

ARTICLE IV

Of the Resurrection of Christ.

De Resurrectione Christi.

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

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

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

From death	=	<i>a mortuis.</i>
To the perfection of man's nature	=	<i>ad integritatem humana natura.</i>

THE Article is virtually the same now as it was in 1553, but there is nothing corresponding to it in the Confession of Augsburg, or the Articles of the Concordat of 1538. It is the natural sequel of the preceding Articles on the Person and Work of Christ. Its purpose was evidently to emphasise the truth of the Resurrection and the reality of our Lord's humanity in the face of primitive and subsequent denials. The Docetism of the early Gnostics had been revived in the sixteenth century, and some taught that the flesh of Christ had not been real, and is now so deified as to have lost all real humanity.¹ On this account it was felt essential to emphasise the real and actual physical resurrection² which would show that our Lord did not lay aside His humanity when He arose from the grave and ascended into heaven.

But as with previous Articles, so with this, there is no doubt that the Reformers wished to emphasise their agreement with the fundamental teaching of the universal Church concerning our Lord's Resurrection. Then, too, there seems to have been a special reference to certain eucharistic views associated with the ubiquity of our Lord's humanity, which this Article would indirectly but effectively meet and controvert.³

I.—THE TEACHING OF THE ARTICLE

As the Article contains several separate and yet connected truths, it seems best first to analyse it as a whole, and then to consider more in detail the chief doctrines taught and implied.

¹ Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 99.

² See *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Hæresibus*, c. 5, *De duabus naturis Christi*. This sentence of it is particularly important, though the entire section should be consulted: *Quidam verbum in carnis naturam conversum asserunt, quam, quamprimum a morte in cælum fuit recepta, rursus volunt in naturam divinam reversam et absorptam esse.*

³ See also on Article XXIX.

1. The Fact of the Resurrection.—“Christ did truly rise again from death.”—The emphasis is plainly on the reality of the physical resurrection.

2. The identity of the risen body.—“And took again His body.”—This is a further proof of actual resurrection which necessarily involves identity with the past.

3. The difference between the risen body and that which was buried.—“With flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man’s nature.”—The omission of “blood” may possibly refer to the essential difference between the body buried and that which was raised. The Article, following Scripture, speaks of “flesh and bones,” and this phrase contrasted with St. Paul’s words about “flesh and blood” being unable to enter the Kingdom of God, may suggest that while the resurrection body was not constituted on a natural basis through blood, yet that it possessed “all things appertaining to the perfection of man’s nature.” Thus, the true description of the Resurrection seems to be that it was an objective reality, and yet not merely a physical resuscitation. It was the same, yet different; different, yet the same.

4. The Ascension.—“Wherewith He ascended into heaven.”—The Latin is significant, *cum quibus*, i.e. with all the parts of His physical nature herein specified. Thus, following Scripture, the Article makes no distinction between the Resurrection and the Ascension as actual facts.

5. The Session.—“And there sitteth.”—This is a virtual repetition of the statement of the Creed, as based upon New Testament teaching.

6. The Return.—“Until He return.”—Another reference to that which is so prominent in the New Testament, the Second Advent of our Lord.

7. The Judgment.—“To judge all men at the last day.”—Again, following the Creed, the statement is quite general in regard to the purpose for which Christ returns.

II.—THE PLACE OF THE RESURRECTION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The statements of the Article with reference to the Resurrection of Christ require the consideration of what Holy Scripture teaches concerning this event, and in order that we may more fully realise its spiritual meaning and practical use it is essential to look at the position it occupies in the record of the New Testament.

1. It was predicted by Christ Himself.—At first He used only vague terms (John ii. 19).—Later on He spoke plainly, and whenever He mentioned His death He added a reference to the Resurrection (Matt. xvi. 21). These statements are numerous and form an integral part of the teaching of Christ concerning Himself (Matt. xii. 38-40; xvi. 21; xvii. 23; xx. 19; xxvii. 63; Mark viii. 31; ix. 31; x. 34; xiv. 58; Luke ix. 22; xviii. 33; John ii. 19-21).

2. The record of the appearances after the Resurrection.—In all four

Gospels the appearances of Christ are clear and prominent. There were two sets of appearances, one in Jerusalem and the other in Galilee. The detailed accounts of these appearances, especially when contrasted with the comparative fragmentariness of the story of Christ's earthly life up to Palm Sunday are undoubtedly significant.

3. The Resurrection was prominent in the preaching of the Apostles. On every occasion when they were faced with unbelievers, both Jews and Gentiles, the main theme of their testimony was "Jesus and the Resurrection" (Acts iv. 2). The choice of the new Apostle was associated with testimony to the Resurrection (Acts i. 22); the sermons of St. Peter made the Resurrection prominent (Acts ii. 32; iv. 10; x. 40). In the same way, St. Paul was first of all convinced of the Resurrection (Acts ix. 5), and then proclaimed it everywhere (Acts xiii. 30; xvii. 31; xxvi. 8, 23; I Cor. xv. 1-4). It is impossible to ignore the prominence of this subject in Apostolic preaching.

4. The Resurrection is shown to be a spiritual force in the life of Christians (Rom. i. 4; iv. 25; vi. 9-11; Eph. i. 19, 20; I Pet. i. 21).

5. It is also set forth as the guarantee of hope in a future life (I Cor. xv. 20-23; I Thess. iv. 14; I Pet. i. 3, 4).

III.—THE PROOFS OF THE RESURRECTION¹

As the Resurrection has always been regarded as vital to Christianity, it is not surprising that opponents have concentrated their attacks on it. There are several converging lines of evidence.

1. The first proof is the life of Jesus Christ Himself. Whether in ordinary experience or in fiction there is a disappointment when a life which commences well finishes badly. With Jesus Christ a perfect life ends in a shameful death, and it is impossible to regard this as a fitting close. The Gospels give the Resurrection as the completion of the picture of Christ. There is no doubt that He anticipated His own Resurrection, and His veracity is at stake if He did not rise. Thus, the Resurrection is that of no ordinary man, but of One whose character had been unique, and for whose shameful death no proper explanation was conceivable.² In view, therefore, of His perfect truthfulness, any denial of His assurance of resurrection is impossible.³ Then, too, if death closed a life so remarkable, we are faced with the insoluble mystery of the permanent triumph of wrong over right;⁴ so that the Resurrection cannot be isolated from what preceded it, and the true solution of the problem is to be found in that estimate which "most entirely fits in with the totality of the facts."⁵

¹ The substance of this section is taken from an article by the author in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopædia*. See also his *Christianity is Christ*, Ch. VII. For other works on the Resurrection see p. 528.

² Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 122 f.

³ C. H. Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection*, p. 30.

⁴ C. H. Robinson, *ut supra*, p. 36.

⁵ Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 14.

2. Another line of proof is the fact of the empty grave and the disappearance of the body. The details of the record as to Christ's death and burial are not now seriously challenged, and yet on the third morning the tomb was empty and the body had disappeared. There are only two alternatives. His body must have been taken out of the grave by human hands or else by superhuman power. The human hands would have been those of His friends or His foes. Even if the former had wished to do so they could hardly have accomplished their desire in the face of the obstacles. If the latter had contemplated the removal it may be questioned whether they would have seriously considered it, since this would have been the most likely thing to spread the report of His Resurrection. As St. Chrysostom said, "If the body had been stolen, they could not have stolen it naked, because of the delay in stripping it of the burial clothes and the trouble caused by the drugs adhering to it."¹ Besides, the position of the grave clothes proves the impossibility of the theft of the body.² Then, too, it is impossible to account for the failure of the Jews to disprove the Resurrection, since it was not more than seven weeks after the Resurrection that St. Peter preached the fact that Jesus Christ had been raised. If the Jews could have produced the dead body it would have silenced the Apostle for ever. "The silence of the Jews is as significant as the speech of the Christians."³ Thus, the fact of the empty tomb with the disappearance of the body remains a problem to be faced. It is now admitted that the evidence for the empty tomb is adequate, and that it was part of the primitive belief;⁴ and it is important to realise the force of this admission because it is a testimony to St. Paul's use of the term "third day," and to the Christian observance of the first day of the week. And yet it is often argued that the belief in the empty tomb is impossible, and some interpret the idea of resurrection to mean the revival of Christ's spiritual influence on the disciples. It is thought that the essential value of the Resurrection can be preserved even while surrendering belief in His bodily rising from the grave.⁵ But how is it possible to believe in the Resurrection while regarding the foundation of this belief as an error? The disciples, finding the tomb empty, believed that He had risen, and the belief can hardly be true if the foundation is false. Besides, the various forms of the Vision theory are now regarded as inadequate, since they involve the change of almost every statement in the Gospel and the invention of new conditions of which the Gospels know nothing.⁶ Why should the disciples have had this abundant experience of visions, and why should these have been strictly limited to a very brief period, and then suddenly come to an end? They knew of the apparition of a spirit, like Samuel's, and had witnessed the resuscitation of a body, like

¹ Quoted in Day, *Evidence for the Resurrection*, p. 35.

² See Greek of John xx. 6, 7; Cf. xi. 44; Grimley, *Temple of Humanity*, pp. 69, 70; Latham, *The Risen Master*; *Expository Times*, Vol. XIII, p. 293 f.; XIV, p. 510.

³ Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 357.

⁴ Streeter, *Foundations*, pp. 134, 154.

⁵ Orr, *ut supra*, p. 23.

⁶ Orr, *ut supra*, p. 222.

that of Lazarus, but they had never experienced or imagined the fact of a spiritual body, the novel combination of body and spirit. It is, therefore, impossible to accept the theory of a real spiritual manifestation of the risen Christ, for no telepathic communication is equivalent to the idea of resurrection. Psychological research in any case does not answer to the conditions of the physical resurrection recorded in the New Testament. "The survival of the soul is not resurrection." "Whoever heard of a spirit being buried"?¹ Even though it is said that faith is not bound up with holding a particular view of the relation of Christ's present glory to the body that was once in Joseph's tomb, yet faith must ultimately rest on fact, and it is difficult to see how Christian belief can be "agnostic" with regard to the facts which are so prominent in the New Testament, and which form a vital part of the Apostolic witness. The attempt to set faith and historical evidence in opposition is unsatisfactory, and there is a growing feeling that it is impossible to believe in the Easter message without believing in the Easter facts. When once the evidence for the empty tomb is allowed to be adequate, the impossibility of any other explanation is at once seen. The evidence must be accounted for and adequately explained. It is becoming more and more evident that various theories cannot account for the records in the Gospels or for the place and power of those Gospels in all ages of the Church. The force of the evidence is clearly seen by the explanations suggested by some modern writers.² Not one of them is tenable without doing violence to the Gospel story and without putting forth new theories which are both improbable and without any historical or literary evidence.

Others suggest that the Resurrection was a real objective appearance without implying physical reanimation, that "the Resurrection of Christ was an objective reality, but was not a physical resuscitation."³ But difficulty arises as to the meaning of the term re-resurrection. If it means a *return* from the dead, a rising *again* (*re*), must there not have been some identity between that which was put in the tomb and the "objective reality" which appeared to the disciples? Wherein lies the essential difference between an objective vision and an objective appearance? If the testimony of the Apostles to the empty tomb is believed, why may not their evidence to the actual Resurrection be also accepted. It is, of course, clear that the Resurrection body was not exactly the same as when it was put in the tomb, but it is also clear that there was definite identity as well as definite dissimilarity, and both elements must be explained. We are, therefore, brought back to a consideration of the facts recorded in the Gospels, and must demand an explanation which will take all of them into consideration and do no violence to any part of the evidence. To predicate a new Resurrection body in which Jesus

¹ Orr, *ut supra*, p. 229.

² Those of Oscar Holtzmann, K. Lake, and A. Meyer can be seen in Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, Ch. VIII, and that of Reville in C. H. Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ*, p. 69. See also article by Streeter, in *Foundations*.

³ C. H. Robinson, *ut supra*, p. 12.

Christ appeared to His disciples does not explain how in three days' time the body which had been placed in the tomb was disposed of. The theory seems to demand a new miracle of its own.¹

3. The next line of proof is the transformation of the disciples, due to the Resurrection. Through their Master's death they had lost all hope, and yet this returned three days afterwards. When the message of the Resurrection first came they were incredulous, but when once they became assured of it they never doubted again. This astonishing change in so short a time has to be explained. Legendary growth was impossible in so brief a period, and the psychological fact of this marvellous change demands a full explanation. The disciples were prepared to believe in the appearance of a spirit, but never seem to have contemplated the possibility of a resurrection (Mark xvi. 11). Men do not imagine what they do not believe, and the women's intention to embalm a corpse shows that they did not expect His Resurrection. Besides, hallucination involving five hundred people at once and repeated several times is unthinkable.

4. The next line of proof is the existence of the primitive Church. It is now admitted that the early community of Christians came into existence as the result of a belief in the Resurrection of Christ.² Two facts stand out: (1) the Society was gathered together by preaching; (2) the theme of the preaching was the Resurrection of Christ. The evidence of the early chapters of Acts is unmistakable, and it is impossible to allege that the primitive Church did not know its own history, and that legends quickly grew up and were eagerly received. Any modern Church could readily give an account of its history for the past fifty years or more.³ There was nothing vague about the testimony of the early Church. "As the Church is too holy for a foundation of rottenness, so she is too real for a foundation of mist."⁴

5. One witness in the Apostolic Church calls for special attention, the Apostle Paul. He possessed the three essentials of a true witness: intelligence, candour, and disinterestedness. His conversion and work stand out clearly in regard to his evidence for the Resurrection.⁵ In view, therefore, of St. Paul's personal testimony to his own conversion, and to his interviews with those who had seen Christ on earth, with the prominence given to the Resurrection in his teaching, we may rightly argue that he stands out beyond all question as a witness to the Resur-

¹ Kennett, *Interpreter*, Vol. V, p. 271.

² "There is no doubt that the Church of the Apostles believed in the resurrection of their Lord" (Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, p. 74).

³ Orr, *ut supra*, p. 144.

⁴ Archbishop Alexander, *The Great Question*, p. 10.

⁵ "He affirms that within five years of the crucifixion of Jesus he was taught that 'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures'" (Kennett, *ut supra*, p. 267).

"That within a very few years of the time of the crucifixion of Jesus, the evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus was, in the mind of at least one man of education, absolutely irrefutable" (Kennett, *ut supra*, p. 267).

rection. His twenty-five years of service were based upon the sudden change wrought at his conversion, and if his conversion was true, Jesus Christ rose from the dead, for everything the Apostle was and did he attributed to the sight of the risen Christ.¹

6. The next line of proof is the record in the Gospels of the appearances of the risen Christ, and in view of the dates when the Gospels were written this should be considered in the order now stated. The Resurrection was believed in by the Church for a number of years before the Gospels were written, and it is therefore impossible for these records to be our primary evidence. We must get behind them if we are to appreciate the force of the testimony, and it is for this reason that, following the proper logical order, we reserve to the last our consideration of these appearances. The point is one of great importance.² Whatever theory may be held as to the origin and relation of the Gospels, the appearances can be safely and thoroughly examined. There are two sets of appearances, one in Jerusalem and the other in Galilee, and their number and the amplitude and weight of their testimony call for careful estimation. Books dealing specifically with the Resurrection examine each appearance minutely, but this is impossible under the conditions of this work, though it may be remarked that no one can read the story of the walk to Emmaus (Luke xxiv), or the visit of St. Peter and St. John to the tomb (John xx) without observing the striking marks of reality in the accounts.³ The difficulties connected with the number and order of the appearances are probably due mainly to the summary character of the story, and do not invalidate the uniform testimony to the two facts: (1) the empty grave; (2) the appearances of Christ on the third day.⁴ The very difficulties in the Gospels are a testimony to a conviction of the truth of the narratives on the part of the Christian Church through the ages. The records have been fearlessly left as they are because of the facts they embody. If there had been no difficulties artificiality could have been charged against the records, and the fact that we possess these two sets of appearances is really an argument in

¹ It is well known how that Lord Lyttelton and his friend Gilbert West left Oxford University at the close of one academic year, each determining to give attention respectively during the Long Vacation to the conversion of St. Paul and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, in order to prove the baselessness of both. They met again in the autumn and compared experiences. Lord Lyttelton had become convinced of the truth of St. Paul's conversion, and Gilbert West of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

² Denney, *ut supra*, p. 111.

³ "It carries with it, as great literary critics have pointed out, the deepest inward evidences of its own literal truthfulness. For it so narrates the intercourse of 'a risen God' with commonplace men as to set natural and supernatural side by side in perfect harmony. And to do this has always been the difficulty, the despair of imagination. The alternative has been put reasonably thus: St. Luke was either a greater poet, a more creative genius than Shakespeare, or—he did not create the record. He had an advantage over Shakespeare. The ghost in Hamlet was the effort of laborious imagination. The risen Christ on the road was a fact supreme, and the Evangelists did but tell it as it was" (Bishop Moule, *Meditations for the Church's Year*, p. 108).

See also Orr, *ut supra*, p. 176 f.

⁴ Orr, *ut supra*, p. 212.

favour of their credibility, since one set only might have been rejected for lack of support.

When we examine all these converging lines of evidence it seems impossible to escape from the problem of a physical miracle, and this is the *prima facie* view of the evidence afforded. It is this question of the miraculous that is at the root of much modern disbelief in the Resurrection. The scientific doctrine of the uniformity and continuity of nature leads to the conclusion that miracles are impossible. We are either not allowed to believe, or else we are told that we are not required to believe, in the reanimation of a dead body. If this view is taken, "there is no need, really, for investigation of evidence; the question is decided before the evidence is looked at."¹ But this position proves too much, since it would rule out all Divine interventions which might be called miraculous. On this view it would be impossible to account for the Person of Christ at all. "A sinless Personality would be a miracle in time." Those who hold a theistic view of the world cannot accept any *a priori* view that miracles are impossible. The Resurrection, therefore, means the presence of miracle, and "there is no evading the issue with which this confronts us."²

Of recent years attempts have been made to account for the Resurrection by means of ideas derived from Babylonian and other Eastern sources. It is argued that Mythology provides the key, and that not only analogy, but derivation is to be found in it. But there is nothing worthy of the name of historical proof afforded, and the idea is often quite arbitrary and prejudiced by the attitude to the supernatural. There is literally no link of connection between these Oriental cults and the Christian belief in the Resurrection.

And so we return to a consideration of the various lines of proof. Taken singly, they are strong; taken together, the argument is cumulative and almost irresistible. Every fact must have its adequate cause, and the only proper explanation of Christianity to-day is the Resurrection of Christ.

IV.—THE THEOLOGY OF THE RESURRECTION

The Resurrection is not only a fact; it is a force, and its theology is so important as to call for special attention. Indeed, the prominence given in the New Testament to teaching connected with it affords a strong confirmation of the fact itself, for it seems incredible that such varied and important truths should not rest on historical fact. The doctrine may be briefly summarised.

1. Evidential.—The Resurrection is the proof of the atoning character of Christ and of His Deity and Divine exaltation (Rom. i. 4). It is shown in the New Testament to be the vindication of His character and the justification of what He had said concerning Himself and His Divine

¹ ORR, *ut supra*, pp. 44, 46; C. H. ROBINSON, *ut supra*, Ch. II.

² ORR, *ut supra*, p. 53.

mission. In this connection it is particularly significant to notice the emphasis placed on the fact that the Resurrection was the act of God rather than of Christ Himself. After the actual Resurrection there does not appear to be a single text which attributes the Resurrection to Christ Himself. Even those passages which are doubtful in the English are quite clear in the Greek, teaching that He *was raised* from the dead (Acts ii. 32; Rom. iv. 24, 25; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 1 Thess. i. 10). This emphasis on the act of God the Father is a striking testimony to His approval of the life and work of Jesus Christ.

2. Evangelistic.—The primitive Gospel included testimony to the Resurrection as one of its characteristic features, thereby affording to the hearers the assurance of Divine redemption. It sealed the Atonement and bore testimony to its adequacy and certainty for men's salvation (Rom. iv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 1-4).

3. Redemptive.—The Resurrection is shown to be the guarantee of the believer's justification, that on his acceptance of the message of the Gospel there is the absolute assurance of acceptance with God (1 Pet. i. 21).

4. Spiritual.—The Resurrection of Christ is regarded as the source and standard of the holiness of the believer. Every aspect of the Christian life from beginning to end is somehow associated therewith (Rom. vi).

5. Eschatological.—The Resurrection is the guarantee and model of the believer's resurrection (1 Cor. xv). As the bodies of the saints arose (Matt. xxvii. 52), so ours are to be quickened (Rom. viii. 11), and made like Christ's glorified body (Phil. iii. 21), thereby becoming spiritual bodies (1 Cor. xv. 44), that is, bodies ruled by their spirits and yet continuing to be bodies. Thus, the Resurrection of Christ guarantees our resurrection (1 Thess. iv. 14). He completed a human experience which prepared Him to be the Saviour of the world, the Head of the Church, and provided Him with a Resurrection body which was the type of ours. It is, of course, impossible to speak definitely about the believer's resurrection body, but the example of our Lord's Resurrection body is the best, indeed the only, illustration we possess. All that we may say is that it will be a body and yet spiritual; spiritual and yet a body. There will be identity and continuity with whatever differences of which at present we know, and perhaps can know, nothing.¹

V.—THE ASCENSION AND SESSION

1. The Ascension.—The New Testament regards the Ascension with its complementary truths of the session and intercession of Christ as the culmination of His redemptive work. Our Lord Himself said to His disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away," and in this "expediency" there is something which has been very largely neglected by the Church. It is doubtless due to the fact that Ascension Day is a

¹ See Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection*; Milligan, *The Resurrection*.

weekday festival, instead of a Sunday one, that its observance has been very insignificant compared with that of Easter Day, and yet perhaps this is not the entire explanation of the comparative neglect of the festival of the Ascension and its profound meaning. In the fourth Gospel there are at least twelve clear references to it (*e.g.* i. 51; iii. 13; vi. 62; xiii. 3; xvii. 11; and especially chaps. xiv-xvi). In the Epistle to the Hebrews no reference to the Resurrection is found, except in the concluding doxology, while the Ascension is the main spiritual truth. Then, too, we see what it meant to our Lord Himself in St. Luke ix. 51 and Acts ii. 33. It was at the Ascension that our Lord entered upon His work as Priest and King, and this is why the doctrinal position of the Epistle to the Hebrews centres in the fact of the Ascension in relation to our Lord's priesthood.

But it also meant much to the disciples as well, for the "expediency" applied to them as well as to our Lord. (a) It brought a deeper peace. Christ's Ascension was the culmination of His earthly life and work, and gave purpose and reason to all the rest. While the removal of the guilt of sin was associated with His death, and the destruction of the power of sin with His Resurrection, the removal of the separation caused by sin was associated with His Ascension, and herein lies the force of the Apostle's word: "It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, *who is even* at the right hand of God" (Rom. viii. 34), so in the assurance that "He Himself is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John ii. 2) the conscience and heart find rest. Christ's righteousness has been accepted, His position is assured, and now access is possible to all believers. (b) It elicited a stronger faith. There was a great work to be done, and one that needed much confidence and boldness. Only the thought of a victorious Master could make victorious disciples. As long as His life was incomplete, or one of suffering only, their life would lack inspiration. But the Ascension was the pledge of a victorious result (Heb. iv. 14), and the disciples were therefore to "hold fast their confession," for whatever struggle they might have it was certain to end in victory (2 Tim. ii. 12). (c) It led into a larger work. During the earthly life of Christ His work was local only, but after He had been received into heaven He could not be limited to Judæa or Galilee. The word was, "Go ye into all the world," and in the Ascension of their Master the disciples would be elevated above narrowness and pettiness as they contemplated the purpose of world-wide evangelisation. (d) It gave a clearer hope. They doubtless had the usual Jewish ideas of salvation, but it was their Master's presence in heaven that made it real to them. At once human and Divine He had told them that He was going to prepare a place for them (John xiv. 2, 3). He went there as Forerunner and Pledge, and told them to rejoice because He was going to the Father (John xiv. 28). His word for them was an inspiration, "Because I live ye shall live also." (e) It provided a greater power. On earth their Master was necessarily limited and circumscribed, but at the right hand of God authority and power were His, and the disciples

could therefore depend upon His presence and grace in all the work which He was sending them to do (Mark xvi. 20). This was the meaning of His own word, "Greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto My Father" (John xiv. 12), and so when the Comforter came they were enabled to accomplish tasks which even the Lord on earth was unable to do. His presence and power led to the accomplishment of spiritual results of marvellous extent and influence (John vii. 37-39; xvi. 7; Acts ii. 33; Eph. iv. 8). Thus, the Ascension was to the disciples at once a cause of joy (Luke xxiv. 52; John xiv. 28), the secret of fellowship (John xvi. 16; xx. 17), and the standard of life (Col. iii. 1 f.).

2. The Session.—Following the act of ascension the New Testament has not a little to say of our Lord's present life in heaven. Most Lives of Christ written of recent years commence with Bethlehem and end with the Ascension. But the New Testament commences earlier and continues later. It is with the glorified life of Christ above that the Article deals, and it is important to observe with some detail the Scripture teaching. He is seated on the right hand of God (Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12). He bestowed the gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 4). He added disciples to the Church (Acts ii. 47). He worked with the disciples as they went forth preaching the Gospel (Mark xvi. 20). He healed the impotent man (Acts iii. 16). He stood to receive the first martyr (Acts vii. 56). He appeared to Saul of Tarsus (Acts ix. 5). He makes intercession for His people (Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25). He is able to succour the tempted (Heb. ii. 18). He is able to sympathise (Heb. iv. 15). He is able to save to the uttermost (Heb. vii. 25). He lives for ever (Heb. vii. 24; Rev. i. 18). He is our Great High Priest (Heb. vii. 26; viii. 1; x. 21). He possesses an intransmissible or inviolable priesthood (Heb. vii. 24). He appears in the presence of God for us (Heb. ix. 24). He is our Advocate with the Father (1 John ii. 1). He is waiting until all opposition to Him is overcome (Heb. x. 13). This includes all the teaching of the New Testament concerning our Lord's life above. It is important to keep strictly to this, because of a current view found in certain quarters that He is now offering Himself before the Father. Many years ago a number of clergymen declared their belief in these terms: "We believe that in heaven Christ our Great High Priest ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father."¹ And some recent works teach the same doctrine. But it is impossible to reconcile this with what is found in the New Testament. All our Lord's offering is there regarded as in the past in connection with the Cross (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 14). The offering is said to have been "once for all" (Heb. x. 10); and He is seated at God's right hand (Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12). There was no *altar* in the Holy of Holies, the symbol of heaven (Heb. ix. 3-5; and the Lamb in the midst of the throne in the Revelation is not offering Himself (Rev. v. 6; vii. 17). In a word, there is not a trace to be found of Christ's presence above

¹ Correspondence between the Rev. W. B. Marriott and Canon T. T. Carter, p. 3.

being a perpetual presentation before God of His sacrifice. The Greek verb "offer" in the phrase, "somewhat to offer" (Heb. viii. 3) is in the aorist tense, implying something completed, and, like all other references in the New Testament, it looks back on Calvary.¹ One great authority, Bishop Westcott, shows that our Lord's present work is that of applying the fruits of His completed Atonement, and that "we have no authority to go beyond" the teaching of Hebrews in this connection. Further, no trace of this doctrine can be found in the Prayer Book. If Christ were offering Himself or His sacrifice in heaven it would be so important a truth that it ought to occupy a position of definite prominence in the teaching of our Church. But on opening the Prayer Book we find no trace whatever of it.² If, therefore, a doctrine is taught which cannot be found either in the New Testament or in the Prayer Book it is certainly no part of Anglican teaching.

A somewhat different yet closely connected doctrine is sometimes taught by saying that our Lord is pleading His sacrifice above, as though pleading were not fundamentally different from offering. The two must never be identified or confused. It is, of course, true that our Lord is present in heaven because of the sacrifice He offered on Calvary, and obviously His intercession is founded on the fact of His complete atoning work. But the New Testament, significantly as it would seem, never associates His intercession with the pleading of His sacrifice, and some of the best scholarship is entirely opposed to this view that our Lord is now engaged in pleading His sacrifice. Thus, Bishop Westcott:—

"The modern conception of Christ pleading in Heaven His Passion, 'offering His blood' on behalf of man, has no foundation in this Epistle. His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly expressed the thought, by His presence on His Father's throne. Meanwhile, men on earth in union with Him enjoy continually through His blood what was before the privilege of one man on one day in the year."³

¹ See Dimock's treatment in *Our One Priest on High* (pp. 14-16), with the striking quotations from three masters of New Testament scholarship, Marriott, Westcott, and Gifford.

² "Echo may answer 'where'? It is the only sound in reply. There is a dead silence—no voice, or any to answer. . . . We look at our time-honoured creeds—it is not there. We turn to the grand anthem, which has come down to us from remote antiquity—the 'Te Deum'; not a word. We examine our Eucharistic Service—it is not there. We find a proper Preface for the day of our Lord's Ascension into heaven—it is not there. In the obsecrations of our Litany we find mention of all the prominent points in our blessed Lord's work for our salvation, but no word of any offering of sacrifice in heaven. We look at the Articles of Religion. It certainly is not there" (Adapted and abbreviated from Dimock, *The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium*, p. 13 f.).

³ Hebrews, p. 230.

"The words, 'Still . . . His prevailing death He pleads' have no apostolic warrant, and cannot even be reconciled with apostolic doctrine. . . . So far as the Atonement in relation to God is spoken of in any terms of time, the Bible seems to me to teach us to think of it as lying entirely in the past—a thing done 'once for all'" (*Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, Vol. II, p. 213).

It need hardly be said that the words connected with the Holy Communion, "Do this"; "Remembrance"; "Shew," tell us nothing of our Lord's present life in heaven.¹

So that our Lord is not offering Himself to the Father, or pleading His sacrifice, or representing, or even re-presenting His sacrifice, but He is appearing in God's presence on our behalf; interceding there by His presence and on the basis of His completed redemption on the Cross; sympathising; succouring, and saving the sinful; giving the Holy Spirit; governing and guiding the Church; waiting till He shall appear again.

We are therefore to "lift up our hearts." It is significant that the Epistle to the Hebrews describes the crowning point or pith of the Epistle as "An High Priest who is set down" (chap. viii. 1). When the High Priest had presented the blood on the Day of Atonement his work was complete, and if we could imagine him able to remain there in the presence of God, it would be on the basis of that completed offering, and not on his continuing to offer, or present anything. Besides, as there was no altar in the Holy of Holies, so there could not be any sacrificial offering. Christ is not now at, or on an altar, or at a mercy seat, but on the throne. His presence there on our behalf, as our representative, includes everything.

Dr. Swete agrees with Bishop Westcott in holding that our Lord's presence in heaven is His intercession:—

"The Intercession of the Ascended Christ is not a prayer but a life. The New Testament does not represent Him as an *orante* standing ever before the Father, and with outstretched arms, like the figures in the mosaics of the Catacombs, and with strong crying and tears pleading our cause in the presence of a reluctant God; but as a throned Priest-King, asking what He will from a Father Who always hears and grants His request. Our Lord's life in Heaven is His prayer."²

We can well be content with the thought that He is there, and that His presence with the Father is the secret of our peace, the assurance of our access, and the guarantee of our permanent relation with God. It is just at this point that one essential difference between type and antitype is noticed. The High Priest went into the Holy of Holies *with* blood, but with regard to Christ's entrance into heaven there is a significant alteration in the phrase. He is said to have gone there "*through* His own blood"; His access is based on the act of Calvary (Heb. ix. 12). It is in the priesthood of Christ that Christians realise the difference between spiritual immaturity and spiritual maturity (Heb. vi. 1; x. 1), and it is the purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews to emphasise this truth above all others. Christianity is "the religion of free access to God," and in proportion as we realise this privilege of drawing near and keeping near, we shall find in the attitude of *Sursum corda*, "Lift up

¹ Plummer, "St. Luke," *International Critical Commentary*, p. 497 f.; Gore, *The Body of Christ* (First Edition), p. 315; W. B. Marriott, *Memorials*, p. 206.

² Swete, *The Ascended Christ*, p. 95.

your hearts," one of the essential features of a strong, vigorous, growing, joyous, Christian life.¹

There is one other matter that seems to call for attention connected with our Lord's session in heaven. When controversies arose in regard to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, some writers used language concerning the glorified body of our Lord which seemed to suggest that after His ascension His human nature became deified, and almost, if not quite, lost the attributes of humanity. It is this that has led to the enquiry: Can we think of our ascended Lord as present everywhere as Man? There can be no doubt whatever that the Article was intended to oppose this opinion, and a strong confirmation of this is seen by a comparison of the words of the Article with the rubric at the end of the Communion Service.² The subject was thus clearly before the compilers of our Articles.³ The Article teaches unequivocally the local presence of Christ's humanity in heaven, since He "took again His body . . . wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth," etc. So that in regard to His humanity we may rightly speak of the Real Absence of Christ, just as we may also equally speak of the Real Presence in and through the Holy Spirit. But while this is so, we are not for a moment to suppose that "the Two Natures" are in any way separated from each other even though, as in the record of our Lord's earthly life, the union and correlation are beyond our comprehension. Hooker has endeavoured to state the truth, though it must be confessed that even he is unable to shed much, if any, light on it. While on the one hand he holds it "a most infallible truth that Christ as Man is not everywhere present," he adds that "in some sense He is everywhere present even as Man," and he speaks of this universal presence as "after a sort," since wherever the Word is the Manhood is united with it. According to Hooker, therefore, there is a sort of presence of the Manhood by conjunction, a presence of co-operation and a presence of force and efficacy.⁴ There is really no danger of Nestorianism or Eutychianism if we carefully adhere to the

¹ The last few sentences are based on and taken from the author's article, "Priest," in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.

"Our faith has to lift up its head and thank God that our Great High Priest is no longer sacrificing for sin; that, having by one offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified, He now lives and reigns, sitting in His majesty, throned in His glory, holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, with power before which every knee must bow, giving victory to His saints, whom He loves to the end, able also to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Dimock, *Our One Priest on High*, p. 78).

² "No adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

³ See also *Reformatio Legum, De Hæresibus*, c. 5.

⁴ Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, Bk. V., Ch. LIV, Section 7.

plain teaching of Scripture as interpreted by the Article, that our Lord is absent as Man and yet present as God. The difficulty is almost wholly due to an erroneous conception of our Lord's glorified humanity as associated with the Holy Communion, but Scripture, with our Prayer Book following it, clearly limits the thought of our Lord's death, and not His glorified state, to the Holy Communion, where, as Cranmer says, we are concerned with the body *ut in cruce non in coelo*.

VI.—THE RETURN AND JUDGMENT

The Article follows the Creed in stating briefly yet plainly the expectation of our Lord's coming again.

1. The Coming.—The return of the Lord Jesus Christ is not a mere doctrine to be discussed, nor a matter for intellectual study alone. Its prominence in the New Testament shows the great importance of the truth, for it is referred to over three hundred times, and it may almost be said that no other doctrine is mentioned so frequently or emphasised so strongly.¹ Just before our Lord died He told His disciples that He would come again (John xiv. 3), and when He ascended, two heavenly messengers appeared to the Apostles corroborating the Master's words by saying that He would come back in like manner as they had seen Him go (Acts i. 11). Thenceforward this Coming was to be the "blessed hope" of His people until His glorious appearing (Tit. ii. 13). It is, therefore, important to distinguish clearly and constantly between our death and the coming of the Lord. The two are always contrasted. Death comes to all, Christian and heathen, but the Lord's appearance is to apply to Christians alone. Christ Himself clearly distinguished between death and His Coming (John xxi. 23). The Creed, following the New Testament, is also quite clear as to the future and personal coming of Christ. While there is a sense in which Christ came in and by the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and while, moreover, He still comes to dwell in His people by the same Spirit, yet these are never to be identified with His future coming, for those who had received the Spirit were still to wait for Him from heaven (1 Thess. i. 8-10). Thus, the Coming is the climax and culmination of His work of redemption, when the Body of Christ, the Church, will be completed, and the Lord will usher in that Kingdom which will eventually result in God being all in all (Eph. i. 14; Rom. viii. 19-23; 1 Cor. xv. 23-28).

2. The Judgment.—The Article states in general terms the purpose of our Lord's Coming as that of judgment "at the last day." But the New Testament has much more detail than this, and judgment is only a part

¹ Baptism is mentioned nineteen times in seven Epistles, and in fourteen out of twenty-one is not alluded to. The Lord's Supper is only referred to three or four times in the entire New Testament, and in twenty out of twenty-one Epistles there is no mention of it. The Lord's Coming is referred to in one verse out of every thirteen in the New Testament, and in the Epistles alone in one verse out of ten. This proportion is surely of importance, for if frequency of mention is any criterion there is scarcely any other truth of equal interest and value.

of His work. In the familiar words, "Lo, He comes, with clouds descending," we have what may be called the second part of His Coming, the coming to judgment, according to the Creed. But before that the New Testament seems to teach a coming for His people, and a taking of them away before He returns to the earth for judgment. Of all the Scriptures which treat of the first part of the Coming there is none more explicit than 1 Thess. iv. 13-18. And while on details students of Scripture may differ, it may be said that there is universal belief in regard to the general lines of teaching expressive of the purpose of our Lord's coming again. Among other objects for which He is coming again are: (1) the taking to Himself of His redeemed disciples, including the resurrection of those who have died and the transformation of those who will be alive at His Coming. (2) To reward His servants after their life of grace on earth. (3) To usher in peace and rule this world now in rebellion. (4) To gather together Israel and to place them in their own land. (5) To execute judgment on the rejecters of His grace. (6) To swallow up death in victory. (7) To bind Satan and to usher in Eternity. It is, therefore, usual to distinguish between Christ coming *for* His people and *with* His people, the latter being that which is specifically referred to in the Creed and the Article. But whatever may be our view of detail we must not allow anything to interfere with our firm belief in the fact of the coming. In the light of St. Paul's inclusion of this in the Gospel preached at Thessalonica (2 Thess. ii. 5), the outcome can only be spiritual loss if the coming of Christ is ignored or set aside. There is no truth that so purifies and exalts the Christian life, none that so inspires the worker with earnestness and the discouraged and perplexed with hope. On the institution of the Lord's Supper reference was made by Christ to His coming again, and no one can enter fully into the meaning of the Holy Communion without looking forward to the Coming as well as backward to the Cross. Salvation includes spirit, soul, and body, and this threefold completeness will only be realised in and through "that blessed hope, the glorious appearing of our Great God and Saviour."

The reference to judgment is of particular value in the light of all the mysteries connected with the presence of sin and suffering. Scripture clearly teaches that Christ the present Saviour is to be the future Judge (John v. 22, 27; Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16), and in this judgment, marked, as it will be, by absolute impartiality and complete knowledge, man will find the perfect vindication of God and an explanation of all that is now mysterious and inexplicable. The craving for judgment which is forced upon us by our reason and conscience will find its perfect realisation in the action of Him to whom all judgment has been committed.¹

SUMMARY OF ARTICLES II-IV

Following the line of the Apostles' Creed, these three Articles bring

¹ Maclear and Williams, *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, p. 86, Note 2.

before us our Lord's Person and work as Redeemer in a series of connected acts and facts which are to be factors and forces in our life. It will be well to summarise these truths for the sake of completeness.

1. The Divine Sonship in which He is "equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead"; "Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord" (Apostles' Creed); "the only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God, Begotten, not made, Being of one substance with the Father; By whom all things were made" (Nicene Creed).

2. The Incarnation by which the Son of God became Son of Man. "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary" (Apostles' Creed); "And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, And was made man" (Nicene Creed).

3. The Death by which He made an atonement for sin. "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified" (Apostles' Creed); "And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered" (Nicene Creed).

4. The Burial and Descent into Hell by which He realised in completeness our human experiences. "Dead and buried" (Apostles' Creed); "And was buried" (Nicene Creed).

5. The Resurrection in which He was victorious over Sin, Satan, and Death. "The third day He rose again from the dead" (Apostles' Creed); "And the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures" (Nicene Creed).

6. The Ascension and Session by which He was crowned as Priest, Intercessor, and Lord, bestowing grace and building up His Church. "He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty" (Apostles' Creed); "And ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of the Father" (Nicene Creed).

7. The Return, when He will receive His people, judge the world, and usher in eternal righteousness. "From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead" (Apostles' Creed); "And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: Whose kingdom shall have no end" (Nicene Creed).

ARTICLE V¹

Of the Holy Ghost.

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

De Spiritu Sancto.

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

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Of one substance = *ejusdem essentia.*
Very = *verus.*

THERE was nothing corresponding to this Article in the Forty-two Articles of 1553, and there was none in the Confession of Augsburg. It was derived entirely from the Confession of Wurtemberg, presented to the Council of Trent, 1552, and was introduced here in 1563. The purpose was doubtless to give greater completeness of presentation of doctrine, but there seems to have been a necessity for the statement of the truth against certain denials of the time. The Section, *De Hæresibus*, of the *Reformatio Legum*, contains frequent reference to, and denunciation of the various forms of, misbelief which existed at the time,² and Article I of the Concordat of 1538 condemned those who represented the Holy Spirit as impersonal.

The only virtual change was "substance" for "essence" in the English of 1571, the Latin remaining unchanged.

I.—THE TEACHING OF THE ARTICLE

The Article elaborates the statement of Article I in regard to the Holy Spirit, and thereby follows naturally from the statements of Articles II, III, and IV respecting our Lord. Before looking in detail at the theological topics embraced in the Article it will be useful to analyse it as a whole.

1. The Fact of the Holy Spirit; "The Holy Ghost."

¹ The various aspects of this subject are more fully treated in the author's *The Holy Spirit of God*, of which the treatment here is an abbreviation. Reference may also be made to the bibliography in that work, special attention being called to the books by Dr. Swete, Bishop Moule, Professor Denio, Dr. Smeaton, and Dr. Davison.

² "Quomodo vero hæc putida membra sunt ab Ecclesiæ corpore segreganda, quæ de Christo capite tam perverse sentiunt, sic illorum etiam est execrabilis impudentia, qui cum Macedonio contra Spiritum Sanctum conspiraverunt, illum pro Deo non agnoscentes" (*Reformatio Legum, De Hæresibus*, c. 6).

2. The Procession of the Holy Spirit; "Proceeding from the Father and the Son."

3. The Equality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son; "Of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son."

4. The Godhead of the Holy Spirit; "Very and eternal God."

It will be seen that the Article follows closely the statements of the Nicene Creed in harmony with the Church doctrine of Chalcedon.

II.—THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

1. This is clearly a Bible doctrine and cannot be derived from any other source. It is essentially a truth of revelation. Naturally the subject is not so prominent in the Old Testament as in the New, but it is referred to in about half of the thirty-nine books, and the idea of the Spirit in Genesis is regarded as quite familiar, just as it is in St. Matt. i.

2. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament calls for attention, first of all, and it is noteworthy that the New Testament identifies the Holy Spirit with the Spirit of God in the Old Testament, thereby showing that there is no difference between them. Indeed, the New Testament conception of the Spirit is very largely only intelligible when read in the light of the teaching of the Old Testament. There are three main lines of teaching in the Old Testament in regard to the Holy Spirit: (a) the cosmical, or world-relation of the Spirit of God. The Spirit associated with creation and human life as a whole; (b) the redemptive relation of the Spirit. The connection of the Spirit with Israel; (c) The personal relation of the Spirit. This is concerned with the spiritual life of individuals. It is often asked whether there are indications of development in the Old Testament of the doctrine of the Spirit of God. In the earlier books the Spirit is certainly depicted as a Divine energy, but in the later there seems to be something like an approximation to the doctrine of the Spirit as a Personal Being (Isa. xlviii. 16; lxiii. 9, 10; Zech. iv. 6). Perhaps, in general, the Spirit in the Old Testament is a Divine Agent rather than a distinct Personality. God is regarded as at work by His Spirit. One strong confirmation of the truth that the doctrine of the Spirit is a Bible doctrine is the fact that for all practical purposes the period of the Apocrypha from Malachi to Matthew contributed nothing to it. It is only when we come to New Testament times that we are enabled to see the real implications of the Old Testament in the fuller light and richer experience of the days of Christ.

3. The New Testament is very full of the subject of the Holy Spirit, and it is found in every book, except three short ap. personal ones. It emerges naturally and clearly from the revelation of Jesus Christ. When we look at it in the light of the New Testament we notice three main divisions:—

(a) The character and teaching of Christ. In the Synoptic Gospels we have the Holy Spirit in relation to Christ Himself at each stage of

His earthly manifestation. Then there is the teaching of Christ, the general idea being that of the Holy Spirit as a Divine power, promised to the disciples for the fulfilment of the Divine purpose of redemption. The Fourth Gospel is much fuller and more thoroughly developed, though it is particularly noteworthy that here, as in the Synoptic Gospels, there is a clear assumption of familiarity with the Holy Spirit (John i. 32 ff.). But there is a distinct development of teaching in the Fourth Gospel, where the Spirit is personal, and closely associated at all points with the redemption of Christ. Perhaps the most important feature in this Gospel is the use of the new term "Paraclete," which is found in connection with the detailed teaching of chaps. xiv-xvi. The general idea of the Johannine teaching is that the departure of Christ was to issue in the gift of the Holy Spirit, as the special bestowal of the new covenant for the purpose of perpetuating Christ's spiritual presence and effecting His redemptive work. Thus, the Holy Spirit would at once be a revelation of truth, a bestowal of life, and an equipment for service.

(b) From the Gospels it is natural to pass to the Acts of the Apostles as expressing the first thirty years of the Church's life and work, and the prominence given there to the Holy Spirit is very remarkable. There are at least seventy references, and on this account the book has been well called "The Acts of the Holy Spirit." This emphasis is really a testimony to the prominence of the Divine over the human element, and starting from the Day of Pentecost we see that the Spirit of God is at work, and, indeed, in supreme authority in every part of the early Church. His Person, His gifts, and His work are everywhere, and the book is dominated throughout by the Spirit, because the life of the Church was controlled by His Divine presence and power.

(c) The teaching of the Epistles will naturally follow, and in this St. Paul's work is of the very first importance. A remarkable fulness is seen in his writings and the teaching touches every part of his message. The usual fourfold grouping of his Epistles reveals references to the Spirit in a variety of ways, and both in regard to the work and the nature of the Spirit St. Paul has very much to say. The Holy Spirit is closely related to God (Rom. viii. 9); is regarded as possessing personal activities (Eph. iv. 30); and is intimately bound up with Christ (Rom. viii. 9). The activity of Christ as the Redeemer and Head of the Church is regarded as continued by the Holy Spirit, and yet with all this intimacy of association they are never absolutely identified. A careful study of St. Paul's teaching will support the view of a well-known writer that "the Apostle's entire thinking stands under the influence of his estimate of the Spirit."¹ Other parts of the New Testament are slight and insignificant in comparison with the writings of St. Paul and St. John.

4. The summary of the teaching of the Bible on the subject of the Holy Spirit suggests the following lines:—(a) A close and essential relation of the Spirit to Christ; (b) the Holy Spirit as "the Executive of the

¹ Quoted in *The Holy Spirit of God*, p. 37.

Godhead " in and for the Christian Church ; (c) the Deity of the Spirit (Matt. xxviii. 19 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 14) ; (d) the Personality of the Spirit.

It will be seen from a study of the New Testament that the distinctions in the Godhead are always closely connected with Divine operations rather than with the Divine nature. While there is nothing approaching the metaphysical Trinity of later days, the association of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit with Divine operations is a clear implication of essential Deity. The fundamental conceptions are the same throughout the whole of the New Testament, and there is no development of the doctrine of the Spirit through Ebionism to Orthodoxy.

III.—THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE

1. The Ante-Nicene Period.—Sub-Apostolic Christianity was marked by experience rather than by reflection. And yet immaturity of thought does not indicate error of experience, for the Spirit of God is never regarded as a creature. It was heresy that compelled the Church to pay closer attention to the intellectual statements of the doctrine of the Spirit, and in particular Montanism led to a careful discrimination and thorough statement of the truth. But the strongest confirmation of the doctrine in this non-reflective period is seen in the devotional life of the Church. Experience is often the best witness to what is doctrinally implicit, and the evidence we possess of the life of the Church in these days bears unqualified testimony to the reality of the Divine Spirit. Not only have we the earliest form of the Apostles' Creed from this date, but Doxologies, and other hymns of praise, the Ordinance of Baptism, and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in connection with the Lord's Supper. All bear witness to what the Church believed concerning the Holy Spirit.

2. From Nicæa to Chalcedon.—This non-reflective period concerning the Spirit could not continue in the light of the controversies of the time, and when the Deity of the Son had been established in opposition to Arianism, thought necessarily turned in the direction of the Deity of the Holy Spirit. The Nicene Creed closed with a simple statement of belief: "And in the Holy Spirit." But if the Son was consubstantial with the Father, and therefore Divine, the Personality and Deity of the Spirit would naturally be inferred, even though not as yet specifically stated. The question gradually arose after the Nicene Council, and controversy was due to those who were unable to accept the Deity of the Holy Spirit. They were described by Athanasius as "enemies of the Spirit," and afterwards designated Pneumatomachi. They were led by Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, and it was the acuteness of the controversy that led to the summoning of the Second General Council at Constantinople, 381. The result was the promulgation of a Creed which made some important additions to the declaration of belief in the Holy Ghost.

“The Lord, the Life-Giver, that proceeds from the Father, that with Father and Son is together worshipped and together glorified.”

But it is noteworthy that the term *Homoousios* (*ὁμοούσιος*) was avoided in expressing the Spirit's oneness with the Father and the Son, nor was He even called God, though the terms in which His work was described cannot be predicated of any human being. Thus, the question of the Deity of the Spirit was settled as the Deity of the Son had been settled at Nicæa fifty years before. But the subject was still discussed and developed both in the East and in the West, and in 451 the Council of Chalcedon confirmed the decisions of Nicæa and Constantinople, stating that the clauses added in 381 were only intended to make the Nicene doctrine more explicit against those who had endeavoured to deny the Deity of the Spirit. The Council endorsed both Creeds and incorporated them in the “Definitio” of Chalcedon.

3. Chalcedon to the Reformation.—The doctrine of the Deity of the Spirit being fully established, there still remained the question of His relation to the Father and the Son. The term “Generation” was used to describe the relation of the Son to the Father, and the term “Procession” was employed to denote that of the Spirit. But the question was whether this eternal “Procession” or “Forthcoming” was from the Son as well as from the Father. The problem was Western, not Eastern, and the attitude indicates a difference which is explained by the conditions of the two Churches. The Eastern was confronted with those who tended to regard the Spirit as inferior to the Son, and in order to protect the full Deity of the Spirit it was regarded as essential to represent Him as proceeding solely from the Father as the Fountain (*πηγή*) of the Godhead. The Western Church, on the other hand, starting with the essential unity of the Son and the Father, desired to protect the truth that the Spirit is as much the Spirit of the Son as He is of the Father. Otherwise there could be no equality. It was this that led the West to express its truth by saying that the Spirit “proceeded” from the Father and the Son. It was the great influence of St. Augustine that led the West to endorse this twofold “Procession,” and it became part of Western doctrine by incorporation into the Creed at the Council of Toledo in Spain, 589. At Toledo the authority of the first Four Councils was acknowledged, and the Creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople rehearsed, and it is curious that in this rehearsal the Synod imagined that the Latin Creed represented the Greek original. It is thus a matter of discussion how the words “And the Son” came into the Creed. Some have thought this was due to a marginal gloss. Dr. Burn adduces evidence to prove that the Council never added the words at all, that they are due to a blunder of a copyist of the Toledo text of the Constantinopolitan Creed.¹ The interpolation did not cause suspicion, but was repeated in several Synods as the orthodox doctrine, so that we have the remarkable

¹ Burn, *The Nicene Creed*, p. 40.

fact of the Council professing to keep the text of the Creed pure, and yet laying stress on the Spirit's "Procession" from the Son. It is probable that increasing error was rendering further dogmatic definition necessary. "The Toledan Fathers were only drawing out what seemed to them latent in the Creed."¹ It is essential to distinguish between the doctrine itself and its insertion in the Creed. However and whenever it was inserted, the addition was unwarranted, because it was without proper ecumenical authority, and it was some time before the addition became part of the Roman version of the Constantinopolitan Creed. The Western doctrine is thought to have come to England from Augustine of Canterbury, and during the Middle Ages little or nothing occurred of importance in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Thus, three things were settled in the Western Church: the Deity of the Son at Nicæa, and the Deity of the Spirit at Constantinople, and the Procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son in the Western Creed. Up to the time of the Reformation, Christian thought had been concerned too little with the Person of the Holy Spirit, but the Reformation marks an epoch in the history of the doctrine by its emphasis on His work in the individual and in the Church. Further reference to the history up to the present day does not seem to be called for in connection with this Article; it must suffice to say that the problems which arose at the time of the Reformation may be said to extend to the present time.²

IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The teaching of the Nicene Creed in regard to the Spirit is as follows: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, The Lord and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified." This statement involves the three doctrines in the Article: Personality, Deity, and Procession.

I. The Personality of the Spirit.—The use of the term "Person" in relation to the Godhead is, of course, difficult, because it expresses something essentially different from our modern view of personality. Instead of meaning the fact of separate individuality, Personality in God is intended to convey an idea of an inner distinction which exists in the unity of the Divine Nature. The facts of Scripture demand from us an acknowledgment of the unity of the Godhead and at the same time those interior distinctions between Father, Son, and Spirit which we can only express by our word "Person." While, therefore, it is true that the term is used to-day in connection with human life in a way that is quite different from its use in connection with the Godhead, it is also true that no other term has yet been found adequate to express the essential distinctions in the Godhead. The Holy Spirit is a Person because He works by personal activities on persons, and the facts of Scripture require this belief. Further, the consciousness of the Church has always borne

¹ Burn, *ut supra*, p. 41.

² *The Holy Spirit of God*, Chs. XIII-XVI.

witness in the same direction. Personal working needs continuity of action, and a clear conception of the Personality of the Holy Spirit is essential to His vital relation to the individual Christian and to the Church.

2. The Deity of the Spirit.—The Deity is a necessary consequence of His Personality, for that which is attributed to the latter involves the former. Here, again, belief is based on the facts and implications of Scripture, for the allusions to the Holy Spirit cannot be predicated of anyone but God Himself. As we have seen, there is not the same clearness and fulness of revelation in the New Testament in reference to the Deity of the Spirit, yet it clearly arises out of the Scripture revelation and cannot possibly be expressed in any other way without doing violence to the facts of the case. The Holy Spirit is at once the personal life of God and the “Executive of the Godhead” in relation to man, and however difficult may be the conception of the Holy Spirit within the Godhead it can never be disregarded without spiritual loss.

3. We have already seen something of the history of the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and from the Son, and it is important to obtain a true idea of the meaning of the Western Church in expressing and insisting on this doctrine. On the one side the Spirit is associated with the Father as sent, given, and proceeding (Matt. x. 20; John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26). On the other hand, He is associated with the Son, being called the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9); described as sent by the Son from the Father (John xv. 26); bestowed by the Son on the Apostles (John xx. 22; Acts ii. 33); and called the Spirit of Jesus (Acts xvi. 7, R.V.). (See also Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 11.) So that, in the statement of the Creed, the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, there was no intention of denying the one *principium* in the Father, but only a general assertion that the essence which the Father eternally communicates to the Spirit is also the essence of the Son, and that the Son shares, and is involved in the act and process of communication. The Eastern Church regards the Procession from the Son as temporal only through the Mission, and suspects our Western view of a tendency towards Sabellianism. It would seem as though no reunion were possible without some change of doctrine; at any rate the Eastern Church does not regard the difference as merely verbal. On the other hand, if the West dropped the *Filioque*, it might be thought to deny or question the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father.¹

¹ An authority on the Eastern Church, Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, writing to the *Guardian*, 28th January 1910, described what he called the chief of the many theological objections which the Easterns have to the insertion of the *Filioque*:

“It is not so much that it puts something fresh into the Creed which has no Ecumenical sanction, but that its insertion cuts out something which was there before—namely, the *μοναρχία* in the Godhead. That the Fathers of Constantinople I. intended to emphasise this doctrine seems quite plain from their alterations of the *παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς*, John xv. 26 into the *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον* of the Creed. This is the reason that in ordinary parlance Russian theologians speak of the Western form nine times out

One question of supreme importance has been raised during recent years: Is the doctrine of the Procession from the Son really justified, and does it represent a vital difference? Several authorities are of opinion that it is this addition which has given to the West its admitted spiritual superiority over the East.¹ One writer goes so far as to say that the denial of the Procession from the Son has done much to fossilise the Greek Church. It is undoubtedly true that no Western theologian ever wished to do anything more than to associate in the closest possible way the Holy Spirit with the Son of God, and in so doing it would seem as though this was keeping quite close to the characteristic New Testament conception of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Jesus. And so we may say that "without the Holy Spirit we have practically no Christ," and without Christ we have practically no Holy Spirit.

V.—THE PLACE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIANITY

It will be evident from the foregoing that the Holy Spirit occupies a vital and essential place in the Christian system.

1. In Relation to the Godhead.—The full New Testament idea of God is that of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is impossible to question the fact that the New Testament affords clear proofs of such distinctions within the unity as can only be adequately expressed by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. And as Christ is *within* the Godhead it is impossible for the Spirit to be *without*, since this would imply an inferiority of the Spirit which is contradicted by the facts of Scripture and spiritual experience.

In the same way the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament is inextricably bound up with the revelation of Christ. It is not in His absolute Being, but as the Spirit of Christ that He is revealed in the New Testament (Acts xvi. 7, R.V.). The language in St. Paul's Epistles about the indwelling of Christ and of the Spirit is practically identical (2 Cor. iii. 17; Gal. iv. 6), and yet with this practical identity there is an equally clear distinction. Christ and the Spirit are different, yet the same; the same, yet different. Redemption comes from the Father, through the Son, by the Spirit. Christ is the Divine Saviour, and the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, and in this association we have the spiritual and experimental foundations of the Trinity. But however difficult it may be to express the difference between Christ and the Spirit, regarded as in the Being of God Himself, no difficulty must allow us to ignore the clear teaching of the New Testament and the personal testi-

of ten not as 'the interpolated symbol,' but as 'the mutilated symbol' (*iskazbenny symbol*; Miklosich in his *Slavonic Roots* gives *ἐννουχάζειν* as the first meaning of this verb). By adding the word *Filioque* the Latins not only added to the Creed, but cut out from it what the Greeks look upon as a vital truth. Our theologians ought at least to realise this before they press for the restoration of the Creed to its original form; they will then be able to do so with much better effect."

¹ *The Holy Spirit of God*, pp. 145, 146.

mony of Christian consciousness. There is a close and intimate connection, and yet Christ and the Spirit are never absolutely identical. The Spirit is at once the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ, and we believe that God can only become known to us in the Historic Jesus, Who is mediated to us by the Holy Spirit.

2. In Relation to Holy Scripture.—The Nicene Creed expresses a profound truth when it associates the Holy Spirit with the Old Testament, “Who spake by the prophets.” It involves the important question of a Divine revelation which we believe has been given in the Person of Jesus Christ. Holy Scripture as the embodiment of that revelation comes to us from God through the Spirit, and both in the Old Testament and in the New the Spirit is clearly associated with the written record of the Divine revelation (Acts i. 16; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. iii. 7; 2 Pet. i. 21). On any showing inspiration implies a specific and unique work of the Holy Spirit in giving to the Church the written embodiment of the Divine religion of redemption, and it is this uniqueness that gives Scripture its supreme authority as the work of the Holy Spirit of God.

3. In Relation to the Individual.—The Holy Spirit is described in the Nicene Creed as the “Life-Giver,” and this includes everything essential in His relation to the individual Christian. Without that Spirit no man can be regarded as a Christian (Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3), and it is the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit to reveal Christ to man, and thereby to link the Jesus of history with the Christ of experience. The great needs of the soul: conversion, communion, and character, are all made possible by the Holy Spirit, and His action covers the entire life of the believer from first to last. The Spirit uses the truth of God to reveal Christ to the soul, and then every means of grace is associated with the Holy Spirit as “the Spirit of Christ.” In whatever way we contemplate individual life we see the need of the presence of the Spirit of God.

4. In Relation to the Church.—It is not without point that the expression of belief in the Holy Ghost in the Creeds is immediately followed by the confession of our faith in the existence of the Church. This close connection suggests the truth of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the body of Christian people. The New Testament teaches that the Spirit constituted the Church on the Day of Pentecost (Acts ii; 1 Cor. xii. 13), and thereupon the Spirit abides in the Christian community, builds it up, governs it, unifies it, and provides in every way for its needs. There is no part of the Christian Church, its life, work, power and progress, which is not in some way influenced by the Holy Spirit.

5. In Relation to Christianity.—The Holy Spirit is the guarantee of the best, and, indeed the only, satisfactory apologetic Gospel. Mohammedanism and Buddhism have their ideas, their sacred books, and even their founders, but it is only in Christianity that God is made real to

men. In many respects the Holy Spirit is the ultimate fact in Christianity, for no other religious system has anything corresponding to this truth. The Divine revelation given historically in the Person of Christ is made real to the soul by the Holy Spirit, and this is a characteristic mark in Christianity, since only therein is religion realised as a matter of personal communion with the Deity. So that the Holy Spirit is the unique element of Christianity, and His presence constitutes the only "dynamic" by means of which Christianity can be recommended and vindicated to the world. Whether we think of the individual or the community, the presence and power of the Holy Spirit are absolutely essential for life and progress. The deepest needs of humanity can never be solved by philosophy, scholarship, or criticism. The supreme need to-day is for that personal discipleship to Christ which is alone made available by the Holy Spirit. Everything in the Old Testament points forward to the Coming of the Spirit, and everything in the New Testament emphasises His presence in the Christian community. It is this that makes the Article so important and the truth it enshrines of the most vital necessity in every aspect of life to-day.

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.

THE subject of the Rule of Faith should obviously be considered before discussing particular doctrines included in the Faith. It is only natural and right to think of the depository of Faith before we attempt to elicit the various aspects of teaching found therein. And so the doctrines discussed in the first five Articles are derivable only from Scripture, the fount of essential Christian truth, which is the subject of the next Article. From another standpoint it may be possible to regard the present as the logical order, that is, if we think of the doctrines of the Godhead as in general a Revelation, and then proceed to consider the seat and sphere wherein that Revelation is manifested and declared.¹ But in view of the fact that the Articles are concerned with the substance of specific Christian doctrine the present arrangement is not appropriate to logical order. For symmetry and proportion we naturally ascertain the depository of our Faith before we examine the contents. It is also interesting to observe that the Helvetic Confessions and the Westminster Confession, together with the Irish Articles of 1615, put an Article on Scripture in the first place.² Our order is doubtless due to the fact that the Reformers were desirous of exhibiting the common Faith of Christendom before dwelling upon the differences between us and Rome, of which the question of the Rule of Faith is one of the chief. Everything depends upon the point of view. In a sense we say first of all, "I believe in God," before we bear our testimony to the Scripture as the Word of God. But inas-

¹ This aspect of the subject is taken by Maclear, who quotes Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 1:—

"For after settling that there is a Revelation, the question follows, How is that Revelation to be made known to us? What are the Books that record it? In other words, What is the Canon of Scripture?"

² "Et in hac Scriptura sancta habet universalis Christi ecclesia plenissime exposita quæcunque pertinent, cum ad salvificam fidem, tum ad vitam Deo placentem, recte informandam. Quo nomine distincte a Deo præceptum est, ne ei aliquid vel addatur vel detrahatur" (*Second Helvetic Confession*, Article I).

much as our faith in God in this sense is only concerned with the conviction of His existence, and of a revelation from Him, the true spiritual order is, "I believe God has spoken through His word," and then, "I examine that Word to see Who and what God is, and what He has said and done."

ARTICLE VI

Of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation.

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

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.
Joshua.
Judges.
Ruth.
The First Book of Samuel.
The Second Book of Samuel.
The First Book of Kings.
The Second Book of Kings.
The First Book of Chronicles.
The Second Book of Chronicles.
The First Book of Esdras.
The Second Book of Esdras.
The Book of Esther.
The Book of Job.
The Psalms.
The Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes, or Preacher.
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon.
Four Prophets the Greater.
Twelve Prophets the Less.

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

The Third Book of Esdras.
The Fourth Book of Esdras.
The Book of Tobias.

De divinis Scripturis, quod sufficient ad Salutem.

Scriptura sacra continet omnia quæ ad salutem sunt necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur, neque inde probari potest, non sit a quoquam exigendum, ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur, aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur. Sacræ Scripturæ nomine, eos Canonicos libros veteris et novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum auctoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.

De Nominibus et Numero Librorum sacra Canonica Scriptura veteris Testamenti.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leviticus.
Numeri.
Deuteronomia.
Josuæ.
Judicum.
Ruth.
Prior Liber Samuelis.
Secundus Liber Samuelis.
Prior Liber Regum.
Secundus Liber Regum.
Prior Liber Paralipom.
Secundus Liber Paralipom.
Primus Liber Esdræ.
Secundus Liber Esdræ.
Liber Hester.
Liber Job.
Psalmi.
Proverbia.
Ecclesiastes, vel Concionator.
Cantica Solomonis.
IV Prophetæ Majores.
XII Prophetæ Minores.

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

Tertius Liber Esdræ.
Quartus Liber Esdræ.
Liber Tobie.

The Book of Judith.	Liber Judith.
The rest of the Book of Esther.	Reliquum Libri Hester.
The Book of Wisdom.	Liber Sapientiæ.
Jesus the Son of Sirach.	Liber Jesu filii Sirach.
Baruch the Prophet.	Baruch Propheta.
The Song of the Three Children.	Canticum Trium Puerorum.
The Story of Susanna.	Historia Susannæ.
Of Bel and the Dragon.	De Bel et Dracone.
The Prayer of Manasses.	Oratio Manassis.
The First Book of Maccabees.	Prior Liber Machabeorum.
The Second Book of Maccabees.	Secundus Liber Machabeorum.

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

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

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Of the sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for salvation.	=	<i>De divinis Scripturis, quod sufficiant ad salutem.</i>
Or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation	=	<i>aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur.</i>
Of the names and number of the Canonical Books	=	<i>De nominibus et numero librorum sacra Canonica Scriptura.</i>
For example of life and instruction of manners	=	<i>ad exempla vitæ, et formandos mores.</i>
To establish any doctrine	=	<i>ad dogmata confirmanda.</i>

THIS Article was the Fifth of the Forty-two Articles of 1553, when its title was *Divinæ Scripturæ doctrina sufficit ad salutem* ("The doctrine of Holy Scripture is sufficient to salvation"). The Article asserted the sufficiency of Scripture, but did not enumerate or define the Canonical books. It read as follows:—

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation : So that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although it be sometime received of the faithful, as Godly, and profitable for an order and comeliness : Yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it, as an article of faith, or repute it requisite to the necessity of Salvation."

In 1563 the clause "Although it be sometime received of the faithful, as Godly, and profitable for an order and comeliness" was omitted, because the Article deals with questions of faith, not of order, the latter being discussed in Articles XX and XXXIV.

The clause which defines the Canonical books was derived from the Confession of Wurtemberg, and was inserted in 1563. This also contained a list of the Canonical books and also of the Apocrypha. In 1571 the catalogue of the Apocrypha was completed by the addition of the names of several books.

The language of the first paragraph of the Article may be compared with a similar statement in the *Reformatio Legum*, in which after a list of the Canonical books it is said:—

“Hæc igitur generatim est sancta Scriptura, qua omnia creditu ad salutem necessaria, plene et perfecte contineri credimus, usque adeo ut quicquid in ea non legitur nec reperitur, nec denique ex eadem aut consequitur, aut vincitur, a nemine sit exigendum ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur.”¹

The object of the Article is to state the position of our Church in regard to Scripture, both in opposition to Rome and also to the extreme wing of the Protestants of the sixteenth century. It effectually meets the errors rife on both sides. On the one hand it states the true position against the Roman view of the Rule of Faith; on the other it opposes the opinion of those who were so concerned with the illumination of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers that they despised the thought of religious teaching in books.² The true Anglican position, following that of essential Protestantism, is careful to emphasise the written Word as against any dominion of ecclesiastical institution, or of subjective impressions of even genuine religious experiences.³ But there does not seem much doubt that the Article is mainly directed against the fundamental error of Rome which had been stated by the Council of Trent several years before.⁴

I.—THE CANON OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

The second sentence of the Article logically comes first by showing what Scripture is before considering its position and the use made of it.

¹ *De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica*, c. 9.

² Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, pp. 99, 373.

³ “In quo genere teterrimi illi sunt (itaque a nobis primum nominabuntur) qui sacras Scripturas ad infirmorum tantum hominum debilitatem ablegant et detrudunt, sibi sic ipsi interim præfidentes, ut earum autoritate se teneri non putent, sed peculiarem quandam spiritum jactant, a quo sibi omnia suppeditari aiunt, quæcunque docent et faciunt” (*Reformatio Legum, De Hæresibus*, c. 3).

⁴ “The sacred, holy, œcumenical, and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost . . . clearly seeing that this truth and discipline (of the Gospel of Christ) are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions, which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted, as it were from hand to hand; (the Synod) following the example of the Orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the Author of both—and also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to Faith as to Morals, as having been dictated either by Christ’s own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession. And it has thought meet that a list of the Sacred Books be inserted in this decree, lest a doubt may arise in anyone’s mind which are the Books that are received by this Synod, they are set down here below: of the Old Testament: the five books of Moses—Josue, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Paralipomenon (Chronicles), the first book of Esdras, and the second which is called Nehemias; Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidical Psalter consisting of 150 Psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias with Baruch; Ezechiel, Daniel; the twelve Minor Prophets . . . two books of Maccabees, the first and the second. Of the New Testament: (this Canon is the same as the Protestant). But if anyone will not receive the said books entire with all their parts as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate Edition; and knowingly and deliberately contemn the traditions aforesaid: let him be anathema” (*Conc. Trident., Sessio Quarta, Decret. de Canon. Script.*, Waterworth’s Translation, pp. 18, 19. London, 1848).

The attitude of the Church is one of reverence for a volume consisting of sixty-six books; thirty-nine in the Old Testament and twenty-seven in the New; by many authors, and of very varied nature. The former part is the Bible of the Jews, setting forth the Jewish religion in its historical development and different aspects covering centuries of time. The Church inherited belief in the sacredness and authority of the Old Testament from our Lord and His Apostles. The New Testament sets forth the Christian religion in various aspects, covering some sixty years, or two generations. In contrast with the Koran, which is alleged to have come from Mohammed, none of the books of the New Testament are by the Founder of the Christian religion. The Church had the Old Testament from the first, even in Gentile Christianity, and then gradually the books of the New Testament were added. Canonicity is the fact, and canonising is the method of recognising these writings as possessed of Divine authority.¹

1. The word "Canon" comes from *κανών*,² and is akin to קִנְיָ, *κάννα* (reed).—The words "cane" and "canon" are cognate terms. The word had active and passive senses. A thing which is employed as a measure is first measured, and only then used to measure other things. The passive meaning, anything measured, *e.g.* a measured racecourse at Olympia, in turn becomes a measure, and the word means a straight road or rule used for measurement: 2 Cor. x. 13–16 (passive); Gal. vi. 16 (active). Then the word came to mean any list of things for reference *e.g.* at Alexandria a list of classical writers was called *κανών*, and Eusebius calls chronological tables *κανόνες χρονικοί* (This is the meaning of the technical word "Canon" in relation to Scripture.) The Canon of Scripture is used first of all in a *passive* sense, meaning that which is measured off, or separated from others, and then it is employed in an *active* sense, meaning that which measures or tests others. Thus Scripture is (1) that which is measured or defined by the rule of the Church, and (2) that which, being measured, becomes thereby the rule of the Church for other cases. The Bible contained the recognised list of books which have been measured by a certain rule or standard of measurement and have thereby become measures of other books. The word is first used in the Christian Church by a poet, Amphilocheus, 380, *ὁ κανὼν τῶν θεόπνευστων γραφῶν*. But Origen had spoken of "canonised books" or books put on the list. Afterwards Jerome and Augustine, 400, used the word quite technically.³

2. What, then, is the rule of the Church by which a book is measured, or defined as canonical?—The Article describes a Canonical Book as one "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." The

¹ For the history of each separate book reference should be made to the Commentaries and Introductions. For the New Testament as a whole Salmon's *Introduction* is the most important.

² See Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*, Appendix A.

³ Jerome's *Prolog. Galeatus*; and Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 18, 38; Jerome saying of Tobias and Ruth, "*non sunt in canone.*"

reference is to authority, not to authorship. The statement is usually regarded as a difficulty, since it cannot apply to all the books and all the Churches, for the Reformers knew well the early doubts about some of the books. It is probable that as the doubts were dead by the sixteenth century the reference is to the Church as a whole as distinct from individual Churches. The matter was originally settled mainly by public reading and general usage. The first three centuries never pronounced on the subject except by the testimony of individual and representative writers. No corporate evidence was possible. But when it became available and necessary it was soon seen that there was no real doubt as to our books. The first corporate witness dates from the Council of Laodicea, 364, where the testimony is clear, and when once the whole Church was able to bear its testimony the words of the Article are seen to be justified.

3. The grounds of Canonicity need consideration.—Why were certain books received and certain rejected? The fundamental reason is the conviction that certain books came from men who were divinely inspired to reveal and convey God's will: Prophets in the Old Testament and Apostles in the New. Prophets were the recognised expounders of God's will, and their writings were regarded as immediately authoritative. The best illustration is found in Jeremiah xxxvi., where the Prophet's words were recognised as possessing authority at once. Each book had this authority by reason of its prophetic source, and thence gradually came the collection into one volume, so that the Old Testament represents those books which Israel accepted on proper evidence as the Divine standard of faith and practice, because they were either written or put forth by prophetic men. It was not the decision of the people that caused the collection, but the collection was due to their acceptance by the people. The authority came from God through the prophets, and the recognition by the people was the effect of the Canonicity. The action of the people was the weighing of evidence, and the outcome was testimony rather than judgment.

In the same way the books of the New Testament were regarded as possessing Apostolic origin. This may have been either by authorship or sanction, but there is no doubt that the primary standard of verification and acceptance was the belief that the books came from Apostolic men, either Apostles themselves or their associates. So that the ground of Canonicity was not merely the age, or the truth, or the helpfulness of these books, but, beneath these characteristics, because they came from uniquely qualified instruments of God's will. All other tests were subsidiary and confirmatory. It is, therefore, important and essential to distinguish between the ground of Canonicity and the ground of the conviction of Canonicity. The latter is quite separate from the former, and is subjective, while the former is rational, objective, and leaves man no excuse.

4. The character of Canonicity.—It is particularly important to

notice what Canonicity really implies and involves. It created a book not a revelation. Canonicity is analogous to codification, which implies the existence of laws already as separate books. The authority of each book of the Bible would have been the same even if there had been no collection and codification. So that the authority is not that of a book, but of a revelation; the revelation did not come to exist because of the Canonicity, but the Canonicity because of the revelation, and the Bible, as we have seen, is regarded as a revelation, because it is held to be the embodiment of the historic manifestation of the Redeemer and His truth.¹ It has been well said that the Bible is not an authorised collection of books, but a collection of authorised books. It is essential to remember that the quality which determines acceptance of a book is its possession of a Divine revelation. So that Canonicity did not raise a book to the position of Scripture, but recognised that it was already Scripture. Canonisation was a decision based on testimony, and the canonising process was the recognition of an existing fact. It is, of course, true that the process of canonisation implies accumulative authority, and adds immensely to the strength of the position as representing the witness of the entire Church, but it must never be forgotten that the authority of each separate book was in it from the first.

5. The History of the Old Testament Canon.—Although of necessity there was no complete history of the Canon in the Old Testament itself, yet there are indications of a growth which need to be considered. While there is no record of the canonisation of any book or collection, there is a frequent recognition of books as authoritative. Provision was evidently made for writing, preserving, and teaching. There are indications all through of gradual growth and accretion. Among the passages the following may be adduced: Exod. xxiv. 4-7; Deut. xxxi. 9-13; 24-26 (Cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 2); Josh. i. 8; xxiv. 26; 1 Sam. x. 25; Deut. xvii. 18 f. (Cf. Ps. xix; cxix, "testimony"); Prov. xxv. 1 (Cf. history by prophets); Isa. xxxiv. 16; Isa. viii. 19, 20; Jer. xxxvi. 4; xlv. 1; Dan. ix. 2; Zech. vii. 12. Proofs are forthcoming that in all periods this law was imposed and taught: Josh. xi. 15; Jud. iii. 4; 1 Kings ii. 3; 2 Kings xiv. 6; 2 Chron. xxx. 16; Dan. ix. 11; Ezra iii. 2; Neh. x. 28. All this shows the gradual growth and progress, and the deposit of Sacred Books in the Sanctuary, a custom which is in harmony with the practice of other nations.²

6. The History of the New Testament Canon.—The idea of a New Testament was natural from the analogy of the Old. The Divine authority of the Old Testament is clear from the New ("oracles," Rom. iii. 2), and this influenced the early Church. The Christian community, therefore, did not need to create the idea of a Canon, for it was there already, and in due course the books of the New Testament

¹ Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, pp. 500-508.

² For fuller details of the history and progress, see W. H. Green, *The Canon of the Old Testament*.

were regarded as authoritative, because they revealed Christ by the Divine Spirit, through inspired men. As the Church did not grow up by natural law, but was founded by Christ, and authoritative teachers were sent forth by Him carrying with them a body of Divine Scriptures, the Church was never without its Bible or Canon, for wherever they went they imposed on the Churches they founded the Old Testament as the code of laws. Christ was the authority, side by side with the Old Testament, and Christ was declared first by the words of the Apostles, and later by their writings (Acts xx. 35). This immediate placing of the new books among the Scriptures was inevitable, and gradually the books became known to the whole Church through the separate testimony of individuals and communities. At the outset, Christ with the Old Testament was the authority for Christians, and this authority was necessarily oral at first, but it is almost certain that the words of Christ were put into writing very early.¹ As the words of Christ were considered holy from the first, it was easy and natural to reverence a report as truly as the living voice, and thus no distinction was made between the spoken and written words of Apostles.² Then came letters of Apostles to particular Churches or individuals, and these would obviously be treasured and read at gatherings side by side with the Old Testament. This public reading was the first step in the process whereby we got our New Testament. Then came interchange with other Churches as the second step. At first the Church seems to have been unconscious of the goal, and it was only later that the process was deliberate. The Church had a New Testament Canon long before it had the conception of it, the fact before the idea. The reception of an Apostolic letter would at once separate it from all else as an authoritative guide, and this would be the canonisation of a single book. While particular circumstances helped forward and accelerated the process, these cannot wholly account for it. Heresy and schism doubtless hastened the completion of the Canon, but the New Testament was inevitable in any case. Oral tradition was soon found to be inadequate, especially as heretics claimed their own tradition. To the earliest Churches Scripture was not a closed, but an increasing Canon, one of gradual growth, like the Old Testament, and this would be so as long as there were living men specially "moved by the Holy Ghost." And so at the end of the process it was not felt to be anything novel or strange, but the whole Church confirmed what had long been familiar in individual Churches. The formal recognition of the entire New Testament was exactly the same as that of separate books used by particular Churches and individuals, and the Church declarations were not the primary investment with authority, but only the record and registration of an authority long existing. There is no evidence whatever of a gradual heightening of the estimate of books originally received on a lower level and at the

¹ Sir W. M. Ramsay considers that parts of our First Gospel were written before the death of Christ: *Luke the Physician*, p. 87.

² Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 366.

commencement tentatively accounted Scripture. On the contrary, the evidence is conclusive of estimation and attachment from the beginning. As book after book came from the Apostolic circle it was received as Scripture and added to the old collection, until the books were numerous enough to be regarded as a separate section of Scriptures.

All through, the question was, which were Christian writings, so that they might be used for life and worship. The answer was that only the writings that could be regarded as of Apostolic sanction were to be included, all others being, therefore, ruled out. And so Christianity was soon seen to be a book religion like the Jewish, for in no other way could the purity of tradition about Christ be preserved. The Canon was part of a general movement of the Church during the last thirty years of the second century, when there was (1) a gradual collection of separate books to form the New Testament; (2) a gradual organising of the Christian Church against its foes; (3) a gradual expression of belief as a deposit from the Apostles. Thus, Scripture, the Christian Church, and the Christian Creeds were a threefold testimony to essential Christianity, and while everything on the surface seemed natural, incidental, and even occasional, a Divine power was really at work from the first giving the Church its authoritative books. The Church was spiritually guided as to the Canon, which has been well called "the slow miracle of history." But this does not mean that the New Testament, the Ministry and the Creeds are of equal authority; it only refers to the human and historical side of the process of collecting the authorised books into a volume. While the Canon (as a volume) is the work of the whole Church, the separate authority of each book is *not*, and in this latter sense the New Testament is *not* the product of the Church. And the witness of the Church to Episcopacy is very different from, because far less assured, universal and primitive than, the witness to the books of the New Testament and the truths of the Creed. These date from the first century, whereas Episcopacy confessedly is much later. Nothing is more fallacious, as we shall see, than the idea that the New Testament is the product of the Church. The Canon is, but the separate books are not.

It is impossible to give anything like an adequate account of the process in these pages,¹ but the germs during the first century seem to call for notice. The claim to Divine authority is evident; Apostolic preaching was regarded as in the Holy Spirit (1 Pet. i. 12), and even words were held to come from the Divine source (1 Cor. ii. 13). Apostolic commands carried Divine authority (1 Thess. iv. 2), and these were found in writing (2 Thess. ii. 15), and obedience to them was demanded (2 Thess. iii. 14). The acceptance of this was regarded as a test of

¹ Reference may be made to Westcott, *The Canon of the New Testament*; Sanday, *Inspiration*; Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*; Charteris, *Canonicity*; Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*; Gregory, *Text and Canon of the New Testament*; Souter, *Canon and Text of the New Testament*.

spiritual life (1 Cor. xiv. 37). It was inevitable that writings making such claims should be given equal authority, because possessing equal quality with the Old Testament.¹ And they were therefore read at worship, a practice required by the Apostles (1 Thess. v. 27; Col. iv. 16; Rev. i. 2), and interchanged between Churches (Col. iv. 16). Something like mutual attestation also seems to be found; thus, Hebrews, 1 Peter, and James appear to use St. Paul's Epistles; 1 Tim. v. 18 quotes Luke x. 7 as "the Scripture" (ἡ γραφή); 2 Peter iii. 16 refers to St. Paul's Epistles as "among the other writings" (Scriptures). After this the line of such quotations is unbroken.²

The process of canonisation may be outlined as follows:—

1. A.D. 50-100: composing, writing.
2. A.D. 100-200: collecting, gathering.
3. A.D. 200-300: comparing, sifting.
4. A.D. 300-400: completing, recognising.

Without entering upon the detailed history in the second century it may be noted that suddenly, about 170, we find the New Testament practically complete, with a hesitation about seven of our books, and four other books as a sort of New Testament Apocrypha. Evidently there was a process of collecting going on very rapidly, and more interest was felt in getting hold of possible Scriptures than of sifting them. Through the absence of accurate knowledge some temporary mistakes were made, but though a section of the Church may not yet have been satisfied of the apostolicity of certain books, and though doubts may have arisen afterwards in sections of the Church as to the apostolicity of others, yet in no case was it more than a minority of the Church which was slow in receiving, or which came afterwards to doubt the credentials of any of the books now received, and in every case the principle on which a book was accepted, or doubts against it laid aside, was the historical tradition of apostolicity. After the second century no one ever really attempted to put forth new documents as Apostolic and authoritative, or to amend them. The content of Scripture was substantially made up, and henceforward differences were not so much on Scripture as on the interpretation. It is particularly striking that hitherto no Councils, Synods, or Decrees had been connected with the Canon. These had absolutely no influence in making the Canon, but only in registering it after it was made. This is particularly important because of the modern tendency to think the Canon was due to the arbitrary arrangement of Church leaders. The movement for the Canon was inevitable and vital, neither artificial nor superficial. It was due to the great mass of Christian people who from their spiritual life provided testimony to the separate

¹ St. Paul "is evidently as sure as any of the Old Testament prophets was ever sure that the message which he delivered was no invention of his own . . . but that he was merely an instrument in the hands of God" (Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 332).

² Revelation: "The strongest language found in the older Scriptures he uses and applies to his own book," Ch. i. 3; x. 7; xxii. 6, 7, 9, etc. (Sanday, *ut supra*, p. 375).

books which led to the collection of a complete Canon. Unconscious at first, the movement was ever tending towards the goal. In the third century a great process of sifting went on. The Church was cautious and conservative, while heretics were free in dealing with books. The fourth century naturally addressed itself to the task of obtaining testimony from all parts of the Church to the New Testament books in use, in order thereby to show clearly what was the authoritative Canon. The greatest writer of this period was Eusebius of Cæsarea, who gives a list of New Testament books in three classes:—

- (a) Class 1.—His New Testament; books accepted: “Homologoumena” (*ὁμολογούμενα*). Hebrews is probably included in Paul’s Epistles, and Revelation is accepted “with hesitation.”
- (b) Class 2.—Books spoken against or disputed: “Antilegomena” (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*). “But yet read by the majority,” viz. James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude.
- (c) Class 3.—Books rejected: “Notha” (*νόθα*). Regarded as spurious. A number like *Hermas*, *Barnabas*, etc., and “with hesitation,” *Revelation*.

The rejection of certain books was due to the fact that they were not accepted by the Churches of his day. Soon catalogues of the accepted New Testament appeared, and the Church received into their New Testament all the books historically evinced to them as given by Apostles to Churches as the code of law. We must not mistake the historical evidences of slow circulation to authentication over a widely-extended Church for the evidences of slowness of canonisation by the authority or test of the Church itself.

The Middle Ages accepted implicitly the Canon thus stamped, and notwithstanding the discussion at the Reformation, especially in connection with Luther, the matter rested until the end of the eighteenth century, when in the general movement of criticism the Canon was inevitably included in discussion. Westcott says that the evidence for the authenticity of the New Testament is “more complete, more varied, more continuous than can be brought forward for any other book.”¹ And Sanday, speaking of the importance of early Christian literature, says that the Church has not discarded “one single work which after generations . . . have found cause to look back upon with regret.”² The re-opening of the question to-day and the thorough examination of the historical materials is not likely to alter the New Testament, and certainly cannot deny, or even minimise its significance in the history of Christianity. It may be confidently said that no critical conclusion will alter, even by one book, our New Testament, which has been rightly described as “the fixed magnitude.” One thing especially should count in this connection. Westcott says, “No one can read it as a whole without

¹ *The Canon of the New Testament*, p. 503.

² Sanday, *ut supra*, p. 27.

gaining a conviction of its unity, not less real because it cannot be expressed or transferred."¹

In studying the history of the Canon four questions must be asked and carefully distinguished:—

1. When was the New Testament Canon completed? That is, when was the last authoritative book given to any Church by an Apostle?
2. When did any one Church acquire a completed Canon? (This is a matter for historical investigation.)
3. When did the completed Canon obtain universal circulation and acceptance?
4. On what ground and evidence did Churches with incomplete New Testament accept the remaining books when they were made known to them?

II.—THE LIMITS OF THE CANON OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

After giving a list of the names and number of the Canonical books the Article refers to "other books," which it is said that the Church reads for instruction and example, but does not use to establish any doctrine. These are all concerned with Old Testament times, and are generally spoken of as the Apocrypha. This term, however, is inaccurate. The word *ἀπόκρυφος* originally had two meanings: (*a*) esoteric teaching, and (*b*) that which shunned the light because it was afraid. But these books were on the contrary (*a*) read publicly to all, and (*b*) are not spurious. A better term would be Ecclesiastical Books. They are sometimes called Deutero-Canonical. It is, therefore, important to be quite clear in regard to the distinction between the Canonical and non-Canonical books. The Jewish Old Testament of to-day is identical with our own, and the same fact can be traced back to the first century. A Tract in the Talmud, of second century date, bears witness to this, and in particular the testimony of Josephus is quite clear. He was born A.D. 37, and as a man of learning and information his testimony is of the first importance. The fact that he endeavours to harmonise the Bible of his day with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet is an illustration of what he held to be the Jewish Bible.² There is no trace of any difference on this point among themselves. Alexandrian Jews would naturally avoid any breach with their Palestinian brethren, and the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus shows what was believed in Egypt among Greek-speaking Jews. Although Philo, A.D. 41, is not so clear, no list of his being available, yet there is not much doubt about his agreement with the rest.

¹ *The Canon of the New Testament*, p. 502.

² "We have not tens of thousands of books discordant and conflicting, but only twenty-two, containing the record of all time, which have been justly believed. . . . From Artaxerxes [Artaxerxes Longimanus, 465-425] everything . . . is not deemed worthy of like credit because exact succession of prophets has ceased. . . . No one has dared to add, or take from, or alter anything."

And yet the "other books" referred to in the Article are found in the Septuagint, not in the Hebrew, and the question at once arises whether they were part of the Canon. Unfortunately the origin of the Septuagint is obscure both in regard to date and authorship, and, to add to the difficulty, all our present Septuagint MSS. are Christian in origin. It seems more probable that these books were regarded as an appendix, especially as the Alexandrian and Palestinian Canon agreed. It is thought by some that the question of the Old Testament Canon was only settled at the Synod of Jamnia, A.D. 90. But the question then discussed was not so much as to admission as to continuance and possible exclusion. There does not seem to be any proof of an unsettled Canon, but only of action against a Canon already decided. An open Canon at that date would be altogether against the plain testimony of Josephus.¹ The witness of the New Testament is clear, even though no list of books is available. Negatively, we may note that our Lord never charged the Jews with mutilation, or corruption, or addition, but only with making Scripture void, and, positively, it may be noted that although the use of the Septuagint is seen as the familiar version, not one quotation appears from the Apocrypha. There are reminiscences, but no authoritative quotations.

The following are the main reasons why the distinction made in the Article is maintained:

1. These books of the Apocrypha were never included in the Jewish Canon.
2. They are never quoted in the New Testament.
3. They were never confused by men like Origen and Jerome, who knew Hebrew.
4. They are not found in the earliest extant catalogue, Melito of Sardis, 171.
5. They are not found in the earliest Syriac version, Peschitto.
6. In Justin Martyr's dialogue against Trypho the Jew, no mention is made of any difference between them as to the Canon.
7. In Origen's catalogue the Canonical Old Testament is found, not the Apocrypha.
8. Tertullian gives the books of the Old Testament as twenty-four, which agrees with the Talmudic number.
9. In the fourth century full testimonies are found to this distinction both in East and West, e.g. Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, Hilary of Poitiers.
10. St. Augustine associates the Apocrypha with the Old Testament, and his confusion was pretty certainly due to his ignorance of Hebrew, though even he shows that the Old Testament was regarded as of higher rank.² But it is through his influence that these books are now included in the Roman Catholic Canon.

¹ Green, *Canon of the Old Testament*, Ch. VI, especially, p. 78.

² *De Civitate Dei*, Bk. XVII, last chapter.

11. In the following centuries, from the sixth to the sixteenth, Augustine's confusion is rejected "by a continuous succession of the more learned Fathers," who follow Jerome and distinguish clearly between the Canonical and the Apocryphal books.¹

12. Even in the Septuagint they are found as an appendix, and not with the rest of the Old Testament. So that it was not their authority which led to their insertion, but the insertion which led to their being regarded as authoritative.

13. Internal evidence also condemns them. Thus Tobit and Judith have doctrinal, chronological, historical, and geographical errors. The books make no claim to Divine inspiration, and several clearly disown any such feature.

The question is important as between us and the Roman Catholic Church, because by the Council of Trent, 1546, seven of the books were placed in the Old Testament Canon, while in 1692 the books were included in the Canon of Scripture by the Eastern Church. But, as already seen, this action is without any justification from history, or the contents of the books, which contain many clear proofs of mere human origin, and that they are not to be regarded as part of Holy Scripture. This is one of the fundamental points of difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome on the subject of the Rule of Faith.

And so we return to the statement of the Article, following St. Jerome, that we use the books for information about the period from Malachi to Matthew, and also for guidance in regard to life, but we do not accept them as Divinely authoritative for doctrine.² Our usage may be summed up as follows :—

"(a) The *Benedicite* from the Apocrypha is appointed as a Canticle for use at Morning Prayer.

(b) *Lessons* are appointed from the Apocrypha at Morning and Evening Prayer. See the Prayer Book Calendar, October 27th–November 18th, Holy Innocents' Day, and the feasts of St. Luke and All Saints.³

(c) Two of the *Offertory Sentences* in the Communion Service are taken from the Book of Tobit.

(d) In the *Homilies* the Apocrypha is very often quoted, and is even spoken of as the Word of God."⁴

III.—THE CHARACTER OF HOLY SCRIPTURE ⁵

The Article refers to the Bible as the record or embodiment of a

¹ Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, pp. 255–259; see also article, "Canon of Old Testament," by Moller in Murray's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary*.

² "Sicut ergo Judith et Tobia, et Machabæorum legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit; sic et hæc duo volumina legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam" (Preface to the Books of Solomon).

³ The Revised Lectionary of 1922 has added many more lessons from the Apocrypha.

⁴ Tyrrell Green, *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, p. 52.

⁵ Several of the topics of this Article are treated more fully in the author's *The Holy Spirit of God*, Chs. XX, XXVI–XXIX.

Divine revelation which, as such, is meant to be authoritative for life. Revelation is the unfolding of the character of God, the supernatural communication from God to man of truth which the human mind unaided could not discover, and of grace for life which human power alone could not provide. This revelation of the will of God for man may be oral or written, but for our present purpose it is to be understood of a written communication. And it is taught by the Articles, here and elsewhere, that this unfolding is found supremely in Holy Scripture.¹ The possibility of revelation is obvious from the character and power of God, whilst its probability is equally clear from the conception of God as One who having made man, would desire to communicate with him. When, therefore, we accept a Divine revelation as both possible and probable it is not difficult to accept its credibility.

1. The need of such an Authoritative Revelation is universally admitted. Authority is essential in every aspect of life and in every branch of knowledge, and when we apply the question to religion we see that man, even as man, and still more man as a sinner, requires an authoritative revelation to guide him in the way of life. Whatever may be said of the light of nature, it is impossible to doubt the necessity of the further and fuller light of revelation (Psa. xix. ; Acts xiv. 17 ; Rom. i. 17-20, 32 ; ii. 15 ; Eph. iii. 9). The only light on such subjects as the character of God, the possibility of deliverance from sin, and the assurance of a future life comes from Divine revelation, while the ignorance and helplessness of man in his natural state called for the light and grace of Divine revelation.

2. The Source of this Authority must necessarily reside in God Himself. He is the Fount of truth and grace, and authority can only be found in the revelation of God. This revelation is personal, both in God as Source and in man as the object, and the personal expression of it was the Lord Jesus Christ.

3. But at this point the question arises, where is this personal revelation embodied or recorded, and how may it become available for man ? God is invisible, and in order that a personal Divine revelation may influence human life it must be available somewhere. If God has revealed Himself to man in Christ, it ought to be possible to find and use the revelation. There are only three possible answers to this question.

Some say that human reason is the seat of authority. But while reason is both valuable and necessary as one of the means of distinguishing the claims of authority it is quite another thing to claim for it the seat of authority itself, especially as it is only one of several human faculties, and as it has been affected by sin. Reason is rightly regarded as a channel, but

¹ For proofs that Holy Scripture is a Divine revelation references must be made to the usual books on Christian Evidences, where the apologetic aspect of the subject is necessarily treated. Of these perhaps special attention should be given to the chapters in Fishers' *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, and Henry Roger's *The Supernatural Origin of the Bible*.

not a source. It weighs and appropriates the data offered to it, but does not create them.

Others say that the Church is the seat of authority, but, leaving for the present the full consideration of this question, it may be asked where such a Church is to be found, since the Church in the fullest, truest meaning of the term, "the blessed company of all faithful people," is itself the product of Divine revelation, having come into existence by accepting God's revelation in Christ. Since, then, the Church is thus the result of revelation it is difficult, if not impossible, to think of it as the seat of authority, for this would mean that the Church embodies its Creator.

The only other answer is that given by the Article, that the seat of authority is found in the Word of God recorded in the Bible. This means that Holy Scripture preserves for us God's revelation in the purest available form. Christianity is based on the Person of Christ, and our supreme need is the clearest and completest form of His revelation of Himself. Our great requirement is that the vehicle of transmission, whatever it may be, shall be certain and assuring, and we believe that this certitude is guaranteed in Holy Scripture as in no other way. Written language seems best to serve the Divine purpose, having the marks of durability, catholicity, and purity, and the testimony of the entire community of Christians through the ages corresponds to the teaching of the Article that in Holy Scripture God has revealed Himself. He might have made direct and oral communications to every person, but to this method there are many serious objections. It would have to be repeated as many times as there are persons, and it would so open the way for imposture that there would be no means of detecting those who were guilty of fraud. On the other hand, a written communication, properly accredited and given once for all, has decided advantages in its certainty, permanence, and universal availability.

4. This Divine authority of Holy Scripture as the embodiment of a Divine revelation is based on a belief in the unique inspiration of the writings, for both in the Old Testament and also in the New there are marks and claims of a position in regard to God's will that can only be described as unique (Acts i. 16; Heb. iii. 7; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 21). Whether we describe it as inspiration or not, there is an element in Scripture which makes it stand out from all else in literature and history, and by this we mean a special influence differing both in degree and also in kind from the ordinary spiritual influence of the Holy Spirit. It is a communication of Divine truth for human life, and it is that which makes the Bible, and the New Testament in particular, fundamental for Christianity. It has been well described as "not the first stage of the evolution, but the last phase of the revelatory fact and deed."¹ When the New Testament is compared, or rather contrasted, with the literature of the second century, we are enabled to see this unique activity of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of inspiration, for the most valuable and beautiful

¹ Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 152.

of later works cannot compare with what is found in the New Testament. Writers of various schools testify to this remarkable difference, and from this we argue that the Holy Spirit in the New Testament was the Spirit of inspiration, while later He was the Spirit of illumination. It is thus that the revelation in Scripture gives it its uniqueness. The revelation is the proof of inspiration, and the inspiration in turn guarantees the revelation. Nor is this truth set aside by the emphasis placed in recent years on the "human element" in the Bible. In the details scholars have discerned traces of the idiosyncrasies of various writers, and this is not surprising, for it is patent everywhere. But there is a serious danger in this kind of examination, because a man may so concentrate on details as to miss the meaning and purpose of the whole book. This is perhaps one of the perils of a good deal of modern investigation of the Bible. Inspiration means such an union of the Divine and human elements that the result is guaranteed to us as the thought of God for the life of man. The Holy Spirit so used the faculties of the writers that without any supersession, but working through them, the Divine truth was given to, through, and for man, and when we accept the book as a record of the Divine revelation it will be found that it is not the "human element" that impresses, but the Divine element. God is realised as speaking through its pages and revealing truth to the soul. By all means let us discover all that we can about the "human element," but let us never forget that it is not the human but the Divine element that constitutes the Bible, the Word of God. It is fallacious, and indeed, impossible to attempt to separate and distinguish the Divine and the human elements. The true idea is not the Divine *and* the human, but the Divine *through* the human. When this is realised the Bible speaks with Divine and convincing authority.¹

The proof of this position may be briefly stated without encroaching unduly on the province of apologetics. The authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture are evident from the objective and subjective phenomena associated with it. The objective history of the Bible, especially in the element of prophecy in the Old Testament, the record of the unique people of Israel, and the picture of Christ, all stamp it as Divine, while

¹ For the theory of Inspiration, see the author's *The Holy Spirit of God*, pp. 155-158, and Additional Note. It is sometimes said that the Church of England nowhere lays down any theory of inspiration. This is doubtless true, and the explanation is that the question of inspiration was not a matter of dispute in the sixteenth century. This question is not formally mentioned simply because it is presupposed. Our Church was not then engaged in establishing the authority of Scripture or in basing that authority on Divine inspiration. These things were not questioned, and being universally admitted were taken for granted. What the Church was then doing was asserting that these Divinely inspired Scriptures, "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," were the sole and exclusive authority for the consciences of men as the Articles of Faith, or as necessary to salvation. In view of these circumstances it is simply impossible to argue that the inspiration of Scripture was left an open question, when every reference to Scripture shows that the compilers of the Articles based their teaching on the claim that Scripture alone should be regarded as an authority. A suggestion of this is found in the reference in Article XXII, "God's Word Written."

the experiences of the people of God in response to this objective revelation support the contention that it comes from God. The words of Coleridge that the Bible "finds" us more thoroughly than any other book are often quoted, but unless this effect is understood to arise out of the supernatural revelation objectively contained in the Scripture it is, of course, inadequate. Indeed, it has been well pointed out, it is inadequate on other grounds, because the teaching of our Lord does very much more than "find" us, for it creates and transforms the life of everyone that receives it.¹

Thus, the Bible stands apart from all other books on the threefold ground: (1) that it embodies a supernatural revelation; (2) that because of this it possesses a unity of structure and purpose; (3) that it reveals and produces spiritual qualities which can only be explained by direct inspiration. It is sometimes said that the Bible *is* the Word of God, while at other times it is said that the Bible *contains* the Word of God. These are both true, if held together, though either alone is liable to misapprehension. If we only say the Bible *is* the Word of God we are in danger of forgetting that it contains the words of men also, many of which are not true in themselves, though the record that they were spoken is true and reliable. If, on the other hand, we limit our belief to the phrase, the Bible *contains* the Word of God, there is the opposite danger of not knowing which is God's word and which is man's, an entirely impossible position. The Bible *is* the Word of God in the sense that it conveys to us an accurate record of everything God intended man to know and learn in connection with His will. The Bible *contains* the Word of God in the sense that in it is enshrined the Word of God which is revealed to us for our redemption.

Thus, there is no contradiction between these two expressions. From different standpoints they are both true, each balances the other, and both together should be held clearly and firmly. The one thing which can never be removed from the Bible is its character as a continuous, complete, and coherent revelation of the mind and will of God for redemption, and when we accept the revelation embodied in Scripture we are led to understand more thoroughly than ever what Scripture is, its place and power. Faith in the revelation leads to faith in the Scriptures, and the character of the Bible, as expressed in this Article and as used elsewhere in the Church of England, may be summed up in the following statements:

"1. Assuming a true revelation to be given us by God, could such a revelation be preserved without a pure Scripture?"

¹ "We may say in Coleridge's phrase that we believe the teaching of Jesus, or acknowledge its (or His) authority because it 'finds' us more deeply than anything else; but any Christian will admit that 'find' is an inadequate expression. The teaching of Jesus does not simply find, it evokes or creates the personality by which it is acknowledged. We are born again by the words of eternal life which came from His lips, and it is the new man so born to whom His Word is known in all its power" (Denney, Article, "Authority of Christ," *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*).

2. Granting Christ to be the culmination of Divine revelation, what could we know of Jesus without a faithful Scripture ?
3. Assuming the Church to be an institution of Christ, what could we know of the foundation, laws, sacraments, doctrine of the Church without an authoritative Scripture ?
4. Assuming that the Church has a mission to the world, how could the Church carry on the propagation of the gospel and the evangelisation of the world without a trustworthy Scripture ?
5. Assuming the end of salvation to be holiness, and growth in knowledge and grace in the believer, how could spiritual life be perceived, described, and Christian character be built up without an inspired Scripture ?”¹

IV.—THE SUFFICIENCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

1. In stating that Holy Scripture contains everything necessary for salvation the Article emphasises one of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, because the Mediæval Church had taught and practised the view that Scripture was not “sufficient,” but had to be supplemented and interpreted by the traditions which the Church possesses and has preserved from the beginning. The question of the place of Scripture was therefore vital in the sixteenth century, and it is not surprising that it is emphasised here and elsewhere with such clearness and force. Without any hesitation or qualification our Church teaches that Holy Scripture contains all that is necessary for “salvation.” The Bible is a book of and for redemption. It is not primarily a collection of literature, though it is full of literature, nor is it scientific in character or purpose, though it contains not a little science. It is not even merely a book of history, though it is probably true that the substance of more than half of it is in the form of history. It is a spiritual book intended for man’s salvation. This statement can be further interpreted and illustrated by the words of the Ordination Service when men are commissioned to the work of the priesthood:—

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

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

2. The reason for this position is that Scripture presents the written record of the revelation of God in Christ in its purest form. Christianity is built on Christ, and our supreme requirement is the clearest and purest form of that revelation. The books of the New Testament being products of the Apostolic age give this, but at a later date it would have been impossible, because the writings would not have come from men in special and unique association with Jesus Christ.

¹ ORR, “The Church and the Holy Scriptures.” An Address.

(1) Our first reason for regarding Scripture as sufficient is found in the claim of Scripture itself. The Old Testament could not claim finality for itself as a whole because of its gradual growth from separate authors, but we can see throughout the process the claim of the prophets to authority and inspiration (Deut. viii. 15-20; 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2; Isa. ix. 8; Jer. ii. 1; Ezek. i. 1), and the New Testament sets its seal retrospectively on the sufficiency and finality of the Old Testament. Thus, our Lord's relation to the Old Testament is seen in His quotations, prefaced by, "It is written"; "Have ye not read?" He also used the facts of the Old Testament (*e.g.* John v. 39), and He referred to the three divisions of the Old Testament Canon (Luke xxiv. 27-44). Then the Apostles held the same views of the Old Testament, St. Paul referring to the authority of the writings (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17), and St. Peter to the inspiration of the writers (2 Pet. i. 21). This is the uniform view of the Old Testament in the New (Matt. xxii. 29; Acts xvii. 11; Rom. xv. 4). In the same way the New Testament could not claim sufficiency or finality for itself for the same reason of gradual growth, for, of course, Rev. xxii. 18, 19 and John xx. 30, 31 refer to these two books alone. Yet it is impossible to avoid noticing our Lord's emphasis on His words (John xvii. 12; xviii. 9, 37). Then, too, St. Paul makes a claim to inspiration (1 Cor. xiv. 37; 1 Thess. iv. 2-8), and there seems to be a mutual attestation of various authors (Acts i. 1 and Luke i. 1-4; 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16; Luke x. 7 and 1 Tim. v. 18; Cf. Deut. xxv. 4). One passage in particular is very striking as showing signs of portions of Gospel already known, either orally or in writing. In 1 Cor. ix. 9-14 we have the exact order of thought found also in 1 Tim. v. 18. St. Jude is able to speak of the faith "once for all delivered" (ver. 3), while special emphasis is laid upon the finality of God's revelation in His Son in contrast with the fragmentary revelation of older days (Heb. i. 1, 2). We may consider, too, the remarkable significance given by our Lord to the words of Scripture (John x. 34 with Psalm lxxxii. 6; John xv. 25 with Ps. xxxv. 19). Again, the opening of the Epistles conveys the same idea (Gal. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; 1 John i. 5), and also the substance of the Epistles (1 Thess. iv. 1, 2; v. 27; 2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 14). All this shows an implicit claim to sufficiency and finality; indeed, it is assumed in the whole matter and manner of the New Testament. A father is not in the habit of frequently reminding his children of his position and authority; the very nature and tone of his commands will lead them to realise and acknowledge his relationship of authority, and this much more effectually than by means of any verbal assertion.

(2) The testimony of Church history is wholly in the same direction. This position of our Church on the sufficiency of Scripture can be supported by writings extending from the earliest ages of the Church. The value of this testimony lies in the fact that the Fathers in bearing witness to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture constitute one of the strongest

supports of the view held by our Church. And it is hardly too much to say that these authorities are practically unanimous as to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as our Rule of Faith :—

“ The ancient Church did faithfully and continually recur to this pattern, and faithfully recognised the limitation of its function. It is evident how constant is the effect of the scriptural pattern, on which they are mainly occupied in commenting, in moulding and restraining the teaching of Origen and Chrysostom and Augustine. The appeal to Scripture is explicit and constant. These fathers knew that they existed simply to maintain a once-given teaching, and that the justification of any dogma was simply the necessity for guarding the faith, once for all, delivered and recorded. There can be no doubt of their point of view.”¹

It is not without point that at the Council of Chalcedon the Gospels occupied a place in the middle of the assembly.

(3) Then, too, every heresy in the early ages claimed to be based on Holy Scripture, and in particular the Gnostics asserted that they had their own Canon and interpretation.

(4) Further, certain books that were revered in the early Church died out, like the Epistle of Barnabas, the Didache, the Epistle of Clement of Rome, and the Shepherd of Hermas.

(5) The ancient Liturgies are saturated with Scripture, and the most severe attacks of opponents were invariably directed against Scripture.

(6) Indeed, the whole record of the Church tells the same story, and if there is one fact plainer than another in Christian history it is that Christ does not fully reveal Himself independently of knowledge and study of the Bible as the Word of God. Whenever Scripture has been neglected the reality of Christ's presence and grace has been obscured, and as often as men have come back to the Bible our Lord has again become real among His people. As a body of divinely authoritative writings the books of the Bible were accepted by the post-Apostolic age, and Church history is full of examples of the use of these writings as the sufficient authority on the matters of which they speak.

(7) The spiritual and practical value of Holy Scripture is another reason for believing in its sufficiency as a Rule of Faith. Although the Bible is comparatively small it is, nevertheless, so full that nothing can be required for the spiritual life that is not found there. Then, too, in spite of all that may be said to the contrary, Scripture is clear in regard to the guidance required for man's spiritual life. It is also remarkable for its definiteness. There is never any real doubt as to its meaning on vital issues, for it contains an answer to every essential question concerning Redemption, Holiness, and Immortality. Such titles as “ The Word of God,” “ The Gospel of Christ,” “ The Law of the Lord ” indicate this sufficiency. Indeed, we may speak of the very existence of

¹ Gore, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 222, 223. Detailed testimonies can be seen in Maclear, *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, p. 104 f., and, as he says, “Such quotations might be greatly multiplied.”

the Bible as one of the most convincing proofs of the truth of the Article, for obviously any written account is intended to supply a trustworthy record. Even the accessibility of the Bible can be adduced in support of its sufficiency. It is a book easily obtained, quickly read, and admittedly adequate to every conceivable circumstance, and to the soul that receives it it affords its own convincing proofs. To the soul that receives its message the Bible gives implicit satisfaction and thereby proves its own adequacy.¹

V.—THE SUPREMACY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

From the sufficiency the Article naturally proceeds to state the supremacy of Scripture: "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." This is borne out by the emphasis placed on Scripture in other Articles. Thus, the three Creeds are to be received and believed "because they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." Points of doctrine are constantly based on passages of Scripture (*see* Articles IX, XIV, XV, XVII, XVIII). The doctrine of the Church is also tested by and made subject to the Word of God (*see* Articles XIX, XX, XXI). Certain doctrines are condemned because they are repugnant to Holy Scripture (Article XXII). In the Sacramental Articles in addition to actual quotation of the words of Scripture there is a constant appeal to Holy Writ (Article XXVIII). Questions of Church order and discipline are discussed in the light of Scripture (Articles XXXII, XXXIV); and even in questions dealing with the relations of Church and State we find the same principle laid down (Articles XXXVII, XXXIX). Thus eighteen out of the Thirty-nine Articles make definite reference to Holy Scripture, some of them more than once, while there are verbal quotations from and references to "Christ's ordinance and commandment." The Old Testament has an Article to itself. Nothing could well be clearer than this emphasis on the supremacy of Holy Scripture.

If it is asked why this is and must be so, the answer is that which has already been given, because Scripture embodies the revelation of God to the world as the Source of authority. The revelation of the Person of Christ is found in Holy Scripture in its clearest, fullest, and purest form. Since Christ is the Source of our religious knowledge the condition of our knowing Him centuries after His historical appearance is that we must know about Him, and for this perpetuation and transmission we must have an objective body of historical testimony. The supremacy of the Bible is due to the fact that it gives this, for the great outstanding fact of history is the supernatural figure of Christ, who is enshrined for

¹ "Unto a Christian man there can be nothing either more necessary or profitable than the knowledge of Holy Scripture, forasmuch as *in it* is contained God's true word, setting forth His glory, and also man's duty. And there is no truth or doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is or may be drawn out of *that* fountain and well of Truth" (*First Homily*).

us in the written word. We adhere to the Bible ultimately on this ground alone, for it is the presence of Christ in the Bible that gives it its uniqueness as our supreme authority in religion.

This supremacy of the Bible has several applications which call for special consideration.

1. Holy Scripture is supreme over Reason. There is a great tendency to find the seat of authority within man himself, as though the consent of the mind is the foundation of all certitude. Now while reason is both valuable and necessary as one of the means of distinguishing the claims of authority, and also as a recipient of the truth of revelation, it is altogether different to claim for it the seat of authority itself. We are, of course, prepared to insist upon the importance of reason as the only faculty for judging anything, as Butler showed long ago, for no authority can be legitimate which subverts or stultifies reason, and the right of verification is the bounden duty of every man. But if there is such a thing as reality independent of our mind, it is obvious that human consent cannot be the foundation of truth, for certitude is only the result of the acceptance and experience of a reality outside ourselves. To regard reason as autonomous is to deny the existence of objective reality. Reason does not create, it only weighs, and then accepts or rejects what is offered. The true idea of authority is that which is not against reason, but in accordance with it. We therefore hold, following the Article, that the supreme authority is the Divine revelation in Christ embodied in the Bible. We believe that in this way the vehicle of transmission is certain for *littera scripta manet*, and that this could not be so with any mere human faculty. Revelation does not dishonour reason, but honours it by appealing to it with evidence, for to the spiritual, enlightened mind the Scriptures make a constant appeal. Reason has the vital duty to perform of judging of man's need of Divine revelation and then of examining the credentials of revelation. Then when the credentials are examined, reason necessarily yields to the superior authority of Divine revelation and finds in it the principle and law of life. The modern tendency to fix the seat of authority within is liable to the error of pure subjectivity unless it is safeguarded by the consciousness of a true objective element in knowledge. The idea that "objective" and "external" are identical is incorrect, for since the ultimate authority is Christ Himself we can see at once that while Christ is dwelling in us He is not thereby identical with us. He is the Divine revelation mediated through Holy Scripture, and applied by the Holy Spirit at once objective and subjective, external and internal. It is perhaps necessary to repeat that as the Lord Jesus Christ is our supreme authority we accept the Bible because it enshrines His Divine revelation in the best available form. All that we desire is the highest knowledge of Christ, and this we hold to be found in Scripture, and while we constantly emphasise the importance and necessity of reason in its work of testing the proofs of revelation, it is equally essential that reason should yield to those proofs when it has proved them satisfactory.

2. Holy Scripture is also supreme over the Church. This was the fundamental principle laid down at the Reformation, as the whole history testified. Holy Scripture was regarded as the warrant for everything essential in Church life and progress. Indeed, the Church itself is the product of Divine revelation by the acceptance of the Word of God proclaimed through inspired Apostles. The Christian community, whether regarded as universal, or consisting of national Churches, has its rightful place of authority, but it is certainly not co-ordinate with Scripture, as the Articles plainly teach (Articles XX, XXI, XXXIV).¹

But it is sometimes said that as the Church existed many years before the New Testament was written the Church must necessarily be supreme. This conclusion, however, does not necessarily follow. To be anterior does not of necessity mean to be superior. To be before does not always mean to be above. Besides, it is not quite correct to say that the Apostolic Church had no Bible, because the Old Testament was constantly used and appealed to in Jewish and Gentile Churches, and St. Paul could say, with the simple addition of faith in Christ Jesus, these Old Testament Scriptures were "able to make wise unto salvation" (2 Tim. iii. 15),² and we can see the position of the Old Testament from our Lord's appeal to it, and the use made of it in the Apostolic Church (cf. Acts xvii. 11). But quite apart from this the argument that because the Church was before Scripture therefore it is above Scripture calls for further attention. It is quite true that the Church existed before the written word of the New Testament, but first of all there was the spoken word through Christ and His Apostles. On the Day of Pentecost the Word of God was proclaimed, and on the acceptance of that Word the Church came into existence, being formed by the Word of God. Every similar proclamation of the Gospel led to the same results, and communities of Christians came into existence based on the acceptance by faith of a Divine revelation. As long as the Apostles' teaching was available nothing more was required, but as time went on it was necessary to embody the Apostolic message in a permanent form. Thenceforward to all ages the written Word became equivalent to the spoken Word as the seat of authority. The fact is the same throughout; the form alone was changed.³ Thus,

¹ Litton, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (Second Edition), p. 27; Wace, *Principles of the Reformation*, p. 236 ff.

² "It is sometimes said, and an important truth lies concealed under the phrase, that the Church existed before the Bible. But a Christian of the earliest days, if you had used such words to him, would have stared at you in undisguised amazement. He would have explained to you that in the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms the Christian possessed all the Scriptures he could want, for they all spoke of Christ" (Turner, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, October 1908, p. 14).

³ "In the history of the world the unwritten Word of God must of course be before the Church. For what is a Church (in the wider sense of the word) but a group of believers in God's Word? And before the Word is spoken, how can there be believers in it? 'Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.' Therefore the Word of God must be before faith. It is only of the Bible, or written volume of God's oracles, assuredly not of God's spoken Word, that we assert it to have been brought into existence later than the Church" (Goulburn, *Holy Catholic Church*; quoted in *Four Foundation Truths*, p. 13).

the Apostles were the seat of authority at the first, and they have continued so to this day, the only difference being between their spoken and written word. The Word created the Church, not the Church the Word.¹ The same thing is seen to-day in the Mission Field, where a Church exists in most places through the Word spoken long before the written Word can be given. The Rule of Faith is the conveyance of a Divine Authority to man, and the Bible as a Rule of Faith must have existed in the minds of Christ and His Apostles long before it was or could be committed to writing. As such, it preceded and conditioned the origin and life of the Church. The relation of the Church to the Word is, in the words of Article XX, "a witness and a keeper"; a witness to what Scripture is, and a keeper of that Scripture for the people of God.² But this is very different from being the maker of Scripture, for the Church, as such, is not the author of Holy Writ.³ Thus, the Word first spoken and then written is at once the foundation and guarantee of the Church. The witness of the primitive Christian community is valuable, because of its nearness to Apostolic times, but if it should be said that we are therefore bound to receive what the Church says, we reply that on the one hand we do not receive Scripture on account of the Roman Catholic Church, and on the other that the Church in the present consideration is universal, and its work is only ministerial, not supremely and finally authoritative. But this is simply the position and work of a witness to an already existing revelation. The function of the Church is exactly parallel to that of the Jewish Church in relation to the Old Testament. The Prophets were the messengers and mouthpieces of Divine revelation and delivered their writings to the Jews, who thereupon preserved them, and thenceforward bore their testimony to the authority of the Divine revelation embodied therein. In the same way the Christian Church received the New Testament writings from the Lord Jesus Christ through His Apostles and Prophets, and now the function of the Church is to witness to this fact and to keep these writings for use by Christian people.⁴ We therefore apply the touchstone of

¹ "Our authority is not the Church of the first century, but the Apostles who were its authority. The Church does not rest on its inchoate stage (which would poise it on its apex) but on its eternal foundation—a Christ who, in His apostolic Self-Revelation, is the same deep Redeemer always" (Forsyth, *The Principle of Authority*, p. 96).

"We have a variety of opinions and sections in the first Church, but I am speaking of the *representative apostles*, and of the New Testament as their register and index. The Church of the ages was not founded by the Church of the first century, but by the apostles as the organs of Christ. We are in the apostolic succession rather than in the ecclesiastic. It is not the first Church that is canonical for us Protestants, but the apostolic New Testament" (Forsyth, *ut supra*, p. 142; see also pp. 146-155).

² See also on Article XX.

³ "The Church from her dear Master Received the gift Divine"—(*Bishop Walsbam How*).

⁴ "The books of the Bible were given to the Church more than by it, and they descended on it rather than rose from it. The Canon of the Bible rose from the Church, but not its contents. The Bible and the Church were collateral products of the Gospel" (Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 140).

"The New Testament is not the first stage of the evolution, but the last phase of

continuity and ask two questions: Has the Church preserved Scripture aright? Has it properly interpreted Scripture? But the former does not involve the latter. There is no desire to detract from the place of the Church as testifying and teaching;¹ on the contrary we are prepared to give every possible weight to the testimony of the Church as of real importance in its proper place, but for every reason we refuse to co-ordinate the Church with Scripture as our authority for the Christian religion.² This position of the supremacy of Holy Scripture above the Church is fundamental to the Church of England, and represents one part of what has been called "a line of deep cleavage"³ between us and Rome.

3. This question of the Bible and the Church has a special application to what is known as Church Tradition. The Church of Rome puts tradition, that is, Church beliefs, customs and usages, on a level with Scripture as the Rule of Faith, and this constitutes a fundamental difference between the two Churches, as Bellarmine, one of the ablest Roman controversialists, allows. While granting that Scripture is a Rule of Faith, according to Rome it is not a complete, but only a partial Rule, and therefore there are some things not found in it. This subject was considered at the Council of Trent in 1546, and the decree was well known to the compilers of this Article. It is as follows:—

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

the revelatory fact and deed. . . . The Creeds are not parallel to the Church, but the Bible is. They are products of the Church. The Bible is not. It is a parallel product of the Spirit who produced the Church. They are two products of one Spirit; the one is not the product of the other. The Bible was not produced by the Church, and yet the Church was there before the Bible. Both were there collaterally from the Spirit" (Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 152).

"If He died to make a Church that Church should continue to be made by some permanent thing from Himself, either by a continuous Apostolate supernaturally secured in the *charisma veritatis*, as Rome claims, or by a book which should be the real successor of the Apostles, with a real authority on the vital matters of truth and faith. But we discard the supernatural pope for the supernatural book" (Forsyth, *op. cit.*, p. 171).

¹ "By experience we all know that the first outward motive leading men so to esteem of the Scripture is the authority of God's Church" (Hooker, *Æcl. Pol.*, Bk. III, Ch. VIII, Section 14).

² "All communities of Christians agree in this, that the Divine Rule is contained in Holy Scripture. They differ as to the authority of an *Ecclesia Docens*. Necessarily there must be something analogous to the latter, even in the smallest sect. The danger lies in the direction of substituting an *independent* for an *interpretative* authority. Undoubtedly this danger, always insidious, is contemplated here. The intention is not to dispense with an *Ecclesia Docens*, but to indicate its proper function and to insist upon its responsibility for fulfilling the same" (Maclear and Williams, *ut supra*, p. 99).

³ *Report of the Royal Commission on Discipline*, 1906, Vol. IV, p. 53.

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

This position calls for careful consideration. The word “tradition” has a great variety of meanings. (1) Sometimes it refers to a usage in worship (1 Cor. xi. 2); (2) at other times it means a doctrine (Matt. xv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 15). In the latter case doctrinal traditions may be those that are not found in Holy Scripture or those that are recorded there. No one objects to all tradition, for we constantly use rites and ceremonies which are not found in Holy Scripture, though they are in proper accord with it. What our Church rejects is any doctrinal tradition which has no warrant in Scripture. Thus, all through the ages the doctrines of our Lord's Deity, Incarnation, and Atonement have been handed down, and we accept them. But, on the other hand, there are distinctive doctrines of Rome, such as Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Mariolatry, which we do not accept because we hold that they are not Apostolic, for it is a matter of supreme importance to know whether a tradition is really Apostolic, since only that which can be proved to originate with our Lord and His immediate followers can rightly be regarded as possessing Divine sanction, and there is not the slightest proof that any of the distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome are derivable from that source.²

The words of the Apostle are sometimes used to support this view of the co-ordination of tradition with Scripture: “Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle” (2 Thess. ii. 15). But the question is not what St. Paul taught in his day, but whether at the present time we can distinguish between oral and written traditions of Christianity. No one questions for a moment that St. Paul's oral instructions were obligatory on his converts, but it is altogether different to believe that the oral tradition claimed to-day by Rome corresponds with this apostolic teaching. The supreme question is whether there are not fundamental Divine truths which are not found in the New Testament. The same thing is true in regard to the Apostle's exhortation to Timothy, to “guard the deposit” (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12-14). St. Paul assuredly taught certain doctrines to Timothy by word of mouth, but again the question arises whether there are any

¹ *Conc. Trident., Sessio Quarta, Decret. de Canon. Script.*

² “Whether the Apostles taught more or otherwise than what is recorded in the Canonical Scriptures, no Church or individual is now in a position to adduce a syllable thereof with certainty” (Litton, *ut supra*, p. 37).

doctrines to be believed to-day which are not contained in the written Word.

But it is sometimes urged that there are certain doctrines which are taught to-day, not because of Scripture, but by reason of Church custom, special reference being made to the observance of the Lord's Day, as to which, it is said that we reverence it because of the tradition of the universal Church. But the argument is more plausible than real, for, in the first place, the principle of one rest day in seven is fundamental in Scripture and is not merely Jewish, while the change from the seventh day to the first is entirely suitable to the circumstances of our Lord's Resurrection. The strongest argument for setting apart one day out of seven for the worship of God is neither Jewish precedent nor Christian practice, for the authority of the Lord's Day is essentially Scriptural, and the usage of the Church is in reality only a witness to an observance which finds its supreme warrant in Holy Scripture. We value all proper appeal to Church tradition, believing that it has its place and power, but this is very different from co-ordinating it with Scripture. The natural tendency in such a case is to reverse the order and to make Scripture subject to tradition, so that while in theory tradition is equal to Scripture in practice it becomes paramount. The moral authority of the universal Church is weighty, and no individual Christian can lightly reject it. But, after all, this is only the work of a witness to an ultimate and original authority, and in making the Bible supreme in things essential we are only doing that which is at once natural and necessary.¹ Tradition is of great value in the interpretation of Scripture, and no one would wish to under-rate its importance.

“It is one thing to use tradition as a help towards arriving at the true sense of Scripture, and quite another thing to make it a source of Christian doctrine.”²

Tradition is also of value for rites and customs, and all such ecclesiastical matters, so far as they are in harmony with the principles of the Word of God, the Anglican Church heartily accepts.³ But this is altogether different from regarding Church tradition as our supreme authority in matters of doctrine and practice.

“This risks making the *Ecclesia Docens* independent instead of interpretative, as though Scripture were not the *sole* source of Catholic truth, and as though an Article of the Faith might rest on Church teaching alone as a sufficient basis in itself. Such were a departure from the primitive conception of the authority of Scripture.”⁴

¹ Bishop Gore said at the Bristol Church Congress, 1903: “The Word of God in the Bible is the only final testing ground of doctrine.”

² Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 238.

³ See Article XXXIV; see Bishop Kaye's *Tertulian*, pp. 299-304; quoted in Gibson, *ut supra*, pp. 246-248.

⁴ Maclear and Williams, *ut supra*, p. 104.

This position of the supreme authority of the Bible over tradition is the assertion of the historic basis of Christianity. Sabatier truly says:—

“It is a historic law that every tradition not fixed in writing changes in the process of development.”¹

Bishop Gore shows the truth of this in connection with the history of the Jews, and points out the application of this fallacy to those in authority in the Christian Church. They ought to have been more thoroughly on their guard against anything that would tend to detract from the constant appeal to Scripture as the supreme authority. In regard to the Mediæval Church, Dr. Gore’s words are important and significant:—

“The specific appeal to the Scriptures of the New Testament to verify or correct current tendencies is gone. . . . The safeguard has vanished.”²

There is perhaps nothing more certain in history than the untrustworthiness of tradition without some historic and literary safeguard.³ It is also curious that in every religion, true or false, men have tended to be wise above that which is written. The people of the book have not been contented with it. Jews, Mohammedans, as well as Roman Catholics, have their traditions, and not seldom these are found to subvert the written authority. Our Lord’s words about the Jews in this respect are of special importance, and the threefold charge made in the Gospels is particularly noticeable. The Pharisees first of all held tradition (Mark vii. 3); the result was that they laid aside the Divine command to hold tradition (ver. 8), with the outcome of rejecting God’s Word in order to keep their own traditions (ver. 9).

Thus, insecurity of tradition constitutes the supremacy of the Bible the charter of spiritual freedom. It is a great mistake to think that the function of the Church is to settle definitely every question of difficulty as it arises, for no trace can be found of any such view, either in Scripture, or in the Creeds, or in the early Church history. Nothing would have been easier than for the Church to summon a Council and settle all disputes by a majority, but no such action was ever taken; on the contrary, we know that after the Council of Nicæa the struggle went on for many years before the decisions of that Assembly were universally

¹ Sabatier, *The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*, p. 40.

² Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 220.

³ “Tradition is utterly unsafe. The Roman Catholic doctrine of tradition is the concrete proof of the assertion. Unwritten tradition is always coloured and transformed by the medium through which it passes. An unwritten Gospel would be subject to all the fluctuations of the spiritual life of man and most likely to gravitate downward from the spiritual to the carnal and formal. Institutions may symbolize or embody truth, but without a written standard they always tend to become external means of grace, or sacraments. They are ladders on which we may climb up or down. Without a corrective it is usually down” (Mullins, *Freedom and Authority in Religion*, p. 349).

accepted. The great authority of the first Four General Councils is acknowledged, and their doctrinal standards are our heritage to-day. But even their decisions were accepted only because they commended themselves to the entire Church as in accordance with Divine revelation. It was this subsequent endorsement by the whole Christian world and not the mere decision of a Council which constituted the real test of universality.¹ But while we cannot for a moment co-ordinate tradition with Scripture, we are ready to appeal to the former whenever possible and necessary. The testimony of the primitive Church is invaluable in many respects, but there is a wide difference between the Roman Catholic and Protestant appeals to tradition :—

“Tradition is either an exposition of apostolic doctrine, or an addition to it. If an exposition, how is it to be shown that the Reformation branch of the Church was wrong. If an addition, what becomes of the claim for the apostolicity of all Catholic doctrine ? ”²

It is this fundamental difference that enables us to see the right and wrong view of appeal to the beliefs and customs of the Church.³ It is always a satisfaction to obtain the consensus of Church opinion, but its use is only that of historical evidence, and not something which settles the matter apart from proper consideration.

When this is clearly understood it removes all objections to what is called “private judgment.” It is easy to introduce confusion by contrasting and opposing Church authority and private judgment. But there is no such contradiction. What is called private judgment is the decision of the whole nature of man, judgment, conscience, and will, in his desire to know and follow the truth. He does not thereby separate himself from, or set himself above the corporate Christian consciousness, so far as he can discover that, but while he welcomes and weighs truth from every side he feels that Scripture is the supreme and final authority for life.⁴ Authority is always based on the possession of superior know-

¹ See on Article XXI.

² Forsyth, *The Principle of Authority*, p. 359, Note.

³ “Romanists appeal to the Church in her organized and official capacity. Protestants appeal to the individuals who compose the Church, and appeal to them, not for their official *sanction*, but for *information* upon a simple question of fact. Romanists appeal to the Church as a judge whose decision is final. Protestants appeal to her members as credible witnesses. Romanists appeal to her for an authoritative decision upon a question which they are unable or indisposed to examine for themselves. Protestants appeal to her members for evidence, which they weigh as they would any other evidence. According to the Romish view, the Church collects the evidence, passes upon it, and declares her judgment in the premises, from which judgment there is no appeal. According to the Protestant view, the persons who compose the Church may collect the testimony and perpetuate it from generation to generation, but each individual may and should pass upon it for himself” (McPheeters, “Objections to Apostolic Authorship or Sanction as the Ultimate Test of Canonicity,” *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, Vol. VI, p. 42).

⁴ “As a matter of fact, the unlimited right of private judgment is not a fruit of the Reformation but of the Renaissance and of the Revolution with their wild individualism. It is Socinian and rationalist, it is not Protestant. The Reformation certainly made

ledge, and no true Christian can have any objection to the authority that comes from any individual or corporate body which actually possesses more and better information than himself. All that his duty to Christ requires is that the information derived from others should be examined, compared, and tested by Holy Scripture as the supreme and final authority in all matters of faith and practice, and when this is done there will be little or no practical difficulty in arriving at a proper decision.

This position is abundantly justified on every ground. Our Lord Himself appealed to the Scriptures as the touchstone of truth. Our personality has been created in a relationship of direct responsibility to God. The Christian religion teaches beyond all else that the soul is in direct personal relationship to God, while welcoming all possible light through human channels in helping us to decide for ourselves. Then, too, this position has ever been productive of the finest characters and the noblest examples of individual and corporate Christian life. It is also at least noteworthy that all the great systems of religion have their sacred books, as though a book were absolutely necessary to a religion. So that the ultimate court of appeal must be the spiritual, enlightened judgment of the individual Christian with reference to any and every matter of conscience. This is the absolute right of the individual, whether like the Protestant he exercises it continually from the Bible, or whether like the Roman Catholic he exercises it once for all in deciding to submit himself to what he believes to be an infallible guide. But the final decision must be made by the spiritually illuminated Christian consciousness, guided by the Word of God, advised by every possible channel of knowledge available, and led by the Holy Spirit of God.

VI.—THE PRACTICAL USE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

The use of Holy Scripture as sufficient and supreme in all essential matters can be applied in various ways.

1. We use it against a Rationalism which is not content without demanding a reason for everything. But, as we have already seen, reason is only one faculty, while religion speaks to all. In the light of what has been said about the duty of verification of revelation by reason, it is obvious that to set up reason as supreme would be to insist upon a false or at least an inadequate and partial criterion. Christ is our authority, and to the spiritual enlightened reason Christ makes His constant appeal.

2. We use it against what is called Mysticism, which in various

religion personal, but it did not make it individualist. The Reformation, if it destroyed the hierarchy of the Church, did not destroy the hierarchy of competency, spiritual or intellectual. In a political democracy we speak of one vote, one value; but in the intellectual and spiritual region all opinions are not of equal worth; nor have they all an equal right to attention. What the Reformation said was that the layman with his Bible in his hand had at his side the same Holy Spirit as the minister. Each had the testimony of the Spirit as the supreme religious Expositor of Scripture" (Forsyth, *ut supra*, p. 320).

forms tends to emphasise the inner light as against, or additional to, the written Word. This is a modern danger of real force and seriousness, and it is essential to remember that the Holy Spirit speaks through and according to the Word of God and never contrary to it.¹

3. We use it against Scepticism. The Bible is a comparatively small book, and yet all that is necessary is found therein. This is a tremendous claim and the question is whether it is justified. The answer is obvious: the Bible has moulded literature, coloured civilisation, affected philosophy, and transformed individuals and races.

4. We use it against an extreme Protestantism or Puritanism. In the sixteenth century men of this type taught that everything is in Scripture, and that nothing else was to be valued in Church life. But the Bible is a book of principles, not of rules, and presupposes natural law, social law, and civic law.² As spiritual life is varied it can and must express itself in various ways. So long as individual and Church life is true to the principles of Scripture all outside authority is to be welcomed. Scripture as sufficient and supreme is intended to emphasise things essential as distinct from things beneficial.

5. We use it against Roman Catholicism, which exalts the Church and Church tradition to the place which our Church gives to Holy Scripture. When once the Rule of Faith is settled, all else is really detail. Apart from the Bible as supreme, it is easy to appeal to Church authority and tradition. In the position of the Article, as laid down at the Reformation and maintained ever since, we find the safeguard of purity and the best guarantee of progress because we possess in Scripture the complete requirement of God for Christian faith and life.

¹ See *The Holy Spirit of God*, Ch. XXVIII.

² Hooker, *Ecel. Pol.*, Bk. I.