

# The thirty-nine articles of the Church of England

Autor(en): **Lias, J.J.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review**

Band (Jahr): **5 (1897)**

Heft 17

PDF erstellt am: **13.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403371>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

# THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

OF THE

## CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

If I again ask for space in the pages of the *Revue internationale de Théologie* for the question of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England it is not so much my purpose to say anything of my own, as to put before those whose acquaintance with the Church of England is not very great the views entertained in regard to them by divines of repute in our communion. Two volumes have lately appeared among us on these Articles. The one, that by D<sup>r</sup> Maclear and M<sup>r</sup> Williams, has already been noticed by my friend M<sup>r</sup> Allen in the *Revue internationale de Théologie* for April-June 1896. The other is by D<sup>r</sup> Gibson, Vicar of Leeds. The first volume of this Work, which is all that has at present appeared, includes only the first eight Articles.<sup>1)</sup>

I propose to allow these divines to speak for themselves. And my object in doing so is to convince your readers that I am not alone in the opinions I have expressed in this *Revue*. My friend Gen. Kiréeff, if he will allow me to take a liberty which his invariable fairness and courtesy toward opponents has led me to believe that he will not resent, expressed great surprise at my statement that the Thirty-nine Articles of Re-

---

<sup>1)</sup> Another volume has recently been advertised by Professor Green, of St. David's College, Lampeter, where a considerable proportion of the Welsh clergy are prepared for Holy Orders. This book, however, has not at present reached me. It consists, I understand, chiefly of documentary evidence bearing on the interpretation of the Articles.

ligion to be found in our Prayer-Book are only binding upon the clergy. Mr Allen has lately reiterated that statement in this review.<sup>1)</sup> Your readers will find it repeated once again in a book which aims at being a text-book for Candidates for Holy Orders in our Church. There are also points of doctrine in which the utterances of our theologians have been misrepresented and misunderstood by those who are not members of our Communion. The assertion, moreover, that our Articles were written under Lutheran inspiration is one which a superficial study of them tends to confirm, but which a more careful examination serves to dissipate. Calumny dies hard—especially hard when it has been current for centuries. But it is time that those who have the best reasons for desiring to be on good terms with us, and who might easily become our friends, should cease to view us through Roman object-glasses. Those same object-glasses are used to colour and distort the opinions of *all* who do not accept the supremacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. It is strange that any should implicitly believe the statements of those whose interest it is to divide and so to conquer their opponents. Not many days ago I read in a Christian Catholic newspaper a communication from one who imagined that the Church of England consisted of *four* (it used to be *three*) distinct and irreconcilable factions, united together by the illusory bond of the Thirty-nine Articles. The slightest acquaintance with our Communion is sufficient to dispel such a supposition.<sup>2)</sup>

---

<sup>1)</sup> April-June 1896, p. 373.

<sup>2)</sup> M. le chancelier Lias attaquant dans ce passage une « Correspondance d'Angleterre » publiée par le *Catholique national* du 17 octobre 1896, p. 86-87, la *Direction* a cru de son devoir de communiquer l'article de M. Lias au Correspondant du *C. N.*, qui lui a envoyé la réponse suivante :

« Si j'ai bien compris la thèse de M. le chancelier L., elle peut être résumée ainsi : — La foi de l'Eglise anglicane ne doit pas être jugée par les 39 Articles, puisqu'ils ne sont pas de foi, mais par le symbole de foi que cette Eglise professe dans sa liturgie. Or, ce symbole est le symbole de Nicée, et il est professé par tous les Anglicans, soit des directions *Low Church* et *Broad Church*, soit des directions *High Church* et *Ritualist Church*. Donc la foi de l'Eglise anglicane est une et catholique, et l'Eglise anglicane est aussi une et catholique.

« Que M. le chancelier veuille bien me permettre les observations suivantes, dont le but est non d'aigrir la question, mais de l'éclaircir et de favoriser sincèrement l'union.

« 1° L'Eglise anglicane ne professe pas le texte authentique du symbole de Nicée-Constantinople, puisqu'elle y a ajouté le mot *filioque* et qu'elle en a retranché, à propos de l'Eglise, le mot *sancta*.

Not only are we united by our profession of the Catholic Creed, and by our orthodox Liturgy and Offices, which, save in Ireland, Scotland, and the United States of America, are *exactly the same* throughout the whole of the Anglican Communion, but we have the clearest practical proofs that we form a corporate whole. Our Church is only connected with the State in England and Wales, and in our Lambeth Conferences, our Convocations and General Assemblies, our Diocesan Conferences, our Ruri-decanal Chapters, and our Church Congresses, and in a thousand other ways, we demonstrate that whatever differences of opinion may exist among us, we form but “one Body in Christ”. So, too, will those who examine into the matter find that our Articles were not adopted as a Confession of Faith, but as a means, in critical times, of securing a certain uniformity and moderation in public teaching; and that, this object having long since been attained, the importance attached to the Articles has been for a long time diminishing among us. There is an increasing number of members of our Communion who, while maintaining their general soundness, especially when

---

« 2° Il ne suffit pas de professer la lettre d'un symbole, il faut encore n'en pas nier le sens traditionnel; une interprétation qui n'est qu'une négation détournée, n'est plus une interprétation permise. Or, n'est-ce pas l'esprit de l'Eglise *large* de ne pas professer la divinité de J.-C. telle qu'elle a été professée dans les sept Conciles œcuméniques? Et dans l'Eglise *ritualiste* n'a-t-on pas généralement une notion erronée de la catholicité, assez erronée même pour favoriser l'union avec la Rome actuelle, qui est papiste et non catholique? Quant à l'Eglise *basse*, est-il certain que sa manière d'expliquer le symbole concorde avec les explications de l'Eglise *haute*? Ce sont là des doutes qui planent non sur des opinions, mais sur la foi même; doutes d'autant plus tenaces que l'Eglise anglicane, en rejetant les 5<sup>e</sup>, 6<sup>e</sup> et 7<sup>e</sup> Conciles œcuméniques, qui sont aussi œcuméniques que les quatre premiers, semble ne pas admettre de fait le criterium catholique de Vincent de Lérins et être ainsi exposée à l'arbitraire.

« 3° Si les 39 Articles ne sont pas de foi, ils sont cependant obligatoires pour le clergé; et s'ils ne le sont pas, pourquoi une décision officielle et synodale ne le déclare-t-elle pas? Cette décision est depuis longtemps nécessaire, et si on s'obstine à la refuser, ce refus paraît à bon droit suspect.

« 4° En tout cas, des Eglises dont les unes reconnaissent sept sacrements, et une deux seulement; des Eglises dont les unes admettent sept Conciles œcuméniques, et une quatre seulement, ne sauraient être unies sans faire de la confusion. Donc, si l'Eglise anglicane veut sérieusement l'union avec les Eglises orientales et les Eglises anciennes-catholiques, qui toutes reconnaissent les définitions dogmatiques des sept Conciles œcuméniques et qui toutes admettent sept sacrements, elle devra évidemment faire d'abord et officiellement la même déclaration. »

interpreted by the *lex orandi* to which they are attached, regard the form of many of their doctrinal statements as somewhat out of date, and who would not be unwilling to see subscription to them abolished, or at least to support some revision of their language.

It will be necessary, before proceeding further, to explain to the readers of this review the position which the authors of these treatises occupy in our Church. D<sup>r</sup> Maclear has long been known as one of our leading divines, and has for many years been Warden of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, our most important College for the training of Missionaries. Numbers of our clergy who are now working in the Mission field owe their theological education to him. M<sup>r</sup> Williams is a colleague of D<sup>r</sup> Maclear. D<sup>r</sup> Gibson was for many years Principal of Wells Theological College, an institution of high reputation, in which a large number of our home clergy have been prepared for Holy Orders. He is now Vicar of Leeds—an important position from which, during the last forty years, D<sup>r</sup> Hook, D<sup>r</sup> Woodford, D<sup>r</sup> Atlay, D<sup>r</sup> Jayne and D<sup>r</sup> Talbot, have been successively selected, the first to fill a Deanery, the rest to occupy Bishoprics in our Church. It can hardly be disputed that the utterances of such men as these are worthy of notice. I am therefore but discharging a duty to the Universal Church in asking the attention of your readers to them.

D<sup>r</sup> Maclear's work is the less ambitious of the two, and is designed for students of an inferior grade to those for whom D<sup>r</sup> Gibson's book is written. I shall therefore follow the order of the latter, and not refer to the former save where it corroborates, corrects, or supplements D<sup>r</sup> Gibson's statements. On the subject of the theological influences under which the Thirty-nine Articles were compiled D<sup>r</sup> Gibson has a good deal, and D<sup>r</sup> Maclear very little to say. D<sup>r</sup> Gibson begins with a brief discussion of the doctrinal Confessions which the Reformation brought into existence. Among these he mentions some articles drawn up in 1538 by certain English authorities in conjunction with some German divines. These, though never officially adopted or composed, he holds to have had more direct influence upon our own Thirty-nine Articles than the Augsburg Confession had. After a very brief notice of other Confessions, he goes on to discuss the Forty-two articles of 1553, from which it is acknow-

ledged on all hands that our Thirty-nine were mainly drawn up. The Forty-two articles were drawn up in the last year of Edward VI's reign, and their avowed object, as their title page tells us, was "for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of religion". He regards these articles as aimed more at Anabaptist excesses than at Roman corruptions.

He further says of them:

"This brief review of the object and contents of the Forty-two Articles will be sufficient to show that in the first instance the document must have been merely intended to be a provisional and temporary one. Every line of it bears witness to this. The idea that it would be maintained as a permanent test of orthodoxy cannot have ever occurred to its authors. For such a purpose it is singularly ill-suited. Many of the articles are purely negative, condemning in trenchant terms some existing error, but not attempting to define the positive truth opposed to it. Our review will also indicate how utterly mistaken is the notion that the Articles were mainly, if not exclusively, designed as a safeguard against Rome, for we have seen that, although a considerable number of the articles do condemn Roman and medieval errors, yet a far larger number are directed against the teaching of the Anabaptists, and denounce false doctrine in terms to which the most ardent Romanist could not take exception." pp. 25, 26.

In regard to their sources he says:

"Nor should it be forgotten that in some of the matters in which indebtedness to the Lutheran formulary cannot be denied, the Anglican statements are far stronger and more precise than those to which the Lutherans were called on to subscribe, *e. g.* on the Sacraments, the Confession of Augsburg said that they were instituted, 'not only to be marks of profession among men, but rather to be signs and witnesses of God's good-will towards us, offered to quicken and confirm faith in those who use them'. In the Thirteen Articles of 1538 this was altered into the statement that sacraments instituted by the word of God are not only marks of profession among Christians, but rather *certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace* and God's good-will towards us, *by which God works invisibly in us . . . .* and through

them faith is quickened and confirmed in those who use them.”  
p. 27.

Dr Gibson's history of the compilation and publication of the Thirty-nine Articles is not material to our present issue. Suffice it to say that four new articles were added, some few clauses in the Forty-two were modified, seven articles and a certain number of clauses were omitted, and some articles and clauses were re-written. Dr Gibson summarizes the effect of the changes thus. “1. A character of greater completeness, as regards fundamentals, was given to the formulary, and some changes were introduced, seemingly in order to make the document suitable for a permanent test of doctrinal orthodoxy. 2. The Catholic position of the Church of England, and her determination to adhere to the general teaching of the Church was made clearer. 3. The independent line taken by the Church of England in the matters of dispute with Rome was adhered to, and in some respects more sharply defined than had been the case in the earlier Articles.” While, 4, Dr Gibson points out that the Puritans, or Calvinists, were much dissatisfied with the omission of the clause in Art. XXVIII which denied a Corporal Presence in the Eucharist, and with the addition of the clause in Art. XX which claimed for the Church the right to “decree rites and ceremonies”. These articles, approved, with certain exceptions, by Convocation in 1563, were published in 1571, with the joint assent of Convocation, as representing the clergy, and of Parliament, as representing the laity, of our Church.

Dr Gibson proceeds to discuss the Royal declaration affixed to the Articles. This was added by Charles I in 1628, in reply to the violent attacks made by the Puritans or Calvinists upon the Arminian, or rather Anglo-Catholic party, which rose into importance about the year 1580. To this party belonged, on the whole, Hooker and Whitgift, while Andrewes and Laud may be regarded as its mainstays. They were followed by nearly all the principal theologians in the Church of England subsequent to the Restoration. Dr Gibson quotes Archdeacon Hardwick, the author of the well known *History of the Articles*, who regards the contention of Montague and others at the beginning of the reign of Charles I, that “Calvinism is not accordant with the letter of the Articles, and cannot be deduced from them by any of the rules which judges commonly apply to the

interpretation of a legal document", as fully justified by the facts. And it may be added that the undeniable and vast preponderance of the Anglo-Catholic divines in the history of English theology tends most strongly to confirm Montague's statement.

This view derives further confirmation from the fact, to which D<sup>r</sup> Gibson's pages, as well as the course of English history, bear witness, that the Calvinist party were not only dissatisfied with the articles, but made repeated attempts to get them altered. He points out that already in 1571, the Puritan party raised some opposition to the adoption of the Articles by Parliament. And the controversy which arose a little later, in 1595, over the Lambeth Articles which Whitgift attempted to introduce, is a still further proof of the fact. The mind of Whitgift, like that of Hooker, seems to have oscillated between Calvinism and Anglo-Catholicism. Hooker's sermons are Calvinistic in their tendency, but his immortal *Ecclesiastical Polity* displays no leaning in that direction. The truth is that men's minds at the outset of Elizabeth's reign were by no means clear in regard to the Divine Decrees, but that ultimately the party opposed to Calvinism acquired and retained the supremacy in our communion. It is true that the Calvinistic doctrines, or heresies, as some prefer to call them, were never formally condemned by the Church of England. But then they have never been condemned by the Universal Church. In point of fact, no such condemnation is needed. The doctrines themselves are their own best condemnation. They have entirely vanished long since from the Church of England, and are rapidly vanishing from the Calvinistic bodies themselves. It were a wiser course, one may believe, to allow error and heresy to wither away under the light of inquiry, than to prolong its existence by premature denunciations on the part of those in authority.

The next point to which I would direct attention is D<sup>r</sup> Gibson's history of Subscription to the Articles. At first the authorities demanded subscription to *all* the Articles. Then Whitgift, in 1583, substituted subscription to *three* articles, the first attributing to the Queen the "sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within her realms", and denying such jurisdiction to any foreign potentate; the second asserting the orthodoxy of the Book of Common Prayer, and the third maintaining



the Thirty-nine Articles to be “agreeable to the Word of God”. There is no obligation here, it will be observed, to express more than a *general* agreement to their tenor. “In practice”, Dr Gibson goes on to say, the subscription to the Articles assumed the form of a declaration that the person subscribing did “willingly and from his heart subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles”, and this, during the reign of our present Queen, has been modified into a simple declaration of assent. We may leave this subject with two quotations. The first is from Bishop Pearson, perhaps the most learned divine of the Anglo-Catholic, or indeed of any school whom the Church of England has ever possessed, who says that the book of the Articles “is not, nor is pretended to be, a complete body of Divinity, or a comprehension and explication of all Christian doctrines necessary to be taught, but an enumeration of some truths which, upon and since the Reformation, have been denied by some persons; who upon their denial are thought until to have any cure of souls within this realm, because they might by their opinions infect their flock with error, or else disturb the Church with schism, or the realm with sedition”.<sup>1)</sup> As Bishop Pearson died in 1686, it will hardly be contended that this view of the Thirty-nine Articles, which seems to have occasioned such surprise to some of the readers of the *Revue internationale de Théologie*, is a recent invention in order to put a more favourable construction on our position in the face of the Catholic world than we deserve. But if they are still doubtful, we will subjoin a second quotation, containing the words of Archbishop Laud, who was martyred on behalf of Catholic truth in 1645. He says, in his controversy with the Jesuit Fisher, that “the Church of England never declared that every one of her Articles are fundamental in the faith. For it is one thing to say, no one of them is superstitious or erroneous, and quite another to say, every one of them is fundamental, and that in every part of it, to all men’s belief.”<sup>2)</sup> Strange, therefore, as it may be, it is nevertheless certain that for two centuries and a half men in the most responsible positions in the English Church have declined to see in our “Articles of Religion” articles of faith in the proper acceptation of that term.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Bishop Pearson, *Minor Works*, II, 215.

<sup>2)</sup> Works (Anglo-Catholic Library), II, 66.

I proceed to note some statements of doctrine on the part of living divines of our Church which may be interesting to the readers of this review. First of all we may notice, as bearing on the *Filioque* controversy, some remarkable words of Bishop Bull (who flourished in the seventeenth century, on the *περιχώρησις* or mutual indwelling of the three Persons in the Blessed Trinity). The Bishop says:

“The Father and the Son are in such sense One, as that the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; and that the one cannot be separated from the other. This mode of union the Greek theologians call *περιχώρησις*, and the Latins, i. e. the Schoolmen, *circuminsession*.”<sup>1)</sup>

I may remark that no one is really qualified to pronounce judgment on English theology who is unacquainted with the writings of its principal exponents, and especially with those of Hooker, Bull, Pearson, and perhaps I may add, Barrow. It is in the living pages of the great doctors of our Church, and not in the dry details of formularies drawn up for a special purpose, that the mind of the English Church is best discerned. I may add that my friend Dr Maclear seems a little less satisfactory here than Bishop Bull, as quoted by Dr Gibson. He appears to me to border on Tritheism, though he quotes Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent* in support of his position, when he says that our Article declares in other words that each “Person in the Blessed Trinity is God, and each expresses the whole fulness of the Godhead with all His attributes. For the Catholic doctrine is that, (1) the Father is the One Eternal Personal God, (2) the Son is the One Eternal Personal God, (3) the Spirit is the One Eternal Personal God.”<sup>2)</sup>

In regard to the connection of our Lord's Session at the Right Hand of God with the doctrine of His Presence in the Eucharist, Dr Gibson rejects the Ubiquitarianism of some Lutheran divines as “unfortunate” (p. 193). In regard to the *Filioque* question he distinctly supports the doctrine that the Holy Spirit derives His Being from the Son as well as from the Father, and maintains strongly the *bona fides* of the Spanish Bishops in the time of king Reccared, in reciting the *Filioque*

---

<sup>1)</sup> *Ante-Nicene Faith*, IV, iv, 9.

<sup>2)</sup> P. 41.

in their Creed. He is convinced that they believed the *Filioque* to have been handed down as part of the deposit of faith in the Church, and that its insertion was “purely accidental”. He further adverts to the recitation of the Creed at our own Council of Hatfield, in 680, under the presidency of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, himself brought up in the bosom of the Eastern Church. But I think that he attaches too much weight here to the authority of Bede, who may have assumed as a matter of course that the Double Procession, apparently regarded by himself as a part of the Catholic Faith, was of necessity so proclaimed at the Council of which he speaks. Bede was but seven years old at the time the Council was held, and though he refers to the testimony of those who were present, his reference is not so express as altogether to overcome the improbability that Theodore, an Eastern, would have consented to recite a different Creed to that recited at the famous Council of Constantinople held in the same year. Dr Gibson quotes the late Archdeacon Freeman, a divine of great learning, ability, and impartiality, on the question. He writes, in a letter to the *Guardian* of Nov. 6, 1872:

“It is commonly and widely imagined that there was direct and irreconcilable opposition between East and West; the Greeks holding that the Holy Spirit does not come forth, in any sense, from all eternity from the Son; the Latins, that He comes forth from both in the same sense and way. Whereas Greeks and Latins held alike, that the Spirit came forth from the Son as well as from the Father, only in a different sense and way. Tertullian who is early enough and central enough to be counted neither Greek nor Latin, in any strict sense, states the whole relation with admirable clearness, so far as human language and earthly types can shadow forth a mystery: ‘Tertius est Spiritus a Deo et Filio; *sicut tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine*: ita Trinitas per connexos gradus a Patre decurrens monarchiæ nihil obstrepat.’ The Holy Land furnishes us with a magnificent illustration of what is meant. Not far from Caesarea Philippi the primary *spring* of the Jordan rushes forth with great violence, and immediately forms a deep and large *fount*; the largest, probably, says Mr Tristram, in the world. From this fount or well the Jordan proper flows. It *issues* forth, that is, from the spring, and from that alone, as its primary source;

but it proceeds also, in strictest truth, from the fount or well, only *not* as its primary source. In this most real sense the Holy Ghost ‘proceedeth from the Father and the Son’. And the ancient Greek Fathers, while stedfastly maintaining that God the Father is the only original fountain of Deity, did not hesitate (so St. Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, John Damascene) to acknowledge that God the Son, as being eternally consubstantial with the Father, is mediately a fountain (*πηγή*) of the Holy Spirit; that He flows to us eternally *through* God the Son (*δι’ αὐτοῦ*), although not *out* of Him in the sense in which He does flow out of the Father.”

It will be well to append what D<sup>r</sup> Maclear says on this point:

“When, then, according to the Western recension of the Nicene Creed, we say that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father, we mean that He proceeds from Him as the sole fount of Deity. When we say that He proceedeth from the Son, we do not mean that He proceeds from the Son as from a source independent of the Father, or that He issues forth from the Father without coming through the Son. We do not allow that there are two Principles or two Causes in the Godhead. We believe in one original Principle and one original Cause, and this is the Father, to Whom all things owe their existence.” (P. 90.)

D<sup>r</sup> Gibson refers <sup>1)</sup> to the difficulty connected with the divergent use of the words *ὑπόστασις* and Substance by Greeks and Latins respectively in the fourth century, and hopes that East and West may ultimately “agree to differ” in like manner about the Double Procession. But it is curious, and in view of the general attitude of living English theologians in regard to Old Catholicism, it may be termed characteristic, that he makes no allusion whatever to the Formula of Concord drawn up through the untiring industry and theological *acumen* of D<sup>r</sup> von Döllinger at the Bonn Conference of 1875, and accepted by all present. I may be permitted to express my conviction that on von Döllinger’s lines, and those alone, can the question be finally settled. It is only by the distinct explanation of our doctrine of the Double Procession in language drawn from sources

---

<sup>1)</sup> P. 228.

acknowledged by the Easterns themselves, that they will be induced to hold communion with us while we retain the words which the Western Church has, on insufficient authority, inserted into the Creed.

In regard to tradition, Dr Gibson declares that our Sixth Article was “not meant in any way to cast a slight on tradition and on the appeal to antiquity”, but “is only designed to protect jealously the rightful position of the Scriptures, as containing, though in an informal way, the ‘faith once for all delivered to the saints’, and to guard against any additions or accretions to the original deposit committed to the care of the Catholic Church”.<sup>1)</sup> Dr Maclear is less definite in his language regarding Tradition. But he asserts that “the Fathers of the Primitive Church found the Rule of Faith (a) in the Bible as its sole source, and (b) in the Creeds as interpreting the Bible”.<sup>2)</sup> They did not, he adds “appeal to some *independent* tradition, teaching doctrines not to be found in Scripture, but to the Creeds taught to Christians, and confessed by them at their Baptism”. As they did not scruple to add definitions to the Creed when necessary, this statement requires some qualification. But it is certain that in so doing the Nicene Fathers considered themselves as having no other end in view than the preservation of the ancient faith, and that nothing was further from their intention than to add to the Creed of Christendom anything which had not been taught from the very beginning.

Dr Gibson’s work, so far as it has at present proceeded, ends, as I have already said, with Article VIII, on the Three Creeds. It is to be lamented that he altogether neglects to deal with the respective claims of these Creeds to the allegiance of Catholic Christendom. He does not, however—and this will be important in the eyes of Eastern Christians—attach any more importance to the two Western symbols than to that which was promulgated, and is still proclaimed in the East. But we ought not to neglect to draw the attention of theological students to the fact that to the Nicene symbol, or rather to that modification of it which was set forth by the Fathers at Chalcedon, has the preeminence been given, in the West as well

---

<sup>1)</sup> P. 238.

<sup>2)</sup> P. 105.

as the East, of being the Creed recited at the celebration of the Holy Mysteries. D<sup>r</sup> Maclear has omitted to mention this material fact. Still, he has not forgotten to remark that “the Nicene Creed is not only the most ancient, but the only one of the three Symbols of doctrine which, with the exception of a single clause, is acknowledged alike by the Greek, the Latin, the Anglican Churches, and the various communities which have broken off from the Roman centre”.<sup>1)</sup> And he subjoins an eloquent note from D<sup>r</sup> Schaff’s *History of the Creeds* (p. 652) in which the latter says: “At this day, after fifteen centuries have passed away, from one extremity of the civilized world to the other, in the lonely hamlets of the Alps, in unknown isles of the ocean discovered by modern science, when the solemnity of the Sunday lifts toward heaven brows bent earthward by labour, is heard a concert of rustic voices repeating in one and the same tone this Hymn of the Divine Unity.”

Need I add more? We are all one, though we know it not. We hug our sectional differences to our bosoms; we cherish, too often, our petty antagonisms; we magnify national, geographical, linguistic misunderstandings; we perpetuate old jealousies and causes of offence; sometimes, alas! we do our best to produce new ones. And yet the one Catholic symbol is repeated at all our altars. We are all one family, one Body in Christ. Underlying all our disunion there is the unifying influence of the same Creed, recited as we plead the One Only Sacrifice of Christ. And so, after all, in spite of seeming divisions, there is in truth “One Body, and One Spirit, even as also we were called in one hope of our calling, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of all, Who is over all and through all and in all”.<sup>2)</sup>

J. J. LIAS.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Eph. IV, 4—6.

<sup>2)</sup> P. 134.