

THE PRINCIPLES OF THEOLOGY

AN INTRODUCTION TO
THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

*Formerly Professor of Systematic Theology, Wycliffe College, Toronto,
and sometime Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford*

Revised 1978

CONTENTS

| ARTICLE | PAGE |
|----------|--|
| | Introduction xvii |
| I. | Of Faith in the Holy Trinity 3 |
| II. | Of Christ the Son of God 32 |
| III. | Of His Going Down into Hell 65 |
| IV. | Of His Resurrection 73 |
| V. | Of The Holy Ghost 90 |
| VI. | Of the Sufficiency of the Scriptures 103 |
| VII. | Of the Old Testament 134 |
| VIII. | Of the Three Creeds 146 |
| IX. | Of Original or Birth-Sin 155 |
| X. | Of Free-Will 176 |
| XI. | Of Justification 184 |
| XII. | Of Good Works 199 |
| XIII. | Of Works before Justification 210 |
| XIV. | Of Works of Supererogation 215 |
| XV. | Of Christ Alone without Sin 223 |
| XVI. | Of Sin after Baptism 229 |
| XVII. | Of Predestination and Election 236 |
| XVIII. | Of Obtaining Salvation by Christ 258 |
| XIX. | Of the Church 265 |
| XX. | Of the Authority of the Church 281 |
| XXI. | Of the Authority of General Councils 291 |
| XXII. | Of Purgatory 298 |
| XXIII. | Of Ministering in the Congregation 313 |
| XXIV. | Of Speaking in the Congregation 339 |
| XXV. | Of the Sacraments 345 |
| XXVI. | Of the Unworthiness of Ministers 365 |
| XXVII. | Of Baptism 371 |
| XXVIII. | Of the Lord's Supper 388 |
| XXIX. | Of the Wicked Which Eat Not the Body of Christ 406 |
| XXX. | Of Both Kinds 411 |
| XXXI. | Of Christ's One Oblation 414 |
| XXXII. | Of the Marriage of Priests 429 |
| XXXIII. | Of Excommunicate Persons 434 |
| XXXIV. | Of the Traditions of the Church 439 |
| XXXV. | Of the Homilies 447 |
| XXXVI. | Of Consecrating of Ministers 452 |
| XXXVII. | Of Civil Magistrates 461 |
| XXXVIII. | Of Christian Men's Goods 480 |
| XXXIX. | Of a Christian Man's Oath 483 |
| | Conclusion 485 |
| | Appendix 495 |
| | Books for Further Study 526 |
| | Index 532 |
| | Index of Scriptural References 542 |

INTRODUCTION

REVELATION¹

THE word "Revelation" almost suggests its own meaning of the unveiling of something hidden. It corresponds to the Greek word "Apocalypse," or "Uncovering" (Rev. i. 1). In the present connection the word refers to the Revelation of God, the "Unveiling" of the Unseen God to the mind and heart of man. While the term is variously applied,² there are certain specific uses which call for definite consideration. (1) There is the Revelation of God through Nature, referring to the indications of wisdom, power, and purpose in the world around (Rom. i. 20). (2) There is the Revelation of God in Man, referring to the traces of God's "image and likeness" in man's conscience, emotional nature and personality in general, involving the consciousness of obligation, the desire for fellowship, and the craving for satisfaction. (3) There is the Revelation of God in History, which means the marks of an over-ruling Providence in the affairs of the human race, and the traces of a progress in the history of nations and mankind in general. (4) There is the Revelation of God in Judaism. The Old Testament involves and records a special supernatural communication of God to man, a disclosure of His character and relationship. (5) There is the Revelation of God in Christianity. This is the crowning feature of God's self-manifestation in the Person of Christ for human redemption.

The problem of Revelation is the correlation of the supernatural disclosure of the character, purpose, and grace of God with the historical and fragmentary process by means of which this progressive revelation has become a received tradition.³ It is essential that justice be done both to the supernatural fact and also to the human elements of the Revelation. In the course of this we are brought face to face with the antitheses of Revelation and discovery, of Revelation and speculation, of Revelation and evolution; and while accepting to the full all historical processes we are led to the conviction (1) that Christianity is only adequately explained as a Personal Revelation of God, Who used and guided history for this purpose; and (2) that history, discovery, philosophy, and

¹ This section is summarised from the writer's article "Revelation," in Hastings' *One Volume Bible Dictionary*. The subject is also treated with great fulness and force in the earlier part of *Revelation and Inspiration*, by Orr.

² The widest use is found in Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*, Vol. I, p. 5, "Any fact which gives knowledge is a revelation . . . the revelation and the knowledge of God are correlative terms."

³ 2 Cor. iii. 14 illustrates both aspects, objective and subjective, of the "unveiling."

evolution are simply the means or channels by which the Revelation has come.

The possibility of Revelation is based on two grounds: (1) The Being of God as Supreme (which for the moment we assume) must necessarily be able to reveal Himself. A Personal God necessarily involves the power of a self-revelation. Theistic belief makes Revelation possible. (2) The nature of man bears the same testimony, for the fact of his personality with all its desires and possibilities involves a capacity for communion with a being higher than himself.

The probability of Revelation is also based on two grounds: (1) Granted a Supreme Personal Being, we are compelled to predicate His willingness as well as His ability to reveal Himself. Even human personality with its desire for self-revelation makes a revelation of God antecedently probable. (2) The needs of man point in the same direction, for as man, and still more as a sinner, he needs a Divine Revelation to guide and guard, to support and strengthen him amidst the problems and dangers of life.

The proofs of Divine Revelation are varied, converging, and cumulative. (1) Speculatively, we argue that "the universe points to idealism, and idealism to theism, and theism to a Revelation."¹ (2) Historically, the Christian religion comes to us commended by the testimony of (a) miracle; (b) prophecy; and (c) spiritual adaptation to human needs. (3) Behind these are the presuppositions of natural religion, as seen in nature, man and history. (4) But ultimately the credibility of Christianity as a Revelation rests on the Person of its Founder, and all evidences converge towards and centre in Him. The fact that God has made other manifestations of Himself in the course of history does not set aside the culmination of Revelation in the Person of Christ. All truth, however mediated, has come from the primal source of truth, and the genuineness of Christianity does not set aside the genuineness of other religions as "broken lights." The real criterion of all religions claiming to be Divine is their power to save. Not truth in itself, but truth in life, and truth as redemptive, constitutes the final and supreme test of religion.

The method of the Christian Revelation is first and foremost one of *Life*; that is, it is a revelation of a Person to persons. Christianity is primarily a religion of facts with doctrines arising out of the facts. All through the historic period of God's manifestation, from patriarchal times to the period of Christ and His Apostles, Revelation was given to life and manifested through Personality. But the Divine life has been expressed in *Word*, first oral and then written. Both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament we see first what God was and did to men, and afterwards what He said. So that while we distinguish between the Revelation and the Record, the former being necessarily prior to the latter, yet the Revelation needed the Record for accuracy, and also for

¹ Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*, p. 243.

accessibility to subsequent ages. Then, too, Scripture is not merely a record of Revelation, for the history itself is a Revelation of God. While from one point of view the Bible is a product of the Divine process of self-manifestation, on the other the Bible itself makes God known to man. It is in this sense that Christianity, like Judaism before it, is a book religion (though it is also much more), as recording and conveying the Divine manifestation to man. A Revelation must be embodied if it is to be made available for all generations, and the one requirement is that the medium of transmission shall be accurate. Christ as our Supreme Authority needs for His manifestation to all ages the clearest and purest available form.

Revelation having been mediated through history has of necessity been progressive. The first stage was primitive Revelation. How men first came to think of God is, and probably must remain, a matter of conjecture, for as so little is known about primitive man there must also be little known about primitive religion. One thing, however, is clear, that the terms "savage" and "primitive" are not synonymous, for the savage of to-day represents a degeneration from primitive man. Analogy favours the idea that primitive Revelation was a sufficient manifestation of God to enable man to receive and retain a true relation with his Creator; that man, when created, had an immediate capacity for entering into fellowship with God, and with this religious endowment we assume a measure of Divine Revelation sufficient to enable man to worship in an elementary way, and to remain true to God. Some such assumption is necessary for the very conception of Revelation, unless we are to resolve religion into merely human conjectures about God. There is no argument against primitive Revelation which is not valid against all Revelation, Christianity included. Then followed in due course the Revelation of God in the Old Testament, and whatever views may be held as to its origin and character it is impossible to avoid being conscious of something in it beyond what is merely human and historical. It does not merely represent human endeavours after worthier ideas of God; it records a true idea of God impressed on the people in the course of history under definite direction. The Old Testament presentation of God is so different from that which obtained elsewhere that apart from a supernatural Revelation it is impossible to account for so marked a difference between peoples who were in other respects so much alike. The New Testament Revelation was the crown and culmination of the Divine self-manifestation. It was given at a particular time, mediated through one Person, and authenticated by supernatural credentials. In Jesus Christ the self-disclosure of God reached its climax, and the New Testament is the permanent, written embodiment of the uniqueness of Christianity in the world. "God, who in ancient days spoke to our forefathers in many distinct messages and by various methods through the prophets, has at the end of these days spoken to us through a Son" (Heb. i. 1, 2; Weymouth).

The purpose of Revelation is also life, God's life, to be received and possessed by man. This practical character is marked everywhere. The "chief end of Revelation" is not philosophy, or doctrine, or enjoyment, or even morality. Christianity has these, but is far more than them all. It is the religion of Redemption, including Salvation past, present, and future. The "chief end" of God's self-manifestation is the union of God and man, and in that union the fulfilment of all the Divine purposes for the world. Man is to receive God's grace, recognise His will, reproduce His character, render Him service, and rejoice in His presence here and hereafter.

FAITH

Literature.—Moule, *Faith: Its Nature and Work*; Inge, *Faith and Its Psychology*; Johnston, *A Scientific Faith*; Edgell, *Faith and Fact* (Index, s.v. "Faith"); Warfield, "Faith in its Psychological Aspects" (*Princeton Theological Review*, Vol. IX, p. 537); Mabie, *Under the Redeeming Ægis*, Ch. V.

The subject of Revelation naturally leads on to that of Faith, which is a matter of vital importance to Christianity and the Christian. Faith is the human attitude to the Divine Revelation, the attitude of the soul to Christ as the manifestation of God. Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and Faith is the means of man's coming to God by Him (Matt. xi. 27; John i. 18; xiv. 6). It is not difficult to understand the interest and importance of Faith. As it is the foundation principle of earthly life in every aspect of relationship, from that of childhood through school days to maturity, in personal, social, commercial, and national affairs, so it enters into religion, and we are thus able to see the meaning of the words, "Without faith it is impossible to please Him" (Heb. xi. 6). Trust is the only adequate answer to God's Revelation. Just as the absence of faith makes it impossible for human beings to have any dealings with each other, so the absence of faith in God makes it wholly impossible for us to have any association with Him. "He that cometh to God must believe" (Heb. xi. 6). Trust is thus the correlative of truth. Faith in man answers to grace in God. As such, it affects the whole of man's nature. It commences with the conviction of the mind based on adequate evidence; it continues in the confidence of the heart or emotions based on the above conviction, and it is crowned in the consent of the will, by means of which the conviction and confidence are expressed in conduct. This is perhaps the meaning of the words, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb. xi. 1). The passage is not so much a definition of faith as a description of it in relation to life, and as such it is illustrated by the examples of faith throughout that chapter. Thus faith is the outgoing of the whole nature to what it believes to be true, or rather, to Him Who is held to be the Truth. It is this that Hooker meant when he spoke of faith as including (1) the certainty of evidence, and (2) the certainty of

adherence. Faith is not blind, but intelligent, since it rests on the conviction of the authority of Christ as Teacher, Saviour, and Lord. The threefold Revelation of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King, revealing, redeeming, and ruling, is met by the response of the whole life, intellect, emotion, and will. This combination of all the elements in human nature involves a moral decision which is illustrated in almost every part of the New Testament (Acts ii. 41; xvii. 11; 1 Thess. i. 5; Jas. i. 21).

But it is necessary to note that the word Faith is also used for the substance of doctrine as well as for the attitude of the soul, for *fides quæ creditur* as well as *fides qua creditur*. This is sometimes spoken of as "the Faith," meaning the Christian truth which is everywhere believed among Christians. It is seen in such expressions as "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3, R.V.); "the common faith" (Tit. i. 4); "the faith of the Gospel" (Phil. i. 27). This twofold use of the term "Faith" necessitates the greatest possible care in distinguishing between believing truths and trusting a Person. The Church Catechism first of all refers to believing "all the articles of the Christian Faith"; that is, the various parts or points of the Christian religion. But this is only a means to an end, since the supreme object of Christian faith can be none other than God Himself. Consequently, the Catechism appropriately follows the rehearsal of the Creed by the Question and Answer, "What dost thou chiefly learn by these articles of thy belief?" "I learn to believe in God." It is only too possible to believe with an intellectual conviction the facts and truths of Christianity, and yet to fall short of full trust in God. When we read that the devils believe and tremble (Jas. ii. 19), we see the difference between intellectual conviction and personal trust. These two elements of faith are found from time to time in Holy Scripture. Thus our Lord speaks in one passage, first, of "hearing His Word;" that is, receiving and accepting intellectually what He said; and, then, of believing on God Who sent Him; that is, personal trust in God arising out of the acceptance of Christ's Word (John v. 24). Nothing short of the latter can satisfy the requirements of the Christian religion.¹ All facts and truths are intended as the food, warrant, and inspiration of full trust, and are intended only to lead to this outgoing of the whole soul in personal confidence in and dependence on God. Danger lies in the frequent implication that man only needs instruction, while overlooking the solemn truth that by reason of sin he needs illumination as well. So that while the intellect is not to be neglected, faith is very much more than knowledge. It is not mere belief in a thought, or conception, or idea. It is the expression of the whole nature of man in response to God's approach in Christ. As such, it involves personal committal and confidence. Conviction alone stops short with orthodoxy, and is liable to lead to formalism, but to be orthodox

¹ Bishop Pearson (*Creed*, Article I) quoting Durandus, says: " '*credere in Deum* ' non est præcise actus fidei, sed fidei et caritatis simul."

is not to be saved. Faith is the surrender of the soul to God and the appropriation of the grace which saves. Correct views of Christ are essential and vital. It behoves us to be thoroughly acquainted with the facts and truths of the Christian religion related to the Person of Christ, His Resurrection, the Holy Spirit, the Bible, and all else. But it must not be assumed that all is settled when the facts of the Christian religion are guaranteed and understood. We may inspect the records and make sure of the history and all the while may only obtain information about God without a personal experience of Him in the soul. Intellectual beliefs are valuable as means to ends, but not as ends themselves. In all true faith, therefore, there will of necessity be the three elements of knowledge, assent, and confidence, and anything short of these will never give the full Christian trust. The knowledge of God consists in sympathetic understanding of His character. We only know our friends so far as mutual sympathy gives us insight into their real nature. There are certain distinctions in the original languages of the Creeds, the Latin of the Apostles' Creed and the Greek of the Nicene Creed, which help to make this clear. In Latin *Credo Deum (esse)* means, "I believe God exists"; *Credo Deo*, "I believe what God says"; *Credo in Deum*, "I trust God."¹

When once we have learned that God is the True Object of faith and we have been made acquainted with the substance of Christian truth, we naturally enquire what precisely we are to believe about God as essential, as distinct from that which is purely accidental. Our enquiry is met by being directed to Holy Scripture. This is the guide and standard of our faith, and the supreme authority as to what we are to believe. We shall see in Article VI that this is the fundamental principle of the Church of England. "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." God has given His people a written Revelation of Himself, and this tells us clearly all that it is necessary for us to know about God. The more we ponder this Revelation the more we shall learn to know and trust God Who is revealed here. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Rom. x. 17). The Bible is therefore of first importance for Christian knowledge and life. In theological language it is "the Rule of Faith," affording us information about truth and preserving us against error. The Creeds which we accept and hold are summaries of what the Bible contains, and are subordinate to the Bible as a secondary Rule of Faith.

¹ "In every movement of faith, therefore, from the lowest to the highest, there is an intellectual, an emotional, and a voluntary element, though naturally these elements vary in their relative prominence in the several movements of faith. This is only as much as to say that it is the man who believes, who is the subject of faith, and the man in the entirety of his being as man" (Warfield, *Princeton Theological Review*, Vol. IX, p. 566).

DOCTRINE

The New Testament has two words for *doctrine*, *διδασκαλία*, and *διδασκαλία* (2 Tim. iv. 2, 3; Tit. i. 9). Both together they occur about fifty times. The word "doctrine" itself is colourless, and is therefore used for truth and error: (a) doctrine of God (Tit. ii. 10); of Christ (2 John 9); "sound" (1 Tim. i. 10); "good" (1 Tim. iv. 6). (b) Of men (Col. ii. 22); of demons (1 Tim. iv. 1); every wind (Eph. iv. 14); divers and strange (Heb. xiii. 9). This necessitates the use of the term "Christian" doctrine to express the truths of Divine Revelation, and perhaps we may define Christian doctrine as the fundamental truths of revelation arranged in systematic form. Dogma, like other Greek words in *μα*, stands for something fixed, completed, *quod statutum est*.¹

THEOLOGY

The term "theology" is used for the scientific expression of all truths relating to divine revelation. Just as nature has to be distinguished from science, so has revelation from theology. Science is the technical expression of the laws of nature; theology is the technical expression of the revelation of God. It is the province of theology to examine all the spiritual facts of revelation, to estimate their value, and to arrange them into a body of teaching. Doctrine thus corresponds with the generalisations of science. Theology, as the science of religion, is concerned with all the phenomena of revelation recorded in Holy Scripture.

Special attention has been given of recent years to what is now known as Biblical Theology, which means theology drawn direct from the Bible and formulated along the lines in which it is there presented. It possesses at once variety and unity; variety, because it was not given all at once, but at stages; unity, because the Bible is held to contain a complete view of theological thought. It is the work of Biblical Theology to set forth this variety and unity of truth.

Dogmatic Theology is the systematised statement of truth deduced from the Bible, the intellectual expression in technical language of what is contained in the Word of God. Martensen defines dogmatics as "the science which presents and proves the Christian doctrines regarded as forming a connected system."² Dogmatic Theology is not necessarily non-Biblical, and Biblical Theology itself depends on the standpoint of the writer.³

¹ "A dogma is not a δόξα, not a subjective, human opinion, not an indefinite, vague notion; nor is it a mere truth of reason, whose universal validity can be made clear with mathematical or logical certainty: it is a truth of *faith*, derived from the authority of the word and revelation of God;—a positive truth, therefore, positive not merely by virtue of the positiveness with which it is laid down, but also by virtue of the authority with which it is sealed" (Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 1).

² *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 1.

³ "Biblical or New Testament theology deals with the thoughts, or the mode of thinking, of the various New Testament writers; systematic theology is the independent

There is obvious danger in every attempt at systematising Christian truth, as we may see from the great works of men like Aquinas and Calvin. The human mind is unable to find a place for every single Christian doctrine, and it is far better to be content with "Articles," or "points," with gaps unfilled, because it is impossible for thought to be covered by them. General lines of Christian truth are far safer and also truer to the growth of thought and experience through the ages. This method prevents teaching becoming hardened into a cast-iron system which cannot expand. It is the virtue of the Church of England Articles that they take this line and do not commit Churchmen to an absolute, rigid system of doctrine from which there is no relief and of which there is no modification.

CREEDS, CONFESSIONS, AND ARTICLES

Faith is response to divine revelation, and confession is the expression of faith.

"What song is to the victory it celebrates, confession is to the religious spirit. . . . Religion, like Science, not only seeks and finds the hid treasures of truth, but is fain to cry 'Eureka.' . . . Religion only betrays an instinct which is universal throughout all the higher interests and activities of humanity when it thus gives utterance, in language as august as lips can frame, to its mature convictions."¹

Every religion has a Creed in one form or another, and we are therefore not surprised to find that the confession of the Christian faith has taken various shapes through the ages. The Creed, properly so-called, is a short, comprehensive statement of belief suitable for discipleship and worship. The earliest form of this was personal, expressive of personal confidence in Christ; it was the natural outcome of the possession of spiritual life. But even here the intellect was necessarily involved, for to believe in Christ was to take up some intellectual attitude in relation to Him. Very soon a more elaborate confession of faith was felt to be necessary, and in due course enquiry and examination at Baptism led to further tests and requirements. Later on the pressure of various heresies accentuated the need of a careful statement of the Christian position.

The making of Creeds may be said to have covered the first four centuries of the Christian era, and then nothing of importance in this respect happened until the dawn of new light and life in the sixteenth century, when confessions of faith and full statements of specific belief

construction of Christianity as a whole in the mind of a later thinker. Here again there is a broad and valid distinction, but not an absolute one. It is the Christian thinking of the first century in the one case, and of the twentieth, let us say, in the other; but in both cases there is Christianity and there is thinking, and if there is truth in either, there is bound to be a place at which the distinction disappears" (Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 5).

¹ W. A. Curtis, *History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, p. 2.

arose in connection with the Reformation movement. There had been debates and discussions in the Middle Ages, but they were not theological and Christological. There seems to have been no desire to reopen problems settled ages before by the great Councils, but there was much thought and no little discussion on such matters as the Church, Ministry, Sacraments, and personal religion. When, however, the various Reformed Churches broke loose from Rome it was found essential to state their position with reference to the specific reasons for protest. As a result we find entire agreement on fundamental facts with very different expressions of the specific applications of those facts.

Credo and Confessions are sometimes contrasted to the detriment of the latter, but a study of the historical order of emergence of these documents of the faith suggests a comparison rather than a contrast. As we follow in order the three Creeds themselves, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, we find that there is a tendency to elaboration, to a fuller theological statement, and to an explanation of what is involved in the original summary of belief. The confessions of faith in the sixteenth century are really only an extension, prolongation, and development of the same process.

If it be said that these Articles and other documents of the sixteenth century are incomplete, and do not provide an adequate statement of belief, it may be pointed out that the same is true of the Creeds. There are many subjects unnoticed in the ecumenical documents of our faith, and we believe this is one of the instances in which the Church has been definitely guided by God. The Church Universal is only committed to a comparatively few fundamental realities, and we might as well complain of the incompleteness of any of the three Creeds as criticise the incompleteness of any of the sixteenth-century Confessions of Faith. They must be judged in the light of the circumstances which gave them birth, and with strict and constant regard to their specific purpose.

THE ANGLICAN ARTICLES

The Thirty-nine Articles have a threefold value and importance:—

(a) Historical: in relation to their origin. They are part of the Reformation position and protest. Definition was necessary on the part of all who differed from Rome, and as a result all the Reformed Churches drew up their protest in the form of Confessions, or Articles. Our Articles are thus not only analogous to documents of Continental Churches, but were also influenced by them. They cannot be separated from their historical root in relation to Rome. They mark the position of the Church of England as it was re-stated in the sixteenth century, and they are equally important now for the same reason. They still mark our present position and attitude.

Another aspect of the connection of the Articles with Rome lies in the fact that they were written by men who had been taught and trained

in the system of Roman theology, and a knowledge of the Roman Catholic controversy is therefore essential to a full understanding of the Articles. But in addition to the necessity of declaring their attitude against Rome, the Reformers were compelled to take action against dangers from the opposite direction. The inevitable swing of the intellectual and moral pendulums had produced serious errors of many kinds, and these were being charged by Rome on all Reformers and attributed to the Reformation movement in general. It was therefore essential not only to define what the true Reformation position was, but also to do everything possible to safeguard its members from reactionary or other errors which had become rife in different localities.

(b) Doctrinal: in relation to Church doctrine. They are of supreme value as giving the standard of Church of England doctrine on (1) points identical with the doctrines of other Churches, and on (2) points characteristic of our own position. They give with exactness, balance, and fulness the supreme voice of our Church on all matters covered therein.

(c) Practical: in relation to the Christian life. The Articles express the intellectual position involved in being a believer, the explicit, intellectual sign of what is spiritually implicit from the first moment of faith in Christ. When He is accepted as Saviour, Lord, and God, everything else is involved and possessed in germ. We commence by *faith* and go on to *knowledge*. It is inevitable that we should think out our position. St. Peter tells us to be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in us (1 Pet. iii. 15), and we see the natural order of experience followed by expression. (1) Hope possessed; (2) having a reason for our hope; (3) giving a reason. The intellectual grasp of Christianity is essential for a strong Christian life, for giving balance and force to experience, for protection against error, for equipment for service. It is possible to be thought spiritual and yet to be only emotional without intellectual clearness and power. This will inevitably produce weakness and lead to the earnest soul becoming a prey to error from one side or another.

It is easy to decry doctrine, and yet the power of science to-day is in its dogmas, not in its generalisations. Great ideas, like the conservation of energy, gravitation, the indestructibility of matter, as held and taught by scientists, are a great power. In the same way Christianity must be strong in its ideas of the personality of God, the Person and Work of Christ, the Holy Spirit, and other related truths. If it be said that religion is possible without doctrine, it may be fully admitted, and yet the question at once arises of what sort will it be. It can only be suited to spiritual childhood, not manhood. Great music involves the theory of music, and a religion without theory will be like a babe with love, but with no ideas. It is doctrine that makes grown men. It is simply impossible to have a religion worthy of the name without some dogma.¹

¹ "Undogmatic religion is, strictly speaking, a contradiction in terms. Dogma is not indeed like Faith, the living spirit of religion; but it is at least the skeleton of all

It is, of course, essential to remember that theology is not merely a matter of intellect, but also of experience. Theology is concerned with spiritual realities, and must include personal experience as well as ideas. *Pectus facit theologum.* This association of theology with experience will always prevent the former from continuing merely abstract and philosophical. Dogmatics, as Martensen points out, must come from within the Church, and not from outside. It is a science of faith, with faith as its basis and source.¹ In past days theology has been too closely limited to metaphysics, intellectualism, and philosophy. The Articles bear the marks of this tendency of the age which produced them. But while the intellectual element must necessarily always be at the basis of every presentation of Christian truth, the intellect is not the only, perhaps not the dominant factor, and other elements must enter. The feeling equally with the reason must share in the consideration of theology, because theology is of the heart, and the deepest truths are inextricably bound up with personal needs and experiences. The moral consciousness of man must also find a place and conscience be allowed to take its part in the provision of a true Creed. This is only one instance out of many which proves the impossibility of limiting ourselves to that which is merely rational, and also the absolute necessity of emphasising the personal and ethical in our discussion of theology. Time was when Dogmatics and Ethics were separated, and the latter regarded as subsidiary and supplementary to the former. But this is not possible to-day. A theology which is not ethical, while it includes ethics, cannot be rightly called theology.²

But here again we must not allow ourselves to go to the opposite extreme and refuse a place to metaphysics and philosophy in our consideration and construction of Christian theology. It is impossible to keep our view of Christianity in any watertight compartment, be it purely intellectual, or purely emotional, or purely ethical. As Christianity speaks to every part of our nature, so every part must take its share in the reception and expression of Christian theology.

Our study of doctrine must therefore include the consideration of embodied religion, the framework, however transitory, of the physical organisation of its life. Faith that is real will out. Faith that is uttered in dogma, like life that is born, may perish; but it is the medium of a manifested spiritual life, mortal like flesh and blood, but like them with a sanctity of its own" (W. A. Curtis, *op. cit.*, p. 3).

¹ "It springs out of the perennial, juvenile vigour of faith, out of the capacity of faith to unfold from its own depths a wealth of treasures of wisdom and of knowledge, to build up a kingdom of acknowledged truths, by which it illumines itself as well as the surrounding world" (*op. cit.*, p. 3).

² Fragment of a conversation between a Professor of Moral Science in an American College and a student just about to graduate from a certain Theological Seminary:

Professor: "Are you entirely satisfied with your course in theology?"

Student: "No, the course has been of value to me, but it has one lack."

Professor: "What? I am interested."

Student: "In studying the Bible and Christian doctrine no connection was anywhere made with moral science."

Professor: "I am not surprised. The theologian is quite wont to forget that a sinner is a man" (O. A. Curtis, *The Christian Faith*, p. 2).

God as its Object of Faith, and the Standard of duty, and the relation between God and man must be shown to include both worship and work, attitude and action, creed and conduct. Our doctrine of Theism, of Christology, of the Holy Spirit, of Divine sovereignty, of the Atonement, of sin, of justification, and the rest, must be closely and constantly related to life in every part if it is to be of weight in modern days. While not making human feeling the sole standard of truth, or human duty the test of theological accuracy, we must certainly enquire whether our intellectual conception of truth possesses ethical vitality, whether it makes for practical righteousness. History in the past warns us against the tendency to allow the intellectual aspects of Christianity to become abstract. We see this in the dreary wastes of controversy which followed Chalcedon, and again in the era of Protestant scholasticism which followed the warm, living experience of the Reformation Age. On the other hand, recent theological discussions have given us an equally grave warning against the tendency to rest in anything merely emotional without satisfying ourselves of its intellectual validity. Modern impatience against dogma, whether on the part of the Ritschlian theologian, or of "the man in the street," springs essentially from the same fundamental source, and is a phase of that practical agnosticism which would insist that no valid knowledge of God and His truth is possible. We must therefore preserve the mean between these two extremes, neither excluding ethics from theology, nor regarding theology as "a footnote to morality." When Creeds, Confessions, and Articles are thus related to every part of personality—mind, emotion, conscience, and will—we may feel sure that our theology is what it ought to be.

The sole and sufficient guarantee of Christian doctrine being at once intellectual and experimental is its constant and close association with the Person of Jesus Christ. In order to avoid anything dry and lifeless we must relate every truth to the living Person of Him Who declared, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." When it is realised that "Christianity is Christ," that Christ Himself is the substance, source, and spring of all doctrine, our theology will be truly Christian.

THE HISTORY OF THE ARTICLES

INTRODUCTION

THE Thirty-nine Articles must be viewed as part of a large number of Confessions issued about the same time. Definition of their position was essential on the part of the Reformers, and our Articles were both suggested by Continental Confessions and also influenced by them. For centuries abuses in the Church had been recognised and almost wholly unheeded, but forces were at work which paved the way for Reformation.¹ The movement in the sixteenth century was a return to the pure and simple faith of Christianity as embodied in Holy Scripture.

There is no distinction in character between our Articles and the Continental formularies such as the Lutheran Confessions. Though Luther and Calvin each emphasised particular doctrines which had been overlain or misrepresented, our formularies show the general attitude of Reformed belief as against Rome. The Reformation was mainly personal, concerned with the application of truth, and there was no desire or intention of questioning the fundamental theistic articles of the Creeds.² Indeed, it is interesting to notice that while the Reformers insisted on the supremacy of Scripture they were anxious to show that their views were also in accord with, and so far subordinated to, the Creeds of the Church.

An additional need for the formulation of the Reformed position was found in the excesses of the Anabaptists and others. The Renaissance was an intellectual new birth, and it is not surprising that on the discovery that much which had hitherto been held sacrosanct was really spurious, some went to extremes and denied the fundamental faith as well as the accretions of Rome. Superstition produces infidelity by a natural reaction. It was therefore necessary for the Reformers to

¹ "Beneath the rigorously smoothed and levelled surface of mediæval Christendom there lay but thinly covered the fruitful seeds of the various outgrowths of the Reformation. It is easy now to discern how far-reaching was the doctrinal and practical preparation for the great movement. For centuries before the crisis was reached, over against the demand of the Roman Curia that all learning and all thought, as well as all political and ecclesiastical life, should be organised in subjection to it, influences had been at work to stimulate freedom of thought and action" (W. A. Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, p. 126).

² "Not the Person and Work of Christ or of the Holy Spirit, not the doctrine of the Divine Trinity, but the doctrines of the means of grace, Church, Ministry, Sacraments, and Scripture, of the processes involved in personal salvation, and of the use of mediators other than the Son of God, were the themes at issue" (W. A. Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 127).

state their position, and in the face of enemies to distinguish themselves from those who went to the extreme of denial. Nor may we overlook the fact that some statement of Protestant belief was required for the guidance and test of those who were, or wished to be, ministers of the Reformed Gospel. To preach the truth men must know that for which our Reformers stood.

We must therefore judge the character of these formularies of the sixteenth century by the circumstances of their origin and composition. They were due to fierce current controversies, and any resulting disproportion must be taken into consideration.¹

LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS

Literature.—W. A. Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, Ch. VIII; Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, Chs. I and II; Maclear and Williams, *Introduction to the Articles*, Ch. II.

Luther's early efforts against Rome naturally involved an attempt at doctrinal formulation, and the way was gradually prepared for a detailed statement which sooner or later was inevitable. The Greater and Lesser Catechisms of Luther (1527-1529) had great influence in Germany, but something much more definite and theological was soon required. The older Creeds were mainly concerned with the doctrines of the Godhead, but as the Reformation was essentially personal in addition, a Confession of this type was needed. But a special cause was also at work. Some German States were in danger of suppression by the Emperor for their Reformed opinions. The Diet of Spires (or Speier), 1529, protested against any forcing of conscience in religious matters, and so in 1530 a Diet met at Augsburg and stated its beliefs. There had been two or three earlier, but more limited, statements like the Articles of Schwabach, 1529, and of Torgau, 1530, but the Confession of Augsburg was by far the most important document of the Reformation, and has attained a permanent position and value.² This was drawn up by Melancthon and Luther, subscribed June 1530, and

¹ "They all bear the marks of their birth-time and birth-place, and it is to the distinctive and often transitory features in them that they draw our chief attention. It is unjust to judge them without regard to their origin and their purpose. Few, if any, of them were fair-weather or leisurely productions laid out for academic criticism or appreciation. Many of them were the work of hunted, outlawed men, and were sealed with martyr blood. They were literally *extempore*" (W. A. Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 128).

² "The 'Augustana' (or Confession of Augsburg) is the classical statement of Lutheran doctrine, and has remained to the present day the bond between all Lutheran Churches. Its dignified simplicity, its temperate tone, and its Christian spirit have endeared it to successive generations, and have made it the model as well as the mother of later Confessions. Portions of it have become obsolete. The piety and thought it has fostered have outgrown their original vestments. But its profound loyalty to the best traditions of the Catholic Church and the great Fathers, its faithfulness to Scripture, none the less impressive because it is unlaboured and unobtrusive, and its deep note of evangelical experience, have secured for it a sacred place, perhaps beyond all other Confessions, in the living faith of its ministers and people" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 142 f.).

publicly read. It consisted of two parts : (1) Faith, covering twenty-one Articles ; (2) Abuses, covering seven Articles. Thus it is concerned with positive beliefs and protests against abuses. There was a strong desire for reformation within the Church, if at all possible.¹ But though signed by representatives of Church and State it failed to accomplish its purpose of producing peace, and soon gave rise to further developments in the reforming direction. Yet it left its mark on all subsequent documents, and abides to this day as a monument of influence in Lutheran Churches.

The next Reformation Confession is known as the Articles of Schmalcald, 1537, which have been described as "Luther's last contribution to the Confessions of Protestantism." There was the expectation of a Council at Mantua, summoned by Pope Paul III, and Luther prepared these Articles for presentation to that assembly. There was no intention on the part of Protestants to appear at Mantua, but it was thought necessary to state the Protestant view, and Luther did so without any qualification. This statement of belief did much to bring about the final separation.

Other documents were the Saxon Confession, 1551, and the Confession of Wurtemberg, 1552, drawn up respectively by Melanchthon and Brentius in view of the meeting of the Council of Trent. The latter consisted of Thirty-five Articles framed on the model of the Confession of Augsburg.

Of all these Lutheran documents the two of most importance for the Church of England were the Confessions of Augsburg and Wurtemberg. The former, as we shall see later on, influenced the Articles of 1553,² and the latter those of 1563.

Other Lutheran documents were subsequently forthcoming in connection with Reformation controversies which came to a head in the Formula Concordiæ, the authoritative books of the Lutheran Church. These deserve notice because, as will be observed, in them the doctrine of our Article XXIX of 1571 is clearly denied and denounced. Although never so authoritative as the Confession of Augsburg, the Formula Concordiæ is a document of great importance.

¹ "The whole Confession, . . . is eloquent of its author's yearning to promote the reunion of divided Christendom; it breathes the spirit of defence, not defiance. It emphasises points of agreement before it affirms points of conscientious difference. To many Romanists it was an amazing revelation of the essential Catholicism of Lutheran teaching. To all it was proffered as a *via media* between the paths of sharp divergence" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 149). Melanchthon wrote an "Apology" of it a year later.

² "That Confession is most intimately connected with the progress of the English Reformation; and besides the influence which it cannot fail to have exerted by its rapid circulation in our country, it contributed directly, in a large degree, to the construction of the public Formularies of Faith put forward by the Church of England. The XIII Articles, drawn up, as we shall see, in 1538, were based almost entirely on the language of the great Germanic Confession; while a similar expression of respect is no less manifest in the Articles of Edward VI, and consequently in that series which is binding now upon the conscience of the English clergy" (Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 13).

"REFORMED" CONFESSIONS

Literature.—Curtis, *ut supra*, Chs. XII–XV.

While the Reformation in Germany was, as we have seen, largely subjective, that in Switzerland, under Zwingli and Calvin, was also objective. Although none of the documents connected with the "Reformed" Churches seem to have had a direct influence on our Articles, yet they are useful, if not essential, for comparison of views.

1.—*Creeds connected with Zwingli*

- (a) The Sixty-seven Articles of Zwingli, 1523.¹
- (b) The First Confession of Basle, 1532.
- (c) The First Helvetic Confession, 1536.²

2.—*Creeds connected with Calvin*

- (a) Calvin's Institutes, 1549.³
- (b) Second Helvetic Confession, 1566. The work of the great Henry Bullinger, "last and greatest in the Zwinglian series."⁴
- (c) The Synod of Dort, 1619.
- (d) The Westminster Confession, 1647.⁵

¹ "The Reformation produced no more impressive or thought-provoking document" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 195).

² "It owed its origination to the peace-making genius of the Strassburg theologians, Bucer and Capito, who made it their great aim to reconcile the Swiss and Lutheran schools of Protestant doctrine—and also to the prospect of an Ecumenical Council being convened at Mantua" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 203).

³ "If it inspired instant alarm in Romanist quarters, or won converts from them, if its pellucid Latinity and its masterly theology won admiration alike from foes and from rivals, it became for Protestants of well-nigh every type a veritable oracle, a source from which confessional, catechetical, and homiletic wants were unfailingly supplied. In diction, in structure, in comprehensiveness, in sheer mass and weight, in unflagging interest and power, in dignity and severe simplicity, it has all the characteristics of a classic. While recognising that it can never be for us what it was to earlier centuries, we cannot but lament that, in an age which so freely proclaims its emancipation from its spell, so few should read it for themselves, so many should condemn it cheaply and at second hand. Signs are not wanting that at no distant time justice will be more generally done to Calvin as a prince among systematic theologians not less than a prince among Christian exegetes" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 20).

⁴ Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 207.

"No other Confessions, save its immediate predecessor, the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563, has ever rivalled it in popularity or in authority among the Reformed Churches of the Continent. . . . It is no small tribute to its merits that its appearance was the signal for the cessation of theological controversy and unrest in Switzerland, and that it enjoyed, during so many centuries of eager thought and change, an unchallenged authority" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 208).

⁵ "It marks the maturest and most deliberate formulation of the scheme of Biblical revelation as it appeared to the most cultured and the most devout Puritan minds. It was the last great Creed-utterance of Calvinism, and intellectually and theologically it is a worthy child of the *Institutes*, a stately and noble standard for Bible-loving men. While influenced necessarily by Continental learning and controversy, it is essentially British, as well by heredity as by environment; for not only is it based upon the Thirty-nine Articles, modified and supplemented in a definitely Calvinistic sense at Lambeth and at Dublin, but it literally incorporates Ussher's Irish Articles, accepting their order and titles, and using, often without a word of change, whole sentences and paragraphs" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 275).

Now although, as it has been said, no direct and specific influence, such as came from Augsburg and Wurtemberg, can be traced from these formularies in the wording of our Articles, the documents themselves are valuable as showing the essential harmony of doctrine among the Reformers amid many details of difference. Expressions on doctrine like Predestination differ, but the difference is one of degree rather than of kind. There is nothing more striking than the fact that while our Articles are often verbally identical with those of Augsburg, their doctrine of the Sacraments is, and always has been, of the "Reformed," not the Lutheran type. And in the reign of Elizabeth Convocation ordered Bullinger's Decades "to be read and studied by the clergy."

THE CHURCH OF ROME

Literature.—Curtis, *ut supra*, Ch. VII.

The Reformation movement could not help affecting Rome, and it had therefore been determined that Protestants were not to be conciliated, but, if possible, crushed. Hence came the exclusion of Protestants from the Council of Trent, which made it impossible to do justice to the Reformed position. The result was the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, 1545-1563, of which it has been well said, "The decrees are the utterance of jealous defence, the Canons with their anathemas are the challenge of proud defiance."¹ These were followed by the Creed and Catechism of Pope Pius IV, 1564, intended for younger clergy and now used for Protestant converts to Roman Catholicism. These are all authoritative documents to-day. The Council met in December 1545, and sat until 1547, when it was suspended until 1551. Then it sat until April 1553, when it was suspended until 1562, and at length its deliberations were completed in January 1564.

There was a distinct alternation of views between Rome and Protestantism. The two parties worked in sight of each other, and everything done by the Council up to 1551 was in clear view of the English revisers in 1553.² That the Protestants were interested in and informed of what was going on at Trent is abundantly clear.³ Further evidence

¹ Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 107.

² "In several letters of Reformers we observe the interest with which they were watching the contemporary disputations at Trent, especially in the course of the eventful year, 1551: e.g. Cranmer's *Works*, I, 346, 349" (Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 84, footnote 1).

³ "Cranmer, just before the issue of the revised Second Prayer Book in 1552, and the first appearance of the Articles in 1553, wrote to Calvin (20th March 1552): 'Our adversaries are now holding their Councils at Trent for the establishment of their errors; and shall we neglect to call together godly synod, for the refutation of error, and for restoring and propagating the truth? They are, as I am informed, making decrees respecting the worship of the host: Wherefore we ought to leave no stone unturned, not only that we may guard others against this idolatry, but also that we may ourselves come to an agreement upon the doctrine of this sacrament' (Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings*, p. 432--Parker Soc.). Sir John Cheke, tutor to the King, and one who had been consulted by Cranmer about the Articles before they were published, wrote to Bullinger on 7th June 1553, after their publication, saying that the King 'has published

will be given when particular Articles are considered, but whether or not our formularies refer to Trent, there is no question about the attitude of our Articles to Rome, and great care must be taken lest we obtain a wrong impression of their character.

THE EASTERN CHURCH

This Church has always prided itself on its steadfast adherence to the orthodox Faith, based on the seven General Councils, the Trullan Council, 692, and the Second Council of Nicæa, 787. But even this Communion could not help being influenced to some little extent by what was going on in Western Europe. Cyril Lucar, Patriarch successively of Alexandria and Constantinople, imbibed Calvinism in Switzerland in the seventeenth century, but he suffered by reason of his Protestant opinions.¹ The Eastern Church repudiated his teaching, publicly and formally, and it has since formally adopted the doctrine of Transubstantiation, so that its Confessions include not only the worship of Images, but Transubstantiation, both name and thing. Thus Cyril Lucar in no sense represents the teaching of the Eastern Church at the present day. The Eastern Church does not really abide by the ancient Councils, but even *since* the Western Reformation has modified its standpoint in a Romeward sense. The "unchanging East" has, in fact, altered its standards more recently than the Western Churches of the Reformation.

THE ENGLISH ARTICLES IN THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

Literature.—Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, Ch. I; Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, Ch. XI; Maclear and Williams, *Introduction to the Articles*, Ch. III; Tyrrell Green, *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, Ch. II; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, Ch. I; Lindsay, *The History of the Reformation*, Vol. II, Book IV, Ch. I; Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, Ch. II.

THERE was a decided difference as well as a real oneness between the English and Continental Reformations. The latter were first religious and then political; the former was first political and then religious.

the Articles of the Synod of London, which, if you will compare with those of Trent, you will understand how the spirit of the one exceeds that of the other. Why should I say more? I send you the book itself as a token of my regard'" (*Original Letters*, p. 142).

¹ A clergyman of the Cypriote Greek Church told the writer in 1907 that Cyril Lucar was not really Calvinistic, and referred to *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, Avril-Juin 1906, No. 54, pp. 327-330, and No. 53, pp. 17-20. But see Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 253, and references in Note.

Up to the sixteenth century the English Church had long been virtually and for practical purposes a part of the Church of Rome, in the same sense that the Churches of the other nations of Europe were. Our Reformers were all priests of that Communion, and both in doctrine and organisation there was fundamental identity, the English Church, that is, the organised society of baptised people in England, being an integral part of the great Western Church. "No tie of an ecclesiastical or spiritual kind bound the Bishop of Chichester to the Bishop of Carlisle, except that which bound them both to French and Spanish Bishops."¹ The assertions of independence from time to time came from Parliament, but never touched questions of doctrine. On the eve of the Reformation this was the general situation.²

The movement in the reign of Henry VIII was very gradual, being almost wholly personal and scarcely at all doctrinal. But it was impossible to ignore what was going on in Germany and elsewhere on the Continent, as well as among the laity in England, in the direction of Reform, and though no doctrinal break with Rome was possible during the reign of Henry VIII there were forces at work tending to produce effects which would inevitably bring about great changes. It was four years after the Confession of Augsburg that Henry's final break with Rome took place. Yet this did not involve any breach of essential doctrine, but only the severance from Papal authority, the King being substituted for the Pope as supreme Head.

The break on personal grounds through Henry's divorce afforded the opportunity of realising the King's idea of making the Church as national and English as it had been Roman since the days of Alfred. But we must distinguish between the occasion and the cause. King Henry's domestic and dynastic circumstances were the occasion, but certainly not the cause of the Reformation, for there were forces at work which were all tending to produce far-reaching effects. The Reformation

"experienced at Henry's hands as much embarrassment as help, and, though his mind had many enlightened sympathies, the royal 'Defender of the Faith' was not the real inaugurator of Reform. The land of Magna Charta and of John Wyclif could not keep still while the rest of Northern Europe was in the throes of the struggle for religious liberty. It was not likely to submit for ever to an Italian Papacy in the realm of truth and order."³

¹ Maitland, *Canon Law*. See also, Smith's *Antiquities of Anglicanism*, and Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*.

² "We see the Church of England on its clerical side more and more separated from the civil power from the Conquest to the Reformation; more and more identifying itself with the Church of Rome from Henry I to the Reformation. The Crown had its share in encouraging Papal domination, from its being continually in need of the influence of the hierarchy; but Parliament, so far as its direct enactments went, resisted Papal usurpations, and was the only body in the Constitution that maintained a consistent attitude of independence in regard to the See of Rome" (Hole, *A Manual of English Church History*, p. 113; see also pp. 28, 53, 72 f., 83).

³ Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 165.

Thus we may see two movements proceeding side by side; the spiritual and the political, quite separate and, during the life of Henry, actually opposed, yet each doing its own part towards freeing our country from the errors and chains of Rome. Cranmer, as Archbishop of Canterbury, was on the one hand a help towards Reformation, and yet on the other his relation to the King made it practically impossible for him to move far or fast. Cranmer's convictions, like those of Luther, were, as we shall see, very gradual, and though the Lutheran Reformation naturally affected the English, there was no slavish following of Luther, while Calvin had no influence until 1550.¹

Speaking generally, the two greatest names are those of Cranmer and Ridley, whose connection with the Articles of 1553 was close and even predominant, but Parker, in 1563, and Jewel, in 1571, as the final editor, have very great weight. In all stages of the doctrinal movement in England these four men occupied a dominant position, and from their writings may be obtained a clear idea of their position, and consequently a guide to the interpretation to be placed on the formularies for which they were thus responsible.

THE TEN ARTICLES OF 1536

The position following Henry's severance from Rome was at once interesting and difficult. There were two parties, headed respectively by Gardiner and Cranmer. To Gardiner, who had been made Bishop of Winchester, 1531, the rejection of Papal supremacy was sufficient, and when he saw the endeavours being made towards Reformation he opposed them with all his power. Cranmer, on the other hand, as Archbishop of Canterbury, was the leader of the reforming opinions, and saw that in addition to the repudiation of Papal supremacy, doctrinal errors and moral abuses would have to be corrected. But the conflict between these two men was only the personal aspect of far deeper and greater issues. The progress of reforming opinions in England could not fail to be affected by similar movements in Germany, and in addition there were political influences at work which made Henry VIII look in that direction. He had quarrelled with Luther in 1521, but that trouble had passed with the years, and Henry was known to have formed a high opinion of Melancthon, and he even invited him to England. The community of interests between England and Germany in regard to national independence of the Papacy was a special reason for Henry's

¹ "The English was essentially a native Reformation, though assisted from abroad. Much as the English Articles, accordingly, owed to Wittenberg and Switzerland, they retained a character of their own. Like the English Church organisation, service, and traditions, they are not to be summarily described as Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinistic" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 165).

"It is abundantly clear that the Anglican Church, since its break with Rome, has been in profound sympathy with the great leaders of the Continental Reformation, both German and Swiss, but it is not hastily to be identified with either of the historic groups" (Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 166).

action, and we are therefore not surprised to find a delegation sent from England to Germany, 1535, the object of which was to find a basis for Henry's association with the German Princes. But Gardiner, then Ambassador at Paris, was the means of preventing any definite political action and also of making Henry hesitate, though the Conference of the English delegates with Lutheran theologians went on, Luther and Melancthon being present.

The outcome was seen in the Ten Articles of 1536, two years after the separation from Rome, six after Augsburg, and three after the appointment of Cranmer to Canterbury. These Articles consisted of two parts; five dealing with Doctrine and Sacraments, and five with Ceremonies. They were proposed by the King to Convocation, and after much discussion were accepted and published by royal authority. They were entitled, "Articles to establish Christian Quietness and Unity among Us and to avoid Contentious Opinions." The Anabaptists had begun to be troublesome in England and were bringing the Reformation into disrepute, and these Articles were largely directed against them. They did not indicate any positive advance towards the Reformation, though they were clearly influenced by the Reform Movement, for they had three Sacraments, including Penance, which even Luther retained for a long time. There was also an attempt to remove abuses. No general subscription was required, though many Bishops accepted them. They represented a compromise between the old and the new. It was a period of transition, and these Articles showed the oscillation of views. Foxe described them as intended for "weaklings newly weaned from their mother's milk of Rome." While there were three Sacraments there was no mention of the word Transubstantiation, though a doctrine of "impanation" was clearly taught.¹ Images were regarded as representing the Godhead, but were not to be worshipped; saints were to be honoured, but not like God; prayers could be addressed to the saints, but as intercessors, not as redeemers. Papal supremacy was rejected and the royal supremacy substituted. Prominence was given to Holy Scripture as authoritative, the Rule of Faith being the Bible, the Creeds, the Councils, and the Tradition of the Fathers in harmony with Scripture. The following opinions of their character and tendency are worthy of notice:—

"It is only when these Articles are read along with the *Injunctions* issued in 1536 and 1538 that it can be fully seen how much they were meant to wean the people, if gradually, from the gross superstition which disgraced the popular mediæval religion. If this be done, they seem an attempt to fulfil the aspirations of Christian Humanists like Dean Colet and Erasmus."²

"The Ten Articles thus authoritatively expounded are anything but 'essenti-

¹ The Tenth Article affirms that "under the form and figure of bread and wine is verily, substantially, and really contained the body and blood of Christ, which 'Corporally, really and in very substance is distributed and received to *all* them that receive the said sacrament.'"

² Lindsay, *ut supra*, p. 334.

ally Romish with the Pope left out in the cold.' They are rather an attempt to construct a brief creed which a pliant Lutheran and a pliant Romanist might agree upon—a singularly successful attempt, and one which does great credit to the theological attainments of the English King."¹

"These Articles, with all their caution, are unmistakably on the side of such reformation as Luther demanded. They were meant to unite old-school and new-school Christians, and to be tender towards everything hallowed by tradition, so long as superstition was not necessarily involved in it. Agreement on a more advanced basis of doctrine was at the time impossible. It is something that Transubstantiation was ignored, that the risks and fact of idolatry in church observances were proclaimed, and that in the *Injunctions* of 1538 a large public Bible was enjoined to be placed in every parish, within the reach of all."²

THE SIX ARTICLES OF 1539

In 1537 the Ten Articles were practically superseded by a book known as "The Bishops' Book," and called *The Institution (or Instruction) of a Christian Man*. This consisted of an exposition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, and other points. But as it was not authorised by Convocation or Parliament it only obtained the authority of its signatories, and so since it never received legal sanction the Ten Articles remained legally binding until the publication of the King's Book, 1543.³ Meantime, after 1536, the parties of

¹ Lindsay, *ut supra*, p. 335.

² Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 168 f.

³ It is necessary to observe carefully the circumstances of the publication of this Book. It was issued by Bishops for the very good reason that neither Parliament nor Convocation sat from July 1536 till March 1539, so that their "sanction" was out of the question. And it is clear that Henry VIII was never fully in accordance with this Book, though it is certain that passively, at least, he was concerned in its issue. The preface to the book is an address to the King, reminding him that "Your Highness commanded us now of late to assemble ourselves together, and upon the diligent search and perusing of Holy Scripture to set forth a plain and sincere doctrine"—they "most humbly submit it to the most excellent wisdom and exact judgment of your Majesty, to be recognised, overseen, and corrected." And to show their determination not to clash with the Royal Supremacy they "knowledge and confess that without the which power and licence of your majesty we have none authority either to assemble ourselves together for any pretence of purpose, or to publish anything that might be by us agreed on and compiled." When after this we find that the King's printer issued the work, we may be sure that while Henry would not commit himself to any responsibility for the statement of the Book as a whole, he permitted the temporary employment of it until a formal revision could be taken in hand. That this was his attitude we learn from the draft reply to the Bishop's address printed in *Cranmer's Works* (Parker Society), Vol. II, p. 469. The controversy between the King and the Primate on this work is given at pp. 83-114 of the same volume, and as Dr. Jacob observes (*Lutheran Movement in England*, p. 112), it shows the "essentially Romanistic" position taken up by the King. Cranmer claimed for the Bishops' Book that it was published by or with the Royal connivance at least. (*Cranmer's Remains*, P.S. page 16). And Bishop Bonner five years after the book had been issued required of his London clergy "that you and every of you do procure, and provide of your own, a book called 'The Bishops' Book,' and that you and every of you do exercise yourselves in the same, according to such precepts as hath been given before, or hereafter to be given" (*Formularies of Faith*, p. 382). It is important to recognise that both at the Visitations of the Bishops, in their synods and consistory courts, and also

Gardiner and Cranmer were engaged in an ever-increasing struggle, while political matters affected and complicated the issues. In spite of the failure of the negotiations between England and Germany in 1535-1536, at the King's request three Lutheran divines were sent over to England, and were met by a committee of three, nominated by the King, consisting of Cranmer and two other Bishops. It was hoped to arrive at some concordat, but in 1538 an entire change of the national situation took place by the excommunication of Henry by the Pope. This seemed to the King to necessitate his putting himself right in the eyes of Europe by a vindication of his essential orthodoxy, and under the growing influence of Gardiner a Roman reaction set in notwithstanding Cranmer's opposition. The Conference with the Lutherans resulted in Thirteen Articles, based partly on the Confession of Augsburg and partly on the Ten Articles of 1536, though going beyond the latter in the direction of reform. But they never saw the light till three hundred years later, or acquired any legal force, for the Roman reaction proved too strong.

The importance of the Thirteen, however, is very great as indicating the channel through which the Confession of Augsburg influenced each of the Forty-two Articles of 1553. The discovery of the Thirteen Articles among Cranmer's papers within the last fifty years is as interesting as it is significant. While Cranmer could not effect any doctrinal Reformation as long as Henry was alive, these Articles represent his views at the time of the Conference, and they were found among his papers by Canon Jenkyns and published under the title of *The Thirteen Articles of 1538*.¹ One interesting point is that "The only Article, namely, that on the Lord's Supper, which there is an opportunity of comparing with the conclusions approved by Fox and Heath in Germany, is word for word the same."²

But the Six Articles of 1539 shelved everything. They were essentially Roman, and the fact that Convocation passed them shows the revulsion of opinion. They maintained Transubstantiation, Com-

by the High Commission, many things not enacted by Parliament could be and were enforced without let or hindrance.

Dr. Lindsay says (*History of the Reformation*, ii. 336): "The King declined to commit himself, on the plea that he 'had no time convenient to overlook the great pains' bestowed upon the book, which bore the signatures of Lee, Gardiner, Bonner, and was itself the product of a Royal Commission. So that the book was issued by the body of Bishops and divines, whom the King had summoned to draft it, though the King refused to formally commit himself to some of its statements." (From the *Church Intelligencer*, June 1914, p. 94).

¹ Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 60.

² Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 60. An American writer, Professor Preserved Smith, in the *New York Nation*, 17th December 1914, pointed out that the Thirteen Articles, in turn, were dependent on Seventeen Articles formulated by Luther and Melancthon at Wittenberg in 1536 and handed to the English Ambassadors, Fox and Heath. This derivation was hardly if at all realised until recent days. The bare existence of the Seventeen Articles had been known from Seckendorf's *Historia Lutheranismi*, 1596, who called them a *repetitio et exegesis confessionis Augustanae*, but the document had been lost and was first rediscovered in the Weimar archives, published, and its relation to the Thirteen Articles demonstrated by Professor G. Mentz in 1905. This evidence of Luther's own work in England is particularly interesting.

munion in one kind, Celibacy of the Clergy, Vows of Chastity, Private Masses, and Auricular Confession. They were well called "The Whip with Six Strings." Then, in 1543, the Bishops' Book having been revised,¹ was re-published under the sanction of Convocation as the King's Book, or *The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*. The book is a further proof of Roman Catholic influence.² All this shows that there was no real Protestantism in Henry's reign. It was Roman Catholicism with the King instead of the Pope as supreme. But it is interesting and significant to observe that no trace of the language of the Ten Articles or the Six Articles can be found in our present Formularies, though there are clear indications of the influence of the Thirteen Articles of 1538.

THE ARTICLES OF EDWARD VI

IN view of Edward's accession in 1547 it has often been a matter of surprise that the Articles should not have been published for six years. The history of this period is somewhat obscure, but certain points stand out. Cranmer was indulging the hope of a united Confession of all the Reformed Churches, and it was only after strenuous effort that he had to abandon the project.³

But the Reformed party was at work, while the party headed by Gardiner became less and less influential. In 1547 the Six Articles Act was repealed, and in 1549 the First Prayer Book was issued. Cranmer, too, appears to have been preparing some Articles as a test of the orthodoxy of preachers, and it would seem as though these were the first drafts of several of the Articles of 1553.⁴

Another movement was an Act passed in 1549 for the Reformation of Church Law. A Committee headed by Cranmer drew up the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* which, though never set forth by authority, was in some respects the foundation of our present Articles, or at least it may be said that the doctrine found in the *Reformatio Legum* is in accord, and sometimes verbally, with that which is found in the Articles.⁵

¹ The Committee of Revision had been at work since 13th April 1540 when Cromwell announced its royal appointment to the House of Lords.

² "It may be said that it very accurately represented the theology of the majority of Englishmen in the year 1543. For King and people were not very far apart. They both clung to mediæval theology; and they both detested the Papacy, and wished the clergy to be kept in due subordination. There was a widespread and silent movement towards an Evangelical Reformation always making itself apparent when least expected; but probably three-fourths of the people had not felt it during the reign of Henry. It needed Mary's burnings in Smithfield, and the fears of a Spanish overlord, before the heaven could leaven the whole lump" (Lindsay, *ut supra*, p. 349 f.).

³ Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 70 f.

⁴ Hardwick, *ut supra*, pp. 77-80.

⁵ On the *Reformatio Legum*, see below, p. xlviii.

In 1551 certain Commissioners directed Cranmer to prepare a Book of Articles. A sketch was made and submitted to some Bishops, but the matter was not carried further until 1552. In May of that year the Council asked Convocation for them, and they were sent. These numbered forty-five, and their interest and value are that they were the draft of those eventually published a year later. They were returned to Cranmer and by him sent to the King. They were revised by the Royal Chaplain, reduced in number to forty-two, and published in Latin and English, May 1553. Their authors were mainly Cranmer and Ridley, but after consultation with many Bishops and Divines. Their composition was mostly that of Cranmer who, when examined in Mary's reign, acknowledged that they "were his doings."¹ He derived much help from the Confession of Augsburg: e.g. in Articles I, II, IV, IX, XIV, XVI, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, though the influence was apparently not direct, but indirectly through the Thirteen Articles of 1538.

It is still undecided whether these Articles were sanctioned by Convocation. Authorities differ widely; some arguing against, and others urging considerations in favour of their endorsement.² It is probable that the subject will never be settled, as the records of Convocation were destroyed by the Fire of London, 1666. Yet the question is now only one of historical interest, for nothing turns on it. The idea that if they were not sanctioned by Convocation the Church of England was not committed to them³ is wholly wide of the mark in view of the close association of Church and State in those days. Whether they were sanctioned by Convocation or not they were put forth by royal authority, and became law for the short time that elapsed before the King's death.

The purpose of these Articles was, to use the doctrine of the Reformers, "for the avoiding of controversy in opinions and the establishing of a godly concord in certain matters of religion." There was obviously no idea, because no need, of a full or systematic statement of beliefs. Like most sixteenth-century documents, they "bore the marks of their birth-time and birth-place," and it is therefore "unjust to judge them without regard to their origin and purpose."⁴ Nor have we any means of knowing what revision they would have received at the hands of their authors if opportunity had occurred. It is equally unfair to speak of them as "provisional or temporary,"⁵ simply because they were issued only seven weeks before King Edward's death. They must be judged by their character and contents, and when this is done we see two things

¹ Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 6, Note 2.

² Against: Lindsay, *The History of the Reformation*, Vol. II, p. 364; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 15 ff.; Tyrrell Green, *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, p. 10 f. For: Cardwell, *Synodalia*, p. 4 f.; Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, pp. 106-115; Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, p. 171; Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 6.

³ Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 29.

⁴ Curtis, *ut supra*, p. 128. See above pp. xxiv, xxv.

⁵ Kidd, *ut supra*, p. 25.

quite clearly: first, Roman errors are definitely condemned (Articles XII, XIII, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXXI); second, the Anabaptists who caused serious trouble by their excesses are also condemned (Articles VI, VIII, XIV, XV, XXXVII). So that the true and fair explanation is that these Articles represent the Church of England view of the time on the points treated in the light of the necessities of the Reformation. In opposition to Roman and Anabaptist errors they state the position of the Reformers.¹

One thing calls for special attention. It has been represented by writer after writer that the Forty-two Articles represent Cranmer's view of the Holy Communion as Zwinglian, and therefore at its lowest.² But the fact is that Cranmer's view of the Lord's Supper was fixed as early as 1548, the year of the Great Debate,³ and this alone proves that there is no inconsistency between the Article on the Sacraments (XXVI of 1553) and that on the Lord's Supper (XXIX).

For the same reason it is impossible to accept the view that "the opinions of the Edwardian Reformers, such as Cranmer and Ridley, on the subject of the Holy Communion have nothing more than a historical interest for us."⁴ A truer view is that which regards the opinions of these two Reformers as of great importance for the proper interpretation of the Articles which they put forth.

"It is of consequence to remember these facts. For, if Cranmer and Ridley were the chief compilers both of the Prayer Book and of the Articles; although the Church is in no degree bound by their private opinions, yet, when there is a difficulty in understanding a clause either in the Articles or the Liturgy, which are the two standards of authority as regards the doctrines of the English Church, it cannot but be desirable to elucidate such difficulties by appealing to the writings, and otherwise expressed opinions of these two reformers. It is true, both Liturgy and Articles have been altered since their time. Yet by far the larger portion of both remains just as they left them."⁵

Then, too, the views of all the Elizabethan Bishops, with two exceptions (Cheney and Geste), were identical with those of Cranmer.

¹ Hardwick, *ut supra*, pp. 83-98.

² Gibson, *ut supra*, pp. 28, 643; Tyrrell Green, *ut supra*, p. 10; and apparently repeated by Kidd, *ut supra*, p. 35.

³ Tomlinson, *The Great Parliamentary Debate*, p. 21.

⁴ Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 647. ⁵ Harold Browne, *ut supra*, p. 7.

THE THIRTY-EIGHT ARTICLES OF 1563

Literature.—Cardwell, *Synodalia*, p. 34 ff.; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 30; Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, pp. 179–181; Lamb, *Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 9–24; Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, Ch. VI.

THE death of Edward VI might have been thought to put an end to the Reformation, and so it did for a time, until an event took place which more than anything else made the Reformation popular and universal. By a natural rebound the martyrdoms during the reign of Mary gave a depth and an intensity to religious feeling on behalf of the Reformation, which had never been experienced either under Henry, or even under Edward VI.¹

On Elizabeth's accession, 1558, the great majority of the people accepted and welcomed the changes, and the Queen soon showed on which side she intended to be. The Forty-two Articles of 1553, though referred to in a document presented to the Queen in 1559, were not revived and made obligatory for some years, but a preliminary Eleven were issued of a very simple and practical nature. These never became legally binding, though in 1566 they were made legal for Ireland and remained so till 1615, when the Thirty-nine Articles became the legal Formularies for that land also.

Meanwhile, under Parker, the Forty-two were revised and corrected from the Confession of Wurtemberg, 1552, another interesting illustration of the way in which, while Lutheran Formularies were freely used in connection with our Articles, the sacramental teaching was throughout of the Swiss or Reformed, not the Lutheran type.² These revised Articles were submitted to Convocation, reduced to Thirty-nine, then one was omitted, almost certainly by the Queen, and finally they were published as Thirty-eight in 1563. The influence of Wurtemberg can be seen in several of the Articles, *e.g.* II, III, VI, X, XI, XII, XX.

The alterations were numerous and important.

(a) *Six Articles were omitted.*

Article X.—Of Grace.

Article XVI.—Sin against the Holy Ghost.

¹ "The event, which seemed to crush the Reformation in the bud, in fact gave it life. Neither clergy nor people appear to have been very hearty in its cause, when it came commended to them by the tyranny of Henry, or even by the somewhat arbitrary authority of Edward and the Protector Somerset. But when its martyrs bled at the stake, and when the royal prerogative was arrayed against it, it then became doubly endeared to the people as the cause of liberty as well as of religion" (Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 7, 8).

² "However paradoxical at first sight this statement may appear, nothing more effectually tended to the final establishment of the Protestant faith in this Kingdom, and to a deep and lasting aversion to the Roman Catholic Religion than the cruel and frequent executions of this reign" (Lamb, *The Articles*, p. 5).

³ See articles in *The Churchman* for January 1920 and 1921, by W. Prescott Upton

Article XXXIX.—The Resurrection of the Dead is not yet brought to pass.

Article XL.—The Souls of Them that do part this Life do neither die with the Bodies, nor sleep idly.

Article XLI.—Heretics called Millenarii.

Article XLII.—All Men shall not be saved at the Length.

(b) *Two were united into one (with parts omitted).*

Article VI.—The Old Testament is not to be Refused.

Article XIX.—All Men are bound to keep the Moral Commandments of the Law.

Together these form our present Article VII.

(c) *Four were added (by Archbishop Parker).*

Article V.—Of the Holy Ghost.

Article XII.—Of Good Works.

Article XXIX.—Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

Article XXX.—Of Both Kinds.

Of these Article XXIX was omitted, apparently by the Queen.

(d) *Clauses and words were omitted or added in many other Articles.*

Details of these will be given in the separate Articles, but the following call for special attention.

Article XX.—Of the Authority of the Church. First clause added, presumably by the Queen, after the Article had left Convocation.

Article XXV.—Of the Sacraments. Several important changes and additions.

Article XXVIII.—Of the Lord's Supper. A change in clause three.

The history of each of these points will be given in connection with the Articles themselves.

It is now necessary to enquire as to the character of these Articles.

1. They represent a greater completeness of statement of doctrine by the Church of England, especially on fundamentals. This was felt to be necessary,¹ and circumstances were favourable to the realisation, for the Reformation settlement made it possible.

2. But there was no essential doctrinal difference, as the following points indicate.

(a) The Article on Justification represented Luther's views and also the Confession of Augsburg.

(b) The Article on Good Works, so far from correcting the Lutheran view of Justification, expressed Luther's own teaching. There was an Article on Good Works in the Confession of Augsburg, 1530.

(c) The omission of the reference to the *opus operatum* view of the Sacraments in Article XXV was due to the ambiguity of the phrase.² The other changes in the Article on the Sacraments were introduced to distinguish between Sacraments and other Ordinances, without calling the latter Sacraments, or Sacramental Rites.

¹ Cardwell, *ut supra*, p. 35.

² Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 132.

(d) Article XXVIII was altered by Parker, who is known to have held (not Lutheran, but) Calvinistic views on the Lord's Supper, in harmony with Cranmer, of whom he was a devoted disciple.¹

(e) But inasmuch as some endeavour was made to give a Lutheran interpretation to Article XXVIII, Parker introduced Article XXIX to safeguard the true doctrine.² The teaching of this Article is admittedly opposed to Lutheranism.

(f) The omission by the Queen of Article XXIX was almost certainly due to her desire to keep Lutheran Reformers in union with other Protestants in support of her Throne. There does not appear to have been any endeavour to favour the Roman Catholic party, a matter which never seems to have entered into the minds of those responsible for the revision and issue of the Articles, as the following point proves beyond all question.

3. The most striking feature is the increased emphasis placed on the anti-Roman character of the Articles in view of the fact that the Articles of 1553 were supposed to represent the high-water mark of Protestantism. This strengthening of the Articles of 1563 in a Protestant direction is particularly noteworthy. Such an intensification of the anti-Roman features at a time when it is alleged by some that Elizabeth was doing her utmost to conciliate Rome is a clear proof that nothing of the kind was intended by the changes made by the Queen and Parker. A reference to the following Articles, and a comparison of their wording with that of 1553 will amply illustrate the position.

Article VI.—Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation. The addition of the reference to the Apocrypha with the distinction made between that and the Canonical Books.

Article XXII.—Of Purgatory. "Doctrine of School authors" changed to "Romish doctrine."

Article XXV.—Of the Sacraments. The wording about speaking in a tongue understood of the people made much stronger.

Article XXX.—Of Both Kinds. Addition of the Article.

Article XXXII.—Of the Marriage of Priests. Made much stronger.

Article XXXIV.—Of the Traditions of the Church. Addition of a new paragraph claiming authority for National Churches.

Article XXXVII.—Of the Civil Magistrates. Addition of a sentence denying jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome in England.

Facts like these amply suffice to show that conciliation of Roman Catholics was entirely outside the purpose of the Church and the Queen.

¹ "Cranmer, his great predecessor, whom he valued so highly, that he 'would as much rejoice to win' some of the lost writings of that prelate as he 'would to restore an old chancel to reparation'" (Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 117 f.).

Hardwick (*ut supra*, p. 138) seems to suggest that this change was really against the Swiss School, but Dimock (*Papers on the Eucharistic Presence*, p. 657) proves beyond all question the harmony of Parker's views with those of (not Zwingli but) Calvin, and this is tantamount to saying that he agreed with Cranmer (Dimock, p. 639).

² Dimock, *op. cit.*, p. 667.

The policy of Elizabeth was not to win Rome, but to unite all Protestants in support of her position. It was this that led to the omission of Article XXIX, and to acts like the insertion of the Ornaments Rubric.¹ But even so, it is a mistake to suppose that the Queen's own view of the Lord's Supper was Lutheran, for there are proofs of her sympathy with the Swiss or Reformed view.² An additional testimony is afforded by the *Reformatio Legum*.³ Another witness, speaking of the Articles, says they

"expressed the doctrine of the Reformed or Calvinist as distinguished from the Evangelical or Lutheran form of Protestant doctrine, and the distinction lay mainly in the views which the respective Confessions of the two Churches held about the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Holy Supper."⁴

And referring to the Queen's action in regard to Articles XX and XXVIII, he remarks:—

"The Queen's action was probably due to political reasons. It was important in international politics for a Protestant Queen not yet securely seated on her throne to shelter herself under the shield which a profession of Lutheranism would give."⁵

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF 1571

Literature.—Cardwell, *Synodalia*, pp. 73-107; Lamb, *Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 24-40.

It is a natural question why the Articles should have needed attention again after the short period of eight or nine years. The explanation is found in the attitude of Queen Elizabeth. Although the Articles of 1563 were promulgated by Convocation, authorised by the Queen herself, and printed and published by her own printer, they were not presented to Parliament. Elizabeth apparently refused to allow this, though pressed by Convocation and Parliament to do so.⁶ The result

¹ The Black Rubric is sometimes used as a further proof of this policy, but the Black Rubric was not "omitted," because it never formed any part of the liturgy of 1552. The revival of 5 and 6 of Edward VI could not therefore include this Royal Declaration, while the Acts giving to Royal Declarations the force of law had meantime been repealed. See Dimock's pamphlet on the subject, and Tomlinson, *Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies*, Ch. XI.

² Dimock, *Vox Liturgie Anglicana*, pp. vi., vii.-xii., 60-63; *Papers on the Eucharistic Presence*, pp. 567-570.

³ See p. xlviii.; Dimock, *Vox Liturgie Anglicana*, p. xv., quotes Cardwell, that the *Reformatio Legum* represented "the state and condition of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the Reformation may be said to have been completed" (*Synodalia*, pp. x., xi.).

⁴ Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, p. 411.

⁵ Lindsay, *ut supra*, p. 414.

⁶ "Her Majesty considered it an encroachment upon her Prerogative of Supreme Head of the Church" (Lamb, *ut supra*, p. 24).

was that for four years after 1563 the Articles do not seem to have been circulated, or appealed to, though they were enforced as far as they could be by the ecclesiastical authority of the Episcopate.¹ The delay seems to have been due to political circumstances. All the efforts of Parliament to obtain clerical subscription to the Articles were blocked by the Queen. Her policy at that time was one of religious toleration, and this "non-committal" attitude served her purpose, for as long as the clergy were not required to subscribe to the Articles, the Queen could appear free to deal with Rome, or to negotiate with the Lutherans, while subscription would mean a definite committal to one side. But though the delay was regrettable and in some respects serious, yet the influence of the Bishops, all of whom were Protestant, tended to keep matters fairly straight. In 1570, however, the Queen yielded to the pressure of Parliament. It is usually thought that the primary cause of this sudden, remarkable, and complete change was the Papal excommunication of Elizabeth,² yet even when the House of Commons took action against this aggression of Rome, and also prepared a Bill requiring clerical subscription to the Articles, the Queen opposed it until on the fourth time of reading by the Commons she gave way,³ and a Bill was passed requiring clerical subscription. During this struggle between the Queen and Parliament, Convocation had been engaged in the revision of the Articles of 1563. This work was due mainly to Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, though partly also to Archbishop Parker. Jewel prefixed "de" to the Latin titles and "of" to the English, and added the names to the list of Books of the Apocrypha in Article VI. Article XXIX was inserted, and accepted by the Queen, while the first clause of Article XX was accepted by Convocation. Article X was changed to "working with" instead of "working in," and Article XXVII added "or new birth" to "regeneration." The only change of importance was the reinsertion of Article XXIX, and this was profoundly significant of the Church doctrine on the Holy Communion.⁴

The Articles were submitted to Convocation, passed, and then became law. For the first time clerical subscription was required. They were

¹ Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 143.

² "The Papal Bull of excommunication was delayed until 1570, when its publication could harm no one but Elizabeth's own Romanist subjects, and the dangerous period was tided over safely. When it came at last, the Queen was not anathematised in terms which could apply to Lutherans, but because she personally acknowledged and observed 'the impious constitutions and atrocious mysteries of Calvin,' and had commanded that they should be observed by her subjects. Then, when the need for politic suppression was past, Article XXIX was published, and the *Thirty-nine Articles* became the recognised doctrinal standard of the Church of England (1571)." (Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, p. 415.)

³ "This seems to have been the first successful resistance made by the constitutional party in the House of Commons to that arbitrary authority in Church matters, which Henry VIII first assumed, and to preserve which his daughter Elizabeth was peculiarly anxious" (Lanib, *ut supra*, p. 25, Note c).

⁴ The details of the history will be given under the Article itself.

issued in Latin and English, and both are equally "authentic,"¹ one often throwing light on the other.²

Since 1571 no change has taken place in the Articles, and as we review the period from 1536 onwards, especially the three last stages from 1553, we see that they are the result of years of controversies, and their wording shows what English theology really was. Their statements must always be taken in the light of the circumstances which brought them forth.

NOTE ON THE "REFORMATIO LEGUM ECCLESIASTICARUM"

Literature.—Cardwell, *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, Preface; Maclear and Williams, *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, New Edition, p. 455; Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 86 ff.; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 28 f.

The abolition of Roman Catholic jurisdiction made it necessary to consider the question of the Canon Law and to frame a body of Ecclesiastical Law, especially as a counter-influence to the action of the Council of Trent. In 1544 Cranmer began the work of selection and adaptation, and a Committee was appointed to assist him, including Bishop Goodrich, Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Cox of Ely, Peter Martyr, and Dr. Rowland Taylor. But the King's death prevented the ratification by Parliament, and for some reasons this result must be regarded as particularly welcome.³ A copy fell into the hands of Archbishop Parker, who edited it, and did not merely reproduce Cranmer's text.⁴ In 1571 it was published with his consent, but was not accepted by the Queen and Parliament. It is valuable for comparison, and for the elucidation

¹ Dr. Stephens in his speech in the Bennett Case (p. 76), denies that the Latin version is in a legal sense "equally authoritative," and the "littlebok" enacted by 13 Elizabeth was certainly the *English* version.

² "The Articles of our Church were at the same time prepared both in Latin and English; so that both are equally authentic" (Burnet, *Articles*, p. xxi.).

"As to the Articles, English and Latin, I may just observe, for the sake of such readers as are less acquainted with these things—*First*, That the Articles were passed, recorded, and ratified in the year 1562, and *in Latin only*. *Secondly*, That those Latin Articles were revised and corrected by the Convocation of 1571. *Thirdly*, That an authentic English translation was then made of the Latin Articles by the same Convocation, and the Latin and English adjusted as nearly as possible. *Fourthly*, That the Articles thus perfected *in both languages* were published the same year, and by the royal authority. *Fifthly*, Subscription was required the same year to the English Articles, called the Articles of 1562, by the famous Act of the 13th of Elizabeth.

"These things considered, I might justly say, with Bishop Burnet, that the Latin and English are both *equally authentic*. Thus much, however, I may certainly infer, that if in any places the English version be ambiguous, where the Latin original is clear and determinate, the Latin ought to fix the more doubtful sense of the other (as also *vice versa*), it being evident that the Convocation, Queen, and Parliament, intended the same sense in both" (Waterland, "Supplement to the Case of Arian Subscription Considered," *Works*, Vol. II, p. 316; quoted in Hardwick, p. 156).

³ "It was as well, for the book enacted death penalties for various heresies, which would have made it a cruel weapon in the hands of a persecuting government" (Lindsay, *ut supra*, p. 364).

⁴ See *Church Intelligencer*, April 1909, pp. 60-63.

of the mind of Cranmer and Parker. As such, it has a definite bearing on the Articles, throwing light on their meaning and purpose. It is incorrect to call it a draft, or explanation of the Articles, because its character and contents show it to be a code of Reformed Canon Law which was never legally adopted. But on subjects of which the Articles treat it is well worth comparison. Thus one section is on "The Catholic Faith and the Trinity," another on "Heresies," and another on "Sacraments." In considering the Articles on these subjects the *Reformatio Legum* will naturally be used for illustration and comparison.

INTERPRETATION AND OBLIGATION OF THE ARTICLES

At this stage it is necessary to notice the question of Puritan objections to the Articles.¹ It is important to observe that these objections were almost wholly concerned with points of Calvinism, for on other subjects the differences were quite insignificant.² On the subject of Calvinism there is the greatest need of care, for nothing is more apt to be misunderstood and misconceived. It may mean so much or so little.

All the Reformers were moderate Calvinists, or Augustinians, Melancthon as well as Calvin himself.³ And the opposite view associated with Arminius never had any real footing in the Church of England until the time and through the influence of Laud.⁴ "In the sixteenth century Predestination was universally accepted,"⁵ and it was only

¹ Hardwick, *ut supra*, Ch. X.

² "As regards the early Puritans, it must be remembered that there was a well-understood agreement between them and their opponents on matters of doctrine. The questions in controversy were questions, not of doctrine, but of order and discipline and ceremonies" (Dimock, *Vox Liturgica Anglicana*, p. xx). Dimock adds that the only exception to this was the observance of the Lord's Day, which was the first doctrinal disagreement.

³ "It is a striking fact that the Protestant theology of the sixteenth century both began and ended in strict theories of Predestination. . . . The severe doctrine of Calvin on the subject of Predestination is notorious; but it should be remembered that the teaching of Melancthon in the first edition of his work was not less severe" (Wace, *Principles of the Reformation*, p. 129).

⁴ "No impartial person, competently acquainted with the history of the Reformation, and the works of the earlier Protestant divines, at home and abroad, even to the close of Elizabeth's reign, will deny that the doctrines of Calvin on redemption and the natural state of fallen man are in all essential points the same as those of Luther, Zwinglius, and the first Reformers collectively" (Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, quoted Wace, *ut supra*, p. 140). (See the entire section, Wace, *ut supra*, pp. 129-153.)

⁵ "Before his time there was a general consent among our divines; for, as Bishop Carleton observes, though disputes arose between the Bishops and the Puritans with respect to Church government, they perfectly agreed in doctrine. Anti-Calvinists have indeed endeavoured to force the Article to speak their own sentiments; yet they must confess, that they would not have expressed them in those words; and a sufficient refutation of their statement is the fact, that Rogers, the first expositor of the Articles, and Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, to whom he dedicated his work, maintains that it conveys a contrary meaning" (Macbride, *Lectures on the Articles*, p. 30 f.).

⁶ Sargeant, *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XII, p. 428.

later that Calvinism underwent further developments. For the balance of our Article XVII we should be rightly grateful, but of its essential Calvinistic doctrine no one who knows the history can have any doubt.¹

A further illustration of the essentially Calvinistic view of the Articles is found in the action of King James I in sending three Anglican representatives to the Synod of Dort, when Calvinistic doctrine was unanimously endorsed, and in 1625, a few years after that Synod, a sermon preached at Cambridge, by Dr. Ward, gave striking evidence of the universal acceptance of Augustinian views from the opening of the Reformation,² while Bishop Hall, one of the three representatives at Dort, bore testimony in the same direction.³ The ineffectual attempts of the Puritans in 1604 to get the Lambeth Articles included in our Formularies is another reason for gratitude, and one that makes the positive Scriptural doctrine of the Articles stand out all the more clearly.

HISTORY OF SUBSCRIPTION

Literature.—Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, Ch. XI; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 57; Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 52; Tyrrell Green, *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, p. 17; *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, p. 544.

Subscription to the Articles was thought necessary to secure uniformity of doctrine among teachers of the Reformed Faith, and it was enjoined

¹ "It is absurd, with some Anglican writers, to deny the Calvinism of the Articles on this subject; but for Calvinistic influence and example they would not have discussed the subject at all. . . . It is unhistorical to deny the Calvinism of the English Articles, as distinct from the English Service Book to which they were added, merely because they do not, with *later* Calvinistic Confessions, endeavour to carry out the broad principles of election and grace to their narrowest ultimate conclusions. Anglican Puritanism might not be able to appeal for authority and vindication to the Prayer Book in its entirety, but to the Edwardine Articles it could legitimately look as to the rock whence in England it was hewn. These Articles are not developed, much less exaggerated, Calvinism. They are not Calvinistic in any partisan sense. But with Calvinistic doctrine, as already formulated, they are in unmistakable sympathy" (Curtis, *ut supra*, pp. 176, 177).

The joint letter of Parker and Grindal to Sir William Cecil is a proof of the value set on the Geneva Bible (*Correspondence of Parker*, p. 261). The influence of Calvin in Elizabeth's reign and the high estimation in which he and his writings were held may be seen in Hardwick (*History of the Articles*, Ch. 7). Hooker's testimony is well known (*Eccles. Pol.*, Preface II, 1). But perhaps the strongest evidence of the hold which Calvin's teaching had obtained in the Universities is the testimony of Bishop Sanderson, and this is all the more significant as the Bishop did not admire Calvin's theology (Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biog.*, IV, p. 416). As Sanderson is referring to 1603, when the Arminian Movement had already greatly influenced English theologians, the testimony to Calvin's *Institutes* is particularly remarkable (cf. Carter, *The English Church and the Reformation*, pp. 143-145, for further references).

² "This also I can truly add, for a conclusion, that the Universal Church hath always adhered to St. Austin, ever since his time till now. The Church of England also, from the beginning of the Reformation and this our famous University, with all those from thence till now who have with us enjoyed the Divinity Chair, if we except one foreign Frenchman (Peter Baro), have likewise constantly adhered to him" (Macbride, *ut supra*, p. 31).

³ "I shall live and die in the suffrage of the reverend Synod, and do confidently avow, that those other opinions cannot stand with the doctrines of the Church of England" (Macbride, *ut supra*, p. 33).

on the clergy as early as 1553, but the death of the King prevented its enforcement. No further action was taken until 1571, when, as we have seen, an Act of Parliament required all clergy to assent to all the Articles concerning Faith and Sacraments. It is interesting to notice that the subscription enforced referred to the Articles of 1563. There seems to have been a certain verbal ambiguity in this order, and some have thought that Parliament intended it to apply only to those Articles concerning Doctrine and Sacraments, and not to those on Discipline.¹ But the Act says he shall "subscribe to *all* the articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted" and requires him to read publicly the "SAID Articles." So that it could not be intended that he might skip and omit to read any of the Articles which in his judgment are not doctrinal. Thus the wider interpretation naturally prevailed, and subscription was required to all the Articles. The controversy, however, appears to have led to a good deal of laxity, though Archbishop Whitgift, in 1583, tried to improve matters by proposing a form of subscription from every clergyman, requiring among other things:

"That he alloweth the Book of the Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord 1562, and set forth by Her

¹ Cardwell's note is as follows:

"This view of the matter certainly receives support from the parliamentary history of the time (D'Ewes' *Journal*, p. 239. *Docum. Ann.*, Vol. I, p. 411), and is also confirmed by the proceedings of the Convocation in 1575, the first year of the primacy of Archbishop Grindal, where the limitation of the statute is distinctly quoted, and applied to all cases of subscription to the Articles (Wilks, *Conc.*, Vol. IV, p. 284). But it is clear that the statute was otherwise interpreted by Sir E. Coke (*Inst.*, Part IV, p. 323); and as the Queen and her Commissioners would not suffer any reserve or qualification, a different practice certainly prevailed in the administration of the Church. From the year 1584, when Archbishop Whitgift issued his orders for subscription to the three Articles, which were afterwards confirmed by King James in the canons of 1603, it appears that no exception or limitation was permitted. In the last Act of Uniformity (13 and 14 Car. II, c. 4) there is no trace of any such distinction being allowed between articles of doctrine and discipline" (Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Vol. I, pp. 61-62). Hardwick (*ut supra*, pp. 227-229), also discusses the question and says the idea of a limitation was due to "those who were in search of pretexts for their non-conformity." But Whitgift and Rogers both contended that "all and every of the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty" were the subject of the subscription. Rogers adds: "no more, no fewer" (Preface, p. 24). It should be noted that the "Convocation of 1575" merely quotes the *ipsisima verba* of the statute. Then, too, lawyers, who are the fit expounders of statutes, with one consent have interpreted the 13 Elizabeth in the sense of a full subscription. The so-called disciplinary articles are the Church of England's doctrine relating to matters of discipline, and the words of the Act cover the whole. The reference in Cardwell to D'Ewes is really irrelevant, for at the p. 239 cited, Wentworth tells us that the Archbishop had asked him: "Why we did put out of the book the articles for the Homilies, consecrating of bishops, and suchlike?" But Wentworth was compelled to see these very Articles enacted with all the rest and made statutory law. This is a refutation of his entire claim. On the Puritan contention all these articles ought to have been expunged as not binding on the clergy, but the articles were imposed to "avoid diversities of opinion, and establish consent touching true religion," and the "diversities" of their day were *not* doctrinal, but disciplinary and ecclesiastical.

Majesty's authority, and that he believeth all the articles therein contained to be agreeable to the Word of God."¹

Not much was done until the Canons of 1604, when Canon V censured the impugners of the Articles, and Canon XXXVI required all Articles to be accepted *ex animo* at Ordination and Institution :—

CANON XXXVI

"Subscription to be required of such as are to be made ministers."

"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 catechise, 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 in this realm, except he be licensed 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 subscribe to these three articles following, in such manner and sort as we have here appointed :—

"I.—That the King's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal; and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within His Majesty's said realms, dominions, and countries.

"II.—That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the form in the said Book prescribed, in public prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and none other.

"III.—That he alloweth the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both Provinces, and by the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God 1562; and that he acknowledgeth all and every the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God.

"To these three Articles, whosoever will subscribe he shall, for the avoiding of all ambiguities, subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian and surname, viz. :—

"I, N. N., do willingly and ex animo subscribe to these three Articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them."

"And if any bishop shall ordain, admit, or license any, as is aforesaid, except he first have subscribed in manner and form as here we have appointed, he shall be suspended from giving of orders and licences to preach for the space of twelve months. But if either of the universities shall offend therein, we leave them to the danger of the law, and His Majesty's censure."²

But this strictness did not continue in the years that followed, and it was only at the Restoration that greater efforts were made to insist on

¹ Strype's *Whitgift*, Bk. III, Ch. III.

² Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Vol. I, p. 267.

proper and full subscription according to this Canon. While the Act of Uniformity demanded assent to the Prayer Book it did not deal with the Articles. But the Act recognises 13 Elizabeth as "in force," and its 17th Section extends the operation of the Act to an additional set of persons, while the 31st Section transfers the reference of Article XXXVI to the Ordinal of 1662.¹

The attempt in 1689 to bring about comprehension proved unsuccessful, and the usual practice was to combine the terms of subscription required by the Act of Elizabeth and Canon XXXVI with the following form :—

"I, *A.B.*, do willingly and from my heart subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to the three Articles in the Thirty-sixth Canon, and to all things therein contained."

The effort made in the eighteenth century to obtain relief from subscription, associated with the name of Archdeacon Blackburne, was too definitely Arian to command assent, and it was therefore summarily rejected.

In 1865 the Formula of subscription was altered by the assent being made much more general, the form being :—

"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."²

The Act requires that a clergyman on being instituted to a living, or on his first Sunday, "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." While they were not to be understood in any non-natural sense, there was to be no narrow interpretation, and the intention of the Act was certainly to grant relief. It is, of course, well known that subscription is only required of the clergy, and that from the laity it is not demanded as a term of Communion. The only lay subscription was that required at Oxford and Cambridge, which was abolished in 1871, except so far as Degrees in Divinity were concerned.

THE ROYAL DECLARATION

The Calvinistic controversy continued unabated during the reign of James I, when, as we have seen, the deputation to the Synod of Dort,

¹ Tomlinson, *Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies*, Ch. XII.

² The words in brackets were, of course, disused after the Irish Church was disestablished in 1869.

1618, was the most important feature. On the accession of Charles I in 1625 he found the Church much agitated by factions and controversy, and issued a Proclamation forbidding the clergy to introduce principles which were not clearly those of the Church. In 1628 he ordered Archbishop Laud to reprint the Articles and to prefix a Declaration that no one was to wrest them, but to take them in their literal and grammatical sense. This project was not submitted to Convocation, but was issued on the King's authority alone. As Parliament at once replied against the King the Declaration did not acquire any legal force.

PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLES

It is sometimes said that the Articles are ambiguous and were intended as a compromise, and that therefore any clear, definite statement of Church doctrine is impossible and not to be expected. But this does not agree with the facts of the case. Cranmer's object in promulgating the Articles was clearly expressed in his letter to John a Lasco, 1548 :—

“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.”¹

The words used in 1563 are evidence of the same intention : “For the avoiding of the diversities of opinions, and for the stablishing of consent touching true religion.”² The same intention is seen by the requirement of clerical subscription, for the purpose was obviously to obtain consent to a recognised statement of doctrine.³

That the Articles were intended to be the legal and authorised statement and test of Church of England doctrine on all subjects treated in them is quite clear from all that we know of their origin, history, and purpose. From the first they were regarded as affording the supreme test of Churchmanship, and from this standpoint there is nothing to compare with them. In order that this may be quite clear, it seems necessary to state as fully as possible what subscriptions and declarations have been required and made since the time the Articles were first promulgated.⁴

1. The Act of 13 Elizabeth, 1571, required a declaration of assent,

¹ *Original Letters*, Vol. I, p. 17.

² Tyrrell Green, *ut supra*, p. 14.

³ “One fact is plain, viz., that the Articles thus drawn up, subscribed, and authorised, have ever since been signed and assented to by all the clergy of the Church, and until very lately by every graduate of both Universities; and have hence an authority far beyond that of any single convocation or parliament, viz. the unanimous and solemn assent of all the bishops and clergy of the Church, and of the two Universities for well-nigh three hundred years” (Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 10).

⁴ These materials are taken in substance from Dean Goode's pamphlet, *A Defence of the Thirty-nine Articles* (Hatchard & Son, 1848).

and a subscription to the Articles expressive of "unfeigned assent" and against the maintenance or affirmation of any doctrine "directly contrary or repugnant."

2. Canon XXXVI of 1603-1604, as already seen, states that the Articles are "agreeable to the Word of God," and that every clergyman must subscribe "*ex animo*" to them.

3. The Act of Uniformity, 1662, is virtually to the same effect, as already observed.

4. The title of the Articles is "for the avoiding of the diversities of opinions and for the stablishing of consent touching true religion."

5. The Canons of 1571, though not legally binding, enable us to see the mind of the Bishops and the Crown. Preachers are to subscribe to the Articles, and promise to maintain and defend "that doctrine which is contained in them as most agreeable to the verity of God's Word."

6. A Canon of the Provincial Synod, held in London, 1575, issued with royal sanction and authority, speaks of the profession of the doctrines expressed in the Articles, and all ministers are to render an account of their faith "agreeable and consonant to the said Articles, and shall first subscribe to the said Articles."

7. Canons drawn up in 1584 and again in 1597 have similar directions, requiring a statement of faith "according to the Articles of Religion."

8. Canon XXXIV, of 1603-1604, makes the same demand on all applicants for Holy Orders.

9. The Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles by Charles I in 1628 speaks of the Articles containing "the true doctrine of the Church of England," and prohibits "the least difference from the said Articles."

10. The statute law of the realm as seen in the Act of 1571, already briefly mentioned, speaks very definitely about those who maintain or affirm "any doctrine directly contrary or repugnant to any of the said Articles," while no one is to be admitted as a minister unless he professes "the doctrine expressed in the said Articles."

11. In 1566 Archbishop Parker drew up a document containing a petition of the Bishops to the Queen to obtain a Bill "concerning uniformity in doctrine and confirmation of certain Articles." This consent and unity of doctrine is said to be necessary to quiet and safety, and that great distraction and dissension existed "for want of a plain certainty of Articles of Doctrine by law to be declared."

12. In 1721 the Crown issued directions for unity and purity of faith, requiring the clergy not to preach any other doctrines than "what are contained in the Holy Scriptures and agreeable to the three Creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion."

13. Thomas Rogers, Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, published an Exposition of the Articles in 1607, in which the Articles are constantly spoken of as "the doctrine of our Church," and that by them "there is now a uniformity likewise of doctrine by authority established." Further, he teaches that the doctrine of our Church is to be judged by the Articles.

To the same effect testimonies can be adduced from representative men like Burnet, Hall, Stillingfleet, and Beveridge.

14. The Act of 28 and 29 Victoria requires everyone instituted to a living to read the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles and to declare his assent to them. And this is all the more remarkable that while, up to the year 1865 a clergyman was required to read over the whole Morning and Evening Service as well, the latter was dispensed with, the requirement to read the Articles was retained.

From all these facts and documents the conclusion ought to be obvious, that the Articles pledge their subscribers to certain definite doctrines, and that for the Church of England the Articles are an adequate safeguard of orthodoxy. It is clear, therefore, that subscription to the Articles is to be regarded as a definite adoption of their doctrines and something very much more than the negative position of restraint within their limits.¹ Hardwick, following earlier writers, suggests the desirableness of the following rules or Canons of interpretation as both reasonable and suitable to the situation :

“*First*, to weigh the history of the Reformation movement in the midst of which the Articles had been produced.

Secondly, to read them in this light, approximating as far as possible to the particular point of view which had been occupied by all the leading compilers.

Thirdly, to interpret the language of the formulary in its plain and grammatical sense (*i.e.* the sense which it had borne in the Edwardine and Elizabethan periods of the Church), bestowing on it ‘the just and favourable construction, which ought to be allowed to all human writings, especially such as are set forth by authority.’

Fourthly, where the language of the Articles is vague, or where (as might have been expected from their history) we meet with a comparative *silence* in respect of any theological topic, to ascertain the fuller doctrine of the Church of England on that point, by reference to her other symbolical writings—the Prayer Book, the Ordinal, the Homilies, and the Canons.

Fifthly, where these sources have been tried without arriving at *explicit* knowledge as to the intention of any Article, to acquiesce in the deductions which ‘the catholic doctors and ancient bishops’ have expressly gathered on that point from Holy Scripture; in accordance with the recommendation of the Canon of 1571 in which subscription to the present Articles had been enjoined upon the clergy.”²

While making every allowance, therefore, for the fact that these Articles exhibit marks of the circumstances which gave them birth, and on this account cannot be regarded as a full and systematic statement of Anglican theology, yet on the subjects with which they deal their character

¹ “Although the latter view has been occasionally advanced by writers of the highest reputation and ability, the former seems to be consistent with the nature and intention of the Articles as well as with the principle embodied by the Church of England in the Canons of 1571” (Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 222).

² Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 224.

and purpose are easily understood when the above facts are weighed, and the use made of them for the last three centuries considered. The Articles represent one of the most remarkable theological documents ever seen. They were the result of two generations of controversy. Parties were face to face, and every word was weighed. The Scholastic theology had been working itself out and the result was seen in the Reformation. The actual words show what their theology was, and bear clear testimony to the meanings of Roman and Reformed doctrines. The Articles can only be understood in the light of their history, and when thus considered they are as weighty as any formula in existence.¹

INTERPRETATION OF THE ARTICLES

It is sometimes urged that the Articles being incomplete are to be interpreted in the light of "Catholic principles." This means that they are to be distinguished rigidly from the Protestant Confessions of the sixteenth century in spite of their evident connection with and imitations of them. On this view our Articles are held to condemn extreme mediævalism, but not the recognised doctrines of the Church of Rome, and it is said that our Church occupies a middle position between two extremes, being neither Roman nor Puritan, but "Catholic." It is, of course, correct to say that truth is often found between two extremes (*in medio tutissimus ibis*), and that in many respects the Church of England stands for a *via media*, but this is very different from saying that our Church is "midway" between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. On the contrary, no Roman Catholic could do anything but admit that our Articles are essentially Protestant. Further, our Formularies on many vital points are fundamentally at one with Continental Protestantism. The history of our Articles has already shown their close association with the Confessions of Augsburg and Wurtemberg. And it must never be forgotten that

"there are only two systems of Dogmatic Theology, coherent in structure and capable of scientific exposition, the Romish and the Protestant; these words being understood not in the popular sense, but of the principles of the respective systems, as they are found stated in the public Confessions of Faith, and elaborated in the works of the principal theologians, on either side since the Reformation."²

It is well known that the experiment of a *via media* theology was made by Newman in connection with Tract 90. But it soon proved

¹ "The Articles, if viewed under one aspect, were *pacificatory*; they strove by silence, or at least by general statements, to divert and calm the speculations of the English clergy on mysterious and scholastic questions which remain unsolved in Holy Scripture, and transcend the present limits of the human understanding. On the other hand those Articles were meant to be *denunciatory*; plain and positive errors were unsparingly rebuked. Criteria had been provided, so that advocates alike of Romanism and Anabaptism, Papist and fanatic, Puritan and Zwinglian, 'sacramentary,' were all excluded from the office of public teachers in the Church of England" (Hardwick, *ut supra*, p. 159).

² Litton, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology*, Second Edition, p. xviii.

to be utterly impossible, and "the golden mean, in its actual application, was found to involve as many difficulties as either extreme."¹ Indeed, the fact that Newman himself was compelled to set it on one side and join the Roman Church is the strongest possible testimony to the essential Protestantism of the Anglican Formularies. In view, therefore, of these statements it is impossible to avoid drawing the conclusion in regard to Newman of one of the ablest thinkers of the last century:—

"A writer may be pardoned who accepts the judgment of so great a master, and ventures to think that nothing in Dogmatic Theology that will satisfy the demands of consecutive thinkers is likely to be produced except on the lines either of genuine Romanism or of genuine Protestantism."²

It is a simple matter of fact that no trace can be found of any such idea as that represented by the phrase "Catholic principles." The plain grammatical sense of the Articles in the light of Holy Scripture is the Anglican position, and the appeal to Scripture shows what is our ultimate authority. The Church, and even the Creeds, are subject to Holy Scripture (Articles VI, VIII, XX).³

¹ Litton, *ut supra*, p. xviii.

² Litton, *ut supra*, p. xix.

³ Three recent testimonies to this are to the point:

"Is it not then entirely inconsistent with this principle of our Church to say, as is constantly said by many among us, that the Prayer Book and Articles were to be read and interpreted in the light of the belief and practice of the Catholic Church? Her principle demands, on the contrary, that our formularies, and more particularly our Articles, should be interpreted in the light of Holy Scripture, rather than in that of mediæval theology" (Wace, *Principles of the Reformation*, p. 248).

"Is it quite accurate to say that the appeal of the English Church is to the Scriptures and the primitive fathers? I should have thought that the sixth Article was sufficiently conclusive. 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.' Nothing is to be received which is not read therein nor to be proved thereby. The English Church, as it seems to me, claims to rest upon the rock of the Bible, and the Bible only, as exclusively as any body of Protestants in Christendom" (Simpson, *The Thing Signified*, p. 13).

"It may be convenient to assert that a particular statement in the Articles is 'patient' of a certain interpretation, but it is obviously important to know whether that interpretation is consistent with the sense in which, and the purpose for which, it was originally set forth" (Tait, *Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 8).

ANALYSIS OF THE ARTICLES

It has already been shown that the Articles do not present a complete system of doctrine because they were largely due to the historical circumstances which called them forth. If they had been intended as a complete, systematic statement of Christian doctrine the logical place of Articles VI-VIII would have been first instead of as at present. But the fundamental doctrines of Articles I-V were doubtless put in the foreground in order to show the vital agreement of Reformation doctrine with that of the mediæval and primitive Church on the realities of Christian Theism. But there is more fulness and completeness of teaching than many are inclined to believe. The main omission is in connection with Eschatology, and on this, the History of the Forty-two Articles is interesting and perhaps significant. The Articles, as they stand, are best divided as follows :—

I.—THE SUBSTANCE OF FAITH (Articles I-V).

1. The Holy Trinity.
- 2-4. The Son of God.
 - (a) The Word or Son of God, which was made very Man.
 - (b) The going down of Christ into Hell.
 - (c) The Resurrection of Christ.
5. The Holy Ghost.

II.—THE RULE OF FAITH (Articles VI-VIII).

6. The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.
7. The Old Testament.
8. The Three Creeds.

III.—THE LIFE OF FAITH (Articles IX-XVIII). *Personal Religion.*

A.—ITS COMMENCEMENT (Articles IX-XIV). Doctrines connected with Justification.

9. Original or Birth-sin.
10. Free-will.
11. The Justification of Man.
12. Good Works.
13. Works before Justification.
14. Works of Supererogation.

B.—ITS COURSE (Articles XV-XVIII). Doctrines connected with Sanctification.

15. Christ alone without Sin.
16. Sin after Baptism.
17. Predestination and Election.
18. Obtaining eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.

IV.—THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH (Articles XIX-XXXIX).
Corporate Religion.

A.—THE CHURCH (Articles XIX-XXII).

19. The Church.
20. The Authority of the Church.
21. The Authority of General Councils.
22. Purgatory.

B.—THE MINISTRY (Articles XXIII, XXIV).

23. Ministering in the Congregation.
24. Speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the people understandeth.

C.—THE SACRAMENTS (Articles XXV-XXXI).

25. The Sacraments.
26. The Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament.
27. Baptism.
28. The Lord's Supper.
29. The Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.
30. Both Kinds.
31. The one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

D.—CHURCH DISCIPLINE (Articles XXXII-XXXVI).

32. The Marriage of Priests.
33. Excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.
34. The Traditions of the Church.
35. The Homilies.
36. Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.

E.—CHURCH AND STATE (Articles XXXVII-XXXIX).

37. The Civil Magistrates.
38. Christian men's Goods, which are not common.
39. A Christian man's Oath.

The scope of the Articles covers the twofold ground of (1) Divine Revelation: its fact and evidences; (2) Human Response: its method and consequences.

The contents of Divine Revelation may perhaps be stated thus—

1. The Doctrine of God. Theology. God in His Being, Character, and Relationships.
2. The Doctrine of Man. Anthropology. Before and after the Fall.
3. The Doctrine of Christ. Christology. His Person, Nature, and Work.
4. The Doctrine of Redemption. Soteriology. Its need, nature, means, and effects.
5. The Doctrine of the Spirit. Pneumatology. The Spirit in the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Christian Church.
6. The Doctrine of the Church. Ecclesiology. The Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments.
7. The Doctrine of the Future. Eschatology. Death, Life, Heaven, Hell.¹

It will be seen that with the exception of the last section the Articles have something to say on all essential points, and in regard to Eschatology, the Church has probably been wise in omitting the controverted subjects stated in Articles XXXIX, XL, XLI, and XLII of 1553, and limiting the teaching of the Church to the brief but plain statements of the three Creeds.

¹ Another outline, which may be compared with the above, will be found in *Outlines of Theological Study*, compiled and published with the approval of the Committee of the Conference upon the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders, pp. 29-32 (London: George Bell & Sons). The entire pamphlet is one of great value for all students.