiam venalia, vitare, nisi ex speciali Dei privilegio, quemadmodum de beata Virgine Maria tenet Ecclesia: anathema sit."

Calvin's teaching, on the other hand, is altogether irreconcilable with the doctrine of our Church. He taught that Divine Grace, where it is really given, is irresistible, and therefore that the elect who have been once justified, and have received the gift of the Holy Spirit, can never fall from grace; if a member of the Church fall away, his fall must be considered a proof that he is not of the number of the elect, and that he never in reality received saving grace. *Cf.* CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, III. xxiv. 6, 7 :—

“Jam vero neque hoc dubium est, quum orat Christus pro omnibus electis, quin idem illis precetur quod Petro, ut nunquam deficiat fides eorum. Ex quo elicimus, extra periculum defectionis esse, quia eorum pietati constantiam postulans Filius Dei, repulsam passus non est. Quid hinc nos discere voluit Christus, nisi ut confidamus perpetuo nos fore salvos, quia illius semel facti sumus? At quotidie accidit ut qui videbantur esse Christi, rursus deficiant ab eo, et corruant . . . sed aequae etiam certum, nunquam ea cordis fiducia tales Christo adhaesisse, qua nobis electionis certitudinem stabiliri dico.”

That the language of our Article was unacceptable to the Calvinistic party in this country is evident from the attack which they made upon it in the “*Seconde Admonition to the Parliament*” (1572) :—

“And in deede the booke of the Articles of Christian religion speaketh very dangerously of falling from grace.”

See also the 5th of the LAMBETH ARTICLES :

“Vera, viva, et justificans fides, et Spiritus Dei sanctificans, non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit in electis, aut finaliter, aut totaliter.”

WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, XI. 5 :

“They can never fall from the state of justification.”

(2.) SIN AFTER BAPTISM, OR FALL FROM GRACE, IS NOT WHAT IS MEANT BY THE UNPARDONABLE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable.

Note that the Article expressly specifies “deadly sin willingly committed,” *i.e.*, known and deliberate sin, as opposed to sin done through ignorance or infirmity. All

such sin is, in its nature, deadly (Rom. vi. 23 ; vii. 9), and is committed against God, the Three in One, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but still it is not unpardonable, unless it be that sin which our Lord calls “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” (S. Matt. xii. 31, 32 ; S. Mark iii. 28–30).

Our Article thus plainly declares that the unpardonable sin is not equivalent to post-Baptismal sin, but no explanation is given as to what is signified by “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.” Our Lord's most solemn warning with regard to it was evidently occasioned by the Pharisees' ascription of His works to the instrumentality of Beelzebub (S. Mark iii. 22, 30). Such conduct as theirs might then be forgiven, but it would seem that Christ warns them that if continued when He was glorified and attested by the Holy Spirit, it would be unpardonable. Thus we conclude that the sin spoken of in S. Matt. xii. 31, 32 ; S. Mark iii. 28, 29, is not an act, but rather a condition, which is itself the result of continued acts of sin against light and knowledge, and of grieving the Holy Spirit. *Cf.* Eph. iv. 30 ; 1 S. John v. 16, 17 ; Heb. vi. 4–6, x. 26–29. See also the explanation of “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” given in the sixteenth Article of 1553, the text of which has been quoted above, p. 106.

Two points have been laid down :—

- (i.) That it is possible to fall into sin after Baptism.
- (ii.) Post-Baptismal sin is not the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost.

It follows, therefore, that :—

(3.) REPENTANCE IS NOT TO BE DENIED TO SUCH AS SIN AFTER BAPTISM.

The grant of repentance (*locus penitentiae*)¹ is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. . . . by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which . . . deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

Rom. xi. 23 ; 2 Cor. ii. 6–8 ; Gal. vi. 1 may be referred to, but Holy Scripture is full of exhortations to those who have once known the favour and grace of God, and have fallen from it, that they should “repent, and do the first works” (Rev. ii. 5).

¹ The expression is taken from Heb. xii. 17.

The question of penitential discipline, and of the advisability of restoring again to the communion of the Church those who had lapsed in time of persecution, agitated the Church in the time of S. Cyprian. Novatian and his fellows, who refused the place of repentance to those who had fallen away, were strongly opposed by him. Cf. Epistle LIV. :—

“It did not seem to be right, or agreeable to fatherly love or divine clemency, that the Church should be shut against such as knock for admission; that the comfort of the hope of salvation should be denied to those who grieve and sue for pardon; and that so they should leave this world, and go to God, without communion and peace with the Church, since our great Lawgiver, as He hath assured us that what is bound on earth shall be bound in heaven, so hath likewise promised that what is first loosed in the Church here, shall also be loosed in heaven ”

The Novatians, whose error was revived by some of the sectaries of the Reformation period, are expressly condemned in Article XII. of the AUGSBURG CONFESSION :—

“Damnantur et Novatiani, qui nolebant absolvere lapsos post baptismum redeuntes ad poenitentiam.”

See also SAXON CONFESSION, Article XVI., quoted above p. 107; and cf. the HOMILY OF REPENTANCE, p. 568 :—

“Whereupon we do not without a just cause detest and abhor the damnable opinion of them which do most wickedly go about to persuade the simple and ignorant people, that, if we chance, after we be once come to God, and grafted in His Son Jesus Christ, to fall into some horrible sin, repentance shall be unprofitable to us, there is no more hope of reconciliation, or to be received again into the favour and mercy of God.”

We may remark, in conclusion, that the case of S. Peter, as recorded in Holy Scripture, furnishes a good illustration of true doctrine on the points dealt with in our Article. It is manifest from our Lord's words in S. Matt. xvi. 17 that S. Peter had received grace; from this he fell when he denied his Lord, yet was restored and became the leader of the Apostolic band.

ARTICLE XVII

OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION. DE PRAEDESTINATIONE ET ELECTIONE.

Predestination to life, is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as

Prædestinatio ad vitam, est æternum Dei propositum, quo (ante jacta mundi fundamenta) suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit, eos quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque (ut vasa in honorem efficta) per Christum ad æternam salutem adducere: Unde qui tam præclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi Spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus vocantur: vocationi per gratiam parent: justificantur gratis: adoptantur in filios: unigeniti ejus Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes: in bonis operibus sancte ambulant: et demum ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam felicitatem.

Quemadmodum prædestinationis et electionis nostræ in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis, suavis et ineffabilis consolationis plena est vere piis et his qui sentiunt in se vim Spiritus Christi, facta carnis et membra quæ adhuc sunt super terram mortificantem, animumque ad coelestia et superna rapientem, tum quia fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum plurimum stabilit atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit: ita hominibus curiosis, carnalibus, et Spiritu

because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This Article is the composition of the English Reformers (1552-3).

In the teaching of Luther and those who followed him, the doctrine of Predestination held no very important place; hence in the famous and widely accepted Augsburg Confession, as also in the later Wurtemberg Confession, there is no Article on Predestination. Amongst the Reformed, however, and especially with Calvin, the subject assumed quite a fundamental importance. The intimacy of Cranmer with Bucer, Peter Martyr, and other leading divines belonging to the Swiss or Reformed school accounts for the place given to the treatment of Predestination in our Articles, and it is noteworthy that the language of this seventeenth Article presents a remarkable agreement with the definition of Predestination given by Peter Martyr in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans¹ (p. 411, folio ed. 1558):—

Dico igitur predestinationem esse sapientissimum propositum Dei, quo ante omnem aeternitatem decrevit constanter, eos quos

¹ It will be remembered that Peter Martyr resided in England for some years (1548-1553) during the reign of Edward VI., and enjoyed close friendship with Archbishop Cranmer. The words quoted above were not published until after he left England, but seem from the Preface to have been written as early as 1552, *i.e.*, about the same time as our Article.

Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari predestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est praecipitium, unde illos diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in aequae perniciosam impurissimae vitae securitatem.

Deinde promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositae sunt: et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in verbo Dei habemus discrete revelatam.

dilexit in Christo, vocare ad adoptionem filiorum, ad justificationem ex fide et tandem ad gloriam per bona opera, quo conformes fiant imagini Filii Dei, utque in illis declaretur gloria et misericordia Creatoris."

At the same time there are in this Article very important differences from the manner of stating the doctrine of Predestination which is found in the formularies of the Swiss school as influenced by Calvin,¹ and in the concluding paragraph (beginning "Furthermore we must receive God's promises") a resemblance may be traced to passages in the writings of Melancthon.² The middle paragraph resembles some passages in Bishop Barlowe's *Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions*.

In the Revision of 1563 two slight changes were made in the text of the Article:—

- (i.) The words "in Christo" (printed in thick type in the Latin Version) were added.
- (ii.) In 1553 the last paragraph began thus:—

"Furthermore, although the decrees of predestination are unknown unto us, yeat we must receive," &c.

This clause was altered to its present form.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The object of those who drew up the Article seems to have been to state, in view of the many altercations on this awful and mysterious subject, the doctrine of Predestination and Election in Scriptural terms, and to guard against the abuse to which it was seen to be liable.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) WHAT IS TO BE UNDERSTOOD BY PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

In the first part of the Article we have simply a statement of the doctrine of Predestination and Election in the phraseology of Scripture, without addition or comment.

Predestination to life, is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, (Eph. i. 4, 5, 11; Rom. viii. 28, 29, ix. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Tim. i. 9.)

¹ These important differences will be noted in the Exposition, § 3, below.

² Several passages are quoted from Melancthon by Archbishop Laurence in his Bampton Lectures, p. 179.

to deliver from curse and damnation, (Gal. iii. 13.)
 those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to
 bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, (Eph. i. 4, 6;
 1 S. Pet. i. 2-5.)
 as vessels made to honour. (Rom. ix. 21.)
 Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of
 God, be called according to God's purpose, by His Spirit
 working in due season: they through grace obey the calling:
 (Rom. viii. 28, 30; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Tim. i. 9.)
 they be justified freely: (Rom. iii. 24; viii. 30.)
 they be made sons of God by adoption: (Eph. i. 5; Gal. iii.
 26, iv. 5; Rom. viii. 15.)
 they be made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus
 Christ: (Rom. viii. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 18.)
 they walk religiously in good works, (Eph. i. 4; 1 Thess.
 iv. 7.)
 and at length by God's mercy they attain to everlasting felicity.
 (Eph. i. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 1 S. Pet. i. 2-5, v. 10.)

From the first it has been God's purpose to gather a
 Church out of the world; it is in fulfilment of this purpose
 that He now sends forth everywhere the preachers of the
 Gospel and *calls* men into His Church (Rom. i. 6, x. 14,
 15; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 12). Those who are thus
 called by God are regarded as chosen by Him from the
 mass of mankind, and are spoken of as His *elect* (Rom. viii.
 33, xi. 5, 7; Col. iii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 4; Tit. i. 1; 2 Tim.
 ii. 10; 1 S. Pet., ii. 9).¹ It is simply due to His
 sovereign will and pleasure that some have the privilege of
 admission to the Church offered to them, while others have
 not (Deut. x. 15; Eph. i. 4, 5; 1 S. Pet. ii. 9; and see
 especially S. Paul's argument in Rom. ix.-xi.). As to
 those who have not this privilege offered them, we may be
 sure that they will be judged each one according to his
 opportunities at the last day (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 11-
 16). With regard to those admitted to the Church, every
 one so elected is *predestinated* to salvation (*cf.* S. John vi.
 39), and has power to attain to it. In considering the
 famous passages in the Epistle to the Romans which are so

¹ The Christian Church has thus succeeded to the privilege of God's ancient
 people, which is spoken of in the Old Testament as *elect*. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Deut. vii. 6;
 Ps. xxxiii. 12.

often quoted in controversy on the subject of Predestination,
 we should note:—

- (i.) That in viii. 28-30 the verbs *προέγνω*, *προώρισε*, *ἐκάλεσε*,
ἐδικαίωσε, *ἐδόξασε*, are all in the past tense. The glory re-
 ferred to in the last of these is, therefore, not the future
 glory which those finally saved will enjoy in the world to
 come, but the present glory of Christians in the Church
 (*cf.* S. John xvii. 22; Eph. i. 18, ii. 6; Col. i. 26, 27).
 (ii.) That the analogy of the potter (ix. 21) does not in reality
 favour the doctrine it is sometimes quoted to support, since
 the potter makes no vessels for destruction.

In order that we may understand the relation of the teaching
 of our Article to other teaching upon the subject, we must
 observe particularly:—

- (a) *Nothing is said in the Article about reprobation, or pre-
 destination to eternal death.*

In this, as throughout, the Article is strictly on Scriptural
 lines. The election of some does not imply the final rejection of
 all the rest. God chooses some, not because He has no regard for
 those that remain, but in order that, by means of His elect, He
 may accomplish His good purpose for the whole race (Gen. xii.
 1-3, xviii. 18, 19; S. John xv. 16; Rom. xi. 25-32).

On the other hand, the doctrine of Reprobation is an integral
 part of Calvinism, and its entire omission forbids us to regard
 the doctrine of Predestination stated in the Article as in any
 sense Calvinistic.

Calvin's own teaching may be illustrated by one or two
 quotations:—

INSTITUTES, III. xxi. 5:

"Praedestinationem vocamus aeternum Dei decretum, quo apud
 se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet. Non
 enim pari conditione creantur omnes; sed aliis vita aeterna, aliis
 damnatio aeterna praecordinatur. Itaque prout in alterutrum finem
 quisque conditus est, ita vel ad vitam, vel ad mortem praedesti-
 natum dicimus."

Again, III. xxiii. 1:

"Multi quidem ac si invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, electionem
 ita fatentur ut negant quenquam reprobari: sed inscite nimis et
 pueriliter, quando ipsa electio nisi reprobationi opposita non staret.
 Dicitur segregare Deus quos adoptet in salutem; fortuito alios ."

adipisci, vel sua industria acquirere, quod sola electio paucis confert, plusquam insulse dicitur. Quos ergo Deus praeterit, reprobatur; neque alia de causa nisi quod ab haereditate quam filiis suis praedestinatur, illos vult excludere."

With our Article we may contrast the following statements of Calvinistic formulæ:—

FRENCH CONFSSION, Art. XII.:

"Credimus ex hac corruptione et damnatione universali, in qua omnes homines natura sunt submersi, Deum alios quidem eripere . . . alios vero in ea corruptione et damnatione relinquere."

LAMBETH ARTICLES, I.:

"Deus ab aeterno praedestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit."

CANONS OF DORT, "De Divina Praedestinatione," Art. VI.:

"Atque hic potissimum sese nobis aperit profunda, misericors pariter et justa hominum aequaliter perditorum discretio: sive decretum illud electionis et reprobationis in verbo Dei revelatum."

(b) *Nothing is said in the Article about the motive or cause of Predestination.*

According to Calvinism, the moving cause of Predestination, as also of Reprobation, is God's absolute will, irrespective of anything in those predestinated.

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, III. xxi. 5.:

"Eam (scil. praedestinationem) multis cavillis involvunt, praesertim vero qui praescientiam faciunt ejus causam."

Cf. III. xxii. 11.:

"Ergo si non possumus rationem assignare cur suos misericordia dignetur, nisi quoniam ita illi placet: neque etiam in aliis reprobatis aliud habebimus quam ejus voluntatem."

See also the second quotation given under the heading (a) above.

LAMBETH ARTICLES, II.:

"Causa movens aut efficiens praedestinationis ad vitam non est praevisio fidei aut perseverantiae, aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei quae insit in personis praedestinatibus, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei."

CANONS OF DORT, "De Divina Praedestinatione," Art. IX.:

"Eadem haec electio facta est non ex praevisa fide, fideique obedientia, sanctitate, aut alia aliqua bona qualitate et dispositione,

tanquam causa seu conditione in homine eligendo praerequisita, sed ad fidem, fideique obedientiam, sanctitatem." . . .

Art. X.:

"Causa vero hujus gratuita electionis est solum Dei beneplacitum."

WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, X. 2.:

"This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man."

According to Arminianism, on the other hand, the decree of Predestination is not arbitrary, but in consequence of God's foreknowledge that those predestinated will respond to His call and make good use of the grace given to them.

Cf. the Confession of the "Remonstrants," xvii. 3.:

"Est vocatio efficax ab eventu potius, quam a sola intentione Dei sic dicta, quae scilicet effectum suum salutarem reipsa sortitur, non quidem idcirco, quod ex praecisa salvandi intentione per singularem et arcanam quandam Dei sapientiam sic administratur, ut fructuose congruat voluntati ejus, qui vocatur, neque quod in ea efficaciter per potentiam irresistibilem aut vim quantam omnipotentem voluntas ejus, qui vocatur, ad credendum ita determinetur, ut non possit non credere et obedire." . . .

In the view of both Calvinists and Arminians election is considered to be to final glory, and by the elect are meant, therefore, *those eventually saved*. But, as we have seen, according to Scripture teaching, which our Article simply affirms, election is to membership in the Church, and the elect are therefore *the baptized*.¹ This is certainly the view of our Church in her public offices and in the Catechism. See the BAPTISMAL OFFICE, where we pray that the child about to be baptized "may ever remain in the number of God's faithful and *elect* children;" and again, in the Rubric at the end of the same service, we are assured, "It is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." So, too, in the CHURCH CATECHISM the baptized person is taught to express his belief in the Holy Ghost, Who sanctifieth him "and all the *elect* people of God."

¹ The baptized in general are constantly spoken of as "the elect" in the Letter of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, the Epistles of S. Ignatius, and in the "Shepherd" of Hermas.

With this doctrine of our Church the Calvinistic belief stands in sharp contrast, as expressed, *e.g.*, in the WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, X. 4:—

“Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved.”

(2.) PRACTICAL RESULTS OF THE CONSIDERATION OF PREDESTINATION.

(a) For the godly.

The godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things,

The consideration of God's Predestination and Election is thus full of comfort for His people, because—

- (i.) it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because
- (ii.) it doth fervently kindle their love towards God.

(b.) For the ungodly.

For curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall,

The compilers of the Article here evidently have in view the evil consequences which were seen to follow in some cases upon the consideration of the doctrine of Predestination as it was often taught and understood at the time.

whereby the devil doth thrust them either

- (i.) into desperation, or
- (ii.) into wretchlessness¹ of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Calvin himself admits that his doctrine of Predestination lies open to similar objection. See *e.g.*, INSTITUTES, III. xxiii. 12:

“Hoc quoque ad evertendam praedestinationem exagitant, quod ipsa stante, concidat omnis sollicitudo, et bene agendi

¹ *I.e.*, recklessness. Cf. Jewel's "Apology," Part I. cap. 3, § 5:

“For men to be careless about what is spoken by them and their own matter . . . is the part, doubtless, of dissolute and wretchless persons.”

studium. . . Ita omnes projicient se, et deploratum in morem, quocunque libido tulerit praecipites ibunt. Et sane non in universum mentiuntur.”

Cf. III. xxiv. 4:

“Et vero licet, periculosi maris instar habeatur praedestinationis disputatio; patet tamen in ea lustranda tuta et pacata, addo et jucunda navigatio, nisi quis periclitari ultro affectet. Nam quemadmodum in exitialem abyssum se ingurgitant, qui ut de sua electione fiant certiores, aeternum Dei consilium sine verbo, percontantur: ita qui recte atque ordine ipsam investigant qualiter in verbo continetur, eximium inde referunt consolationis fructum.”

(3.) THE DOCTRINE OF INDIVIDUAL PREDESTINATION REPUDIATED. Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: (See S. John iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6.)

The meaning is that we must receive God's promises as they are set forth to us, *viz.*, as applying to the 'genus humanum,' and not to some favoured individuals only.¹

Cf. the wording of HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION prefixed to the Articles in 1628:—

“That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures.”

See also REFORMATIO LEGUM, “De Haeresibus,” Cap. 22:—

“Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi sunt, ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta praedestinationis se non referant, sed universam vitae suae rationem ad Dei leges accomodent; cum et promissiones bonis, et minas malis, in Sacris Scripturis generaliter propositas contemplentur.”

In the light of this last paragraph, we should not omit to notice the manner in which the doctrine is stated in the first part of the Article. Predestination is there declared to be

¹ For the use of the adverb *generally* in the Article, *cf.* CHURCH CATECHISM:

“Q. How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?

A. Two only, as generally necessary to salvation.” . . .

See also 2 Sam. xvii. 11; Jer. xlvi. 38.

"the purpose of God whereby . . . He hath constantly decreed . . . to deliver from curse, &c., . . . and to bring . . . to eternal salvation," not individuals separately, but a certain class of persons as Christians collectively, "those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind."

Calvin's manner of stating the doctrine of Predestination should be carefully compared with this, and the vital difference will at once appear. See, *e.g.*, INSTITUTES, III. xxi. 5 :—

• "Prædestinationem vocamus æternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit quid *de unoquoque homine* fieri vellet.

"Itaque prout in alterutrum finem *quisque* conditus est, ita vel ad vitam vel ad mortem prædestinatum dicimus."

Again, III. xxi. 7 :—

"Quamquam satis liquet Deum occulto consilio libere quos vult eligere, aliis rejectis, nondum tamen nisi dimidia ex parte exposita est gratuita ejus electio, donec *ad singulas personas* ventum fuerit."

Further, in III. xxiv. 1 Calvin expressly says :—

"Aliquid disserui eorum errorem refellens, quibus generalitas promissionum videtur æquare totum humanum genus."

In this connection it is instructive to note that in the General Confession prefixed in 1552 to the Order for Morning and for Evening Prayer, which was based on a form composed in French by Calvin, the clause "According to Thy promises *declared unto mankind* in Christ Jesu our Lord" was added by our English Reformers.¹

The Article concludes :—

And in our doings that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God.

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 22 :—

"Debemus enim ad Dei cultum viis illis ingredi, et in illa Dei voluntate commorari, quam in Sacris Scripturis patefactam esse videmus."

This last clause of the Article is manifestly directed against those who held that, besides the revealed will of God (*cf.* 1 Tim.

¹ *Cf.* Article VII. :—

"Per Christum qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum Deus et homo, æterna vita *humano generi* est proposita."

ii. 4), there is also His secret will according to which He has elected only a few.

A few quotations may be given to indicate the position taken up by the Church of Rome in the controversy on the subject of Predestination. The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session VI.) decreed :—

"Nemo quoque, quamdiu in hac mortalitate vivitur, de arcano divinae prædestinationis mysterio usque adeo præsumere debet, ut certo statuat se omnino esse in numero prædestinatorum ; quasi verum esset, quod justificatus aut amplius peccare non possit, aut si peccaverit, certam sibi resipiscentiam promittere debeat : nam nisi ex speciali revelatione, sciri non potest quos Deus sibi elegerit."

Cf. Canon XVII. of the same session :—

"Si quis justificationis gratiam non nisi prædestinatis ad vitam contingere dixerit, reliquos vero omnes, qui vocantur, vocari quidem, sed gratiam non accipere, utpote divina potestate prædestinatos ad malum : anathema sit."