
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

subjects in which, it may be, he is more keenly interested. Not a few of those who have to do with crowds, and have met anti-Christian objectors in the open air, have found how necessary it is to be well acquainted with current discussions of the historical element in Christianity. Then there is the Divinity Student who closes his text-books not, let us hope, with a sigh, but with a quickened interest and a desire to know still more about the fascinating problems to which he has been introduced. Finally, there is the Research Student who has already completed a B.D. Course, or its equivalent, and now stands at the parting of the ways. Either he will quickly lose much that he has gained at so much cost and settle down to become a merely desultory reader, or he will find an added interest in the possibility of penetrating into the hinterlands behind an already well-occupied country. His predilections may or may not be for New Testament Criticism, but this is not essential, since whatever subject he chooses, even if it be the study of the Complutensian Polyglott, nearly everything else will be involved in some way or other. If, however, he has already a love for New Testament problems, it may be that the present Series will open out the way to a course of fruitful research leading to some solid contribution to theological learning. Should this prove to be the case, I imagine that the Editors will feel that the Series of articles has been amply justified.

Besides meeting the needs of a number of readers there is another purpose which it is to be hoped the Series will fulfil. No one will pretend that the pace of Biblical research in Great Britain is swift. There is a good side to this; we are spared the perils of lightning forays, and a new idea has time to be assimilated or to die of pernicious anæmia. None the less, I am sure that progress ought to be more rapid than it is. It is just ten years since Canon Streeter in his *Four Gospels* poured a handful of new problems into the lap of New Testament Criticism. Can British scholarship look with pride on its treatment of these problems, and have we so very much to show for ten years' further study? The same questions also press for an answer in connexion with Dr. G. S. Duncan's stimulating book, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*. Along with others, I have sometimes wondered if more could be achieved by some kind of corporate investigation like that of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology which produced that invaluable work, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*; and there is no doubt that very useful work has been done in Seminars at Oxford and Birmingham and other centres. There are, however, severe limits within which corporate investigation is practicable; and, of course, nothing can replace the lonely work of the individual student. It is greatly to be hoped that the projected Series will increase the number of such students, and especially from among those who combine Biblical studies with pastoral duties, to the mutual benefit of each, for since the days of Matthew Poole this combination has been the traditional glory of British scholarship.

It may well be that such a Series as this will reveal the need for others dealing with the problems of the Old Testament, and with those of Theology. A book like the late R. H. Kennett's *The Church of Israel* is enough to show how many important and interesting Old Testament problems are in the melting-pot; and I have no doubt at all that readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES would like to share in, or at any rate to follow, these discussions. Whether we shall be permitted to do so depends in large measure upon the interest taken in the present New Testament Series. Those of us who read and prize THE EXPOSITORY TIMES generally get in the end what we want, or at least as much as we deserve.

The Heretics of the Church and Recurring Heresies.

Arius and Arianism.

BY PROFESSOR W. EMERY BARNES, D.D., CAMBRIDGE.

THE early Christians accepted from the Jewish Church the doctrine of the Unity of God. Both our Lord and St. Paul are emphatic in asserting it. Jesus quotes as His own the Jewish confession, 'The Lord our God is one Lord' (Mk 12^{29}); and St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, 'We know that no idol is anything in the world, and that there is no God but one' (1 Co 8^{4}). So in the early centuries

the Christian Apologists defiantly asserted the Divine Unity against 'the godless multitude of gods' worshipped by the heathen.

On the other hand, the New Testament contains a history of Jesus which could not fail to arouse discussion as to His relation to the One God. No doubt simple Christians were content to place Jesus beside God the Father of All, and to say with St. Paul: 'To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him' (1 Co 8^6).

But there remains the challenging title, 'Son of God,' given to Jesus in the New Testament (Mk 3^{11}), and made doubly challenging in the Johannine form, 'Only begotten Son' (τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ: Jn 3^{16}; cf. v.^{18}). Moreover, 'Son of God' is impressively used not only in St. Peter's confession (Mt 16^{16}), but also in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But in theological controversy the title 'Son of God,' though quoted from Scripture, could not bring a decision. If it were cited as a proof of the full divinity of Jesus, it could be met by an appeal to other passages of the New Testament, *e.g.* to Ro 8^{14}, where men of Christian life and character are called 'Sons of God.' Nor did the word 'God' itself settle the doubt. In the fourth century the Old Testament counted in the Arian controversy as equally authoritative with the New, and the Arian who denied the full Godhead of Jesus could quote as a passage addressed to men, 'I said, *Ye are Gods*, and all sons of the Most High' (Ps $82^6=81^6$, Septuagint, ἐγὼ εἶπα Θεοί ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου πάντες). In fact, the word Θεὸς, God, could be used with other than a strictly doctrinal reference, as in the opening words of the 'Second Epistle of Clement' (second century): 'Brethren, thus it behoves us to think of Jesus Christ as we think of God, of the Judge of quick and dead; and it does not behove us to think lightly (μικρὰ φρονεῖν) of our salvation.'

This is the language of practical religion, not of scientific theology.

But Christians who had been educated in the classical learning of their age and were influenced by the teaching of the philosophers could not be content with such a statement. Philosophy was alive and insisted on putting its difficult questions. Rufinus tells us that when the Fathers were assembling for the Council of Nicæa, a distinguished (heathen) dialectician intervened in the discussion of Christian doctrine contending with the Bishops (*E.H.* i. 3=Sozomen, *E.H.* i. 18). No true Greek could bear to be shut out from a discussion which had a philosophical side.

Indeed, Christians could not avoid giving an answer clothed in the terms of philosophy to the philosophers. The question for Christians was, *How far* it was possible to use philosophical terms for the definition of Christian doctrine. Three necessities were laid upon the representative of Christianity; *first*, against heathendom he must assert the Unity of God; *secondly*, to satisfy Christian consciousness he must give due emphasis to the Person of Jesus Christ as Divine; *thirdly*, as against inhuman heathen philosophy he must assert a Living God.

(1) To establish the doctrine of the Unity of God some very crude theories were proposed.

Of these perhaps that which gave most offence to Christian feeling in general and (by a side wind) most help to Arianism was the theory of the Libyan, Sabellius, who taught at Rome at the beginning of the third century. 'God is, according to his teaching, essentially one, and the Trinity which he recognizes is a Trinity not of essence but of revelation; not in the essential relations of the Deity within itself, but in relation to the world outside and to mankind. . . . Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are simply designations of three separate phases under which the one divine essence reveals itself—three names of one and the same being.' 'He (Sabellius) even coined a word υἱοπάτωρ (Son-Father) to exclude the thought of two beings.' . . . 'There is (in Sabellianism) no real incarnation: no personal indissoluble union of the Godhead with the Manhood took place in Christ. God only manifested Himself in Christ, and when the part was played . . . there ceased to be a Christ or Son of God.'[1]

Such doctrines reduced the significance of the Gospels and the story of Christ's life and struck at the root of Christian piety. Yet if an unwary preacher set out to preach the unity of God, he could hardly escape using some expressions which would have a Sabellian sound to the critics of Sabellianism—and they were many. So about the year A.D. 318 Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria, was publicly accused by Arius (Ἄρειος), one of his presbyters, of introducing Sabellianism into a discourse which he was delivering on the Trinity. Thus was the Arian controversy kindled.

The time at which the controversy arose is significant. The year 313 saw imperial edicts of toleration for the Christian Church issued both in the East and in the West. It soon became clear

[1] Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, 105 f.

that imperial favour was turning towards the new religion. Heathens began to press into the Church, bringing many heathen presuppositions with them, and Arius had a Christ to offer them who in nature was not unlike a heathen demigod. At the same time he proclaimed that there was but One God in the full sense. The One God stood alone in isolation from Man and from the World. The Son was *not* eternal; he was of a different substance (ὑποστάσεως) or essence (οὐσίας) from the Father; he was even liable to change (τρεπτόν). Such was the teaching of Arius as we gather it from the anathemas of the Creed of Nicæa. On the other hand, Arians asserted that the Son was created 'out of nothing' and 'out of the will of the Father' in order to distinguish Him, though a creature from all other creatures. And with the same object, though they asserted, 'Once he was not,' they allowed that He was 'born' or 'created' before time began. 'Arius was willing to recognize in the Son of God every dignity compatible with the isolation . . . of the Father.'[1] The title 'Son' meant for the Arians chiefly that the Son was 'subsequent' to the Father. 'We are persecuted,' writes Arius to Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, 'because we said, *The Son hath beginning* (ἀρχήν), *but God is without beginning*' (ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἄναρχός ἐστι: Theodoret, *E.H.* i. 5).

The Nicene doctrine has been criticised for 'substituting the subtleties of philosophy (e.g. *homo-ousion*, "of one substance") for the simplicity of the earlier Christian confession.' A similar criticism can be more justly passed on the Arianism of Arius. He argues that since God is *incorporeal* (ἀσώματος) the title 'the Father' has no natural meaning, and he proceeds to empty the title 'the Son' of its content. The confession which Arius and his sympathizers presented to his bishop (Alexander), *circ.* A.D. 321, actually avoids the word 'Father': it begins, 'We know one God, One only Unbegotten, alone eternal, alone without beginning, alone true God (ἀληθινόν), alone having immortality,' etc. etc.[2] Here is philosophy indeed, but has it any religious appeal?

Arius was not a wilful innovator. He did not claim to be bringing forward some newer and more correct statement of doctrine, but only to be reproducing that which he had been taught in earlier years. Indeed, the short and simply worded creeds which were taught in different places to candidates for Baptism were ambiguous and could be understood in an Arian sense. When Arius presents his confession to Alexander, he introduces it in the words: 'Our creed (πίστις), our ancestral creed, which we learned also from thee, O blessed Pope (μακάριε πάπα) is this.' He and his supporters were confident, it seems, that his doctrine would be accepted at Nicæa. But disappointment awaited them. The Council was not ready as yet to accept the 'unscriptural' terms recommended by the Athanasian party, but when 'a certain few' bishops brought forward an Arianizing creed, the other bishops at once tore it to pieces, calling it 'spurious and tricky' (εὐθέως διέρρηξαν ἅπαντες, νόθον καὶ κίβδηλον ὀνομάσαντες: Theodoret, *E.H.* i. 7). The Arians for their part were trying to introduce unscriptural terms in order to emphasize the distinction of the Son from the Father.

There was a fundamental defect in Arian doctrine, in that it outraged Christian feeling. While Arius was insisting on the difference between the Father and the Son, Christian faith was resting on the reality of their relationship, and Christian feeling was responding instinctively to the challenge of St. Paul, 'He that spared not his own Son (τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ), but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?'

The Nicene Fathers by a very great majority responded to Christian feeling and, eschewing Arian philosophizing, they surrendered to the lead of the Athanasian party. The historian Eusebius of Cæsarea had laid before the council the creed which was taught to candidates for baptism in his city. This the Fathers now took, and, keeping the substance of it, they introduced into it certain clauses which contradicted Arian doctrine.

Two of these contain the Greek word οὐσία, which is translated 'substance' in the English versions of the Creed. But οὐσία, like 'substance,' can be used of that which is material, whereas God is spirit. Objection was taken to the word in the fourth century, but in each case it is defended by Athanasius. The Fathers declared in their Creed, *first*, that the Son is 'of the substance' or 'essence' of the Father (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας), and *secondly*, that the Son is 'of one substance with the Father' or 'one in essence with the Father' (ὁμοούσιον, *homo-ousion*). 'Let no one be startled,' writes Athanasius, 'on hearing that the Son of God is from the Essence of the Father; but rather let him accept the explanation of the Fathers. . . . For they considered it the same thing to say that the Word was "of God" and "of the essence of God," since the word "God," as I have already said, signifies nothing but the essence of Him Who is' (*De Decretis*, 22). Again he writes (*De Decretis*,

[1] Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, 24.
[2] Hahn, *Symbole*, 188.

24): 'Further, let every corporeal inference be banished on this subject: and transcending every imagination of sense, let us with pure understanding and with mind alone, apprehend the genuine relation of son to father, and the Word's proper relation towards God, and the unvarying likeness of the radiance towards the light: for, as the words "Offspring" (γέννημα) and "Son" bear, and are meant to bear, no human sense, but one suitable to God, in like manner when we hear the phrase "one in essence" (τὴν λέξιν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου), let us not fall upon human senses, and imagine partitions and divisions (μερισμοὺς καὶ διαιρέσεις), but as having our thoughts directed to things immaterial, let us preserve undivided the oneness of nature and the identity of light' (τὴν ταυτότητα τοῦ φωτός).[1]

Surely the Nicene doctrine thus explained by Athanasius is more Christian than the Arian assertion of the unlikeness of Father and Son, surely it agrees better with the faith which the plain Christian man draws from the four Gospels.

The discussions at Nicæa were limited (so far as we know) to the nature of the Son and his relation to the Father. Concerning the Holy Spirit no fresh pronouncement was made: the (true) Nicene Creed admitted no addition to the simple form of belief 'in the Holy Spirit.' But Arius, with his zeal for maintaining the Unity of the Godhead, was prepared to resist any assertions that might be made of the personality and true deity of the Spirit. His statements, as Athanasius (*Or. c. Arian.*, i. § 6) gives them, are vehement denials: 'The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are altogether unlike one another (ἀνόμοιοι πάμπαν ἀλλήλων) both in their substances ("essences," οὐσίαις) and in their glories' (δόξαις). 'The Arian Trinity of divine Persons forms a descending series separated by infinite degrees of honour and glory,' is Professor Gwatkin's comment.[2]

Arianism was defeated, but not crushed, at Nicæa. For there were Arians and Arians, and many who bore the name had the saving grace of missionary zeal. Arian teachers converted the barbarians—Goths, Vandals, and Lombards—who conquered the Roman Empire, and Ulfilas, the translator of the Bible into Gothic and one of the greatest missionaries of ancient times (fourth century), was an Arian. Probably these apostolic men would be more accurately described as Conservatives, *i.e.* as Christians who because they disliked the new term *homo-ousion* were too hastily styled Arians by their Nicene opponents. For men who refused the theological language of Athanasius would not necessarily accept that of Arius.

What was it, then, that gave vitality to the conservative form of Arianism? Surely it was that it preserved for the simple and unlearned the distinctness of outline of the person of the Lord Jesus, which the *homo-ousion* seemed to blur for them. The Saviour who is shown in the Gospel of St. Luke who perseveres in prayer to His Father, the Son who declares in St. John, 'The Father is greater than I,' and again who asks, 'The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' seems to be indistinctly portrayed in the terms of Nicene orthodoxy—at least when these are isolated from their context. The missionary in presenting the person of the Christ to his hearers would naturally use the strong appeal of the concrete language of the Evangelists and at the same time avoid any ill-timed introduction of the *homo-ousion*.

The Renaissance and the Reformation led to a revival of the controversy between the Athanasians and the Arians. At last the Scriptures could be printed and published in many languages, including the chief vernaculars of Europe, and it became an easy task both for the learned and also for the unlearned to bring the doctrines of the Church to the test of scriptural proof. No doctrine however mysterious and fundamental in the eyes of the theologians could escape critical examination. When the authority of the Church herself was challenged, we need not be surprised that the authorized doctrine of the Trinity was put to the test of comparison with the utterances of the Scriptures.

Indeed, the great contrast which exists between the terms taken in post-Nicene times to represent Nicene orthodoxy on the one side, and the language of the Four Gospels on the other, has remained as a justification of the conservative form of Arianism through the ages. To Anglican churchmen the terms *Person* and *Substance* and *Trinity* and *Unity* have come from an anonymous Latin composition of the fifth century (*Quicumque vult*), not from the pages of St. Mark or St. John. The contrast between the language of *Quicumque* and that of the Gospels is startling, and it gives a shock to read in Article VIII. (Articles of Religion, 1571): Symbola tria, Nicaenum, Athanasii (i.e. *Quicumque vult*), et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur omnino recipienda sunt et credenda; nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

[1] Henry Wace and Philip Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, iv. 165 f.

[2] *Studies of Arianism*, 27.

It was sheer provocation to many Christian men to tell them that the scholastic terms of *Quicumque vult* could be proved most certainly from the non-scholastic language of the Scriptures—*firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis*.

Imagine this statement being brought to the mind of Milton—the mind which valued 'the liberty to argue freely above all other liberties.' Its weakness in logic could not fail to strike him. And Milton was not only a logician, but also a poet. As a poet he must allow his mind to move more freely than dogmatic formulas would permit. Poetry requires the interplay of differing human characters: the interaction of Father and Son in the Christian Trinity could hardly be represented truly even in as great a poem as *Paradise Lost*. The mystery is too great.

Milton in his poem keeps close to the 'Conservative' position. Several passages may be quoted from Book III. to show that he held the doctrine of the Subordination of the Son, but *not* the tenet that the Son is 'unlike' (ἀνόμοιος) the Father in essence. He ascribes full honour to the Son in lines 138–140:

> Beyond compare the Son of God was seen
> Most glorious, in him all his Father shon [1]
> Substantially express'd.

And in lines 169 f. the Father's address:

> . . . Son, who art alone
> My word, my wisdom, and effectual might,

has in it more of Athanasius than of Arius.

Dependence and Subordination to the Father are expressed in the lines 243, 244:

> . . . Thou hast givn [2] me to possess
> Life in myself for ever; by Thee I live, . . .

rather than the doctrine of the Eternal Generation of the Son.

Finally, Milton departs far from the *homo-ousion* in the lines addressed by the Father to the Son (308 ff.):

> [Thou] hast been found
> By merit more than Birthright Son of God;
> Found worthiest to be so by being Good
> Farr [2] more then [2] Great or High.

In *Paradise Lost* the needs of poetry sometimes obscure the expression of dogma, but Milton's real views are clearly expressed in his posthumous work on *Christian Doctrine*.[3] There, under the heading, *Eternal Generation of the Son*, he first quotes nine passages from the New Testament, and then pronounces judgment as follows: 'All these passages prove the existence of the Son before the world was made, but they conclude nothing respecting his generation from all eternity' (p. 83).

In an earlier passage of the same work (pp. 25 ff.), Milton quotes eleven texts from the Old Testament which assert the unity of God, and continues: 'And thus the Israelites under the law and the prophets always understood [the First Commandment] to mean, that God was numerically one God, that beside him there was none other, much less any equal. For those disputants of the schools had not yet appeared, who, depending on their own sagacity, or rather on arguments of a purely contradictory tendency, cast a doubt upon that very unity of God which they pretended to assert.'

The testimony of the New Testament, Milton adds, proves that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is that one God (p. 26). As to the sense in which God the Father can have begotten the Son, 'This point,' Milton says, 'will be easily explained by reference to Scripture' (p. 87). 'God OF HIS OWN WILL created or generated, or produced (*creavit sive generavit aut produxit*[4]), the Son before all things, endued with the divine nature, as in the fulness of time he miraculously begat him in his human nature of the Virgin Mary . . . God imparted to the Son as much as he pleased of the divine nature, nay, of the divine substance itself, *modo ne substantia pro essentia tota accipiatur*.' [5]

Here, in the assertion that the Son is created of the Will of the Father and that he is not wholly divine, Milton is in agreement with the Arians of the fourth century.

Milton wrote his *de Doctrina* in Latin, and did not publish his work, and so it is improbable that it had any influence on the Arian Movement of the beginning of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, it is possible that a pregnant phrase from *Paradise Lost* may have moved some to question current belief, 'By Merit more than Birthright Son

[1] Spelling according to H. C. Beeching's edition, after the original texts, Oxford, 1913.

[2] Original spelling.

[3] *A Treatise on Christian Doctrine compiled from the Holy Scriptures alone*, translated from the original by Charles R. Sumner, M.A. Printed at the Cambridge University Press, 1825.

[4] Johannis Miltoni Angli, *De Doctrina Christiana* Libri duo posthumi, quos ex schedis manuscriptis deprompsit. . . . C. R. S., A.M., Cantabrigiae, MDCCCXXV.

[5] 'Only let us not understand *substance* as equivalent to *the whole essence*.'

of God.' But however this may be, it is probable that the old difficulty which the 'Conservatives' felt at Nicæa was still the main source of trouble. The special terms in which Churchmen sought to define the relation of the Son to the Father were not to be found in Scripture. The fact had given rise to a discussion in Convocation in 1689 over *Quicumque vult*, the so-called Athanasian Creed, but the matter had been shelved, and the question remained unanswered, Could such definitions be reconciled with Scripture?

Discussion was re-opened (and just from this question) in 1712. Dr. SAMUEL CLARKE, Rector of St. James's, Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her MAJESTY (Queen Anne), published a work called *The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*. There is a challenge in the title: the Author is thinking that many hold a non-Scriptural Doctrine. But Clarke quotes with approval the saying of 'the excellent Mr. Chillingworth,' that 'the Bible, I say, the BIBLE only, is the Religion of Protestants.' 'But,' says Dr. Clarke, 'the Church has out of Scripture selected those plain fundamental doctrines which were of necessity to be known by all Christians . . . These all persons were taught in their *Baptismal Creed*.' But 'as men grew less pious and more contentious . . . they inlarged[1] their Creeds, and grew more minute in determining unnecessary controversies.'

The first part of Dr. Clarke's work consists of an extensive collection (and 'explication') of texts from the New Testament regarding (*a*) God the Father; (*b*) the Son of God; (*c*) the Holy Spirit. His first quotation, significant of much that is to follow, is of Mt 19[17] (A.V.), 'Why callest thou me good? there is none good, but *One* (εἷς, *One Person*), that is, God.' In Part ii. he sums up in several Propositions the doctrine which he gathers from these passages. These Propositions are marked by their avoidance of the word *Trinity* and by their large divergence from *Quicumque vult*.

After asserting in Proposition I. that 'There is *One* Supreme Cause and Original of Things; One simple, uncompounded, undivided, intelligent Being, or Person; who is the Author of all Being, and the Fountain of all Power,' Clarke proceeds to state that '*With* This *First* and Supreme Cause or Father of all Things there has existed from the Beginning, a *Second* divine Person, which is his *Word* or *Son*.' The Third Proposition runs, 'With the Father and the Son, there has existed from the Beginning, a *Third* divine Person, which is the *Spirit* of the Father and of the Son.' These three Propositions depart far from *Quicumque vult*. They represent God the Father as the ἀρχή, the Beginning of All, and as the πηγή, the Fountain of Deity. So Proposition IX. declares that 'The Scripture, when it mentions the *One God*, or the *Only God*, always means the *Supreme Person of the Father*.' In a note Clarke refers to the seventeen passages from the New Testament which he quoted at the beginning of Part i. (pp. 1–7).

In Proposition IV. we come to a definite declaration that the Church's treatment of the Doctrine of the Trinity is unscriptural. Clarke writes, 'What the proper Metaphysical *Nature, Essence*, or *Substance* of any of these divine Persons is, the Scripture has nowhere at all declared; but describes and distinguishes them always, by their *Personal Characters, Offices, Powers*, and *Attributes*.'

This statement, though true in general, is not true in every particular. A conspicuous exception is the case of Heb 1[3] (R.V.m.), where the Son is described as 'the very image of his (*i.e.* the Father's, God's) substance' or 'the impress of his substance' (χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ). This is surely metaphysical language. Still in the vast majority of passages of the New Testament the terms used are popular and pictorial. The word *Trinity* is not used in Scripture, nor the phrase *Three Persons*. Though *Father, Son*, and *Holy Spirit* are mentioned together, no statement is made of their mutual relation. They are to be regarded as *one* in agreement, because they work together in their several functions, and not as one in substance or essence. Thus the Trinity which (according to Dr. Clarke) can be proved from the Scriptures of the New Testament is an Economic Trinity, which we know through spiritual experience and not by theory.

The Arian Controversy of the early eighteenth century in England had a history different from that of the fourth century in the Roman Empire. The later Arians did not claim to be the only true exponents of the doctrine of the Church. All that they demanded was the liberty (a large liberty!) that when they subscribed to the Thirty-Nine Articles, they might put upon them such interpretations as Dr. Clarke and his friends gave them. A war of pamphlets followed. The Arian demand was answered by 'Daniel Waterland, D.D., Master of Magdalen College, in Cambridge,' in a booklet of sixty-nine pages, entitled *The Case of Arian Subscription considered*, and the several Pleas and Excuses for it particularly Examined and Confuted (1721). Other literary broadsides were exchanged, but the controversy died down. No

[1] *Sic.*

change was made in the conditions of Subscription, but Dr. Clarke was left undisturbed in his living. There was no need to call for a General Council. *Nicaea locuta est: causa finita est.*

Christians who believe that 'God fulfils Himself in many ways' will not be indiscriminate in their condemnation of 'Arianism.' Men who were called Arians did noble missionary work in early days, and Eusebius of Cæsarea and Samuel Clarke of St. James, Westminster, 'who confessed the Father and the Son,' though imperfect as theologians, may be numbered with the saints. Eusebius lives as a great Christian advocate, Samuel Clarke as a faithful parish priest.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

An Address for Armistice Day.

By the Reverend F. A. Farley, M.A., B.D., Blackpool.

'With the jeopardy of their lives they brought it.'—1 Ch 11[19].

You will all remember how popular David became with the people when he slew the giant Goliath, whom all the warriors of Israel had feared. And you will also remember that, because of that popularity, and in spite of the fact that David's music had often cheered him in his depression and sullen tempers, King Saul became very jealous of David, and David had to seek refuge among the bare hills. There he lived with those who cared to share with him in the hardships of that exile—some of them were men in debt, others had committed some great wrong, and for these reasons they were glad to find some place where they could be safe from those who pursued them. Others were brave men, loyal to David, who looked for the time when he would be their king, and would drive the invading Philistines from their land. Whatever their characters had been before they joined David, and although they had to live as outlaws, and almost as brigands, yet David kept them under good discipline. They were never allowed to harm the weak, or to take what food they needed from the hard-working farmers of their own people. If they needed corn or a sheep they must raid the Philistines' camp, or seek their food from some wealthy man in return for their protection of his lands from the enemy.

For all that it was a wild life they led, and a hard one. The hills were bare even of grass. They could not move this way, because Saul's soldiers were waiting for them; and they could not move that way, because the Philistines were eager to catch them. In the hot, rainless season there was no water near at hand, the cave where they hid and lived was very close, and often they were thirsty as well as hungry.

On one such day David stood at the mouth of the cave with parched lips, and as he looked out towards Bethlehem, the village in which he was born and which he loved so well, but which was now in the hands of the Philistines, a longing came to his lips, and he said, 'Oh, that one would bring me water from the well of Bethlehem!' But that was impossible. The enemy had that village, and what they would guard most securely was the well on which they depended for their water. But brave men often do the impossible. Three of his followers heard David express his wish, and when night came they stole out of their cave, passed the Philistines' sentries, went right into the village, filled a flask with water from the well, and then turned to go back. Again they had watchfully to pass the sentries, but this they did, and safely reached their stronghold again.

Then they brought to their great leader the drink he had longed for. Still his lips were parched. He looked at the water and saw its sparkle and freshness, but he saw something else as well. He saw his men taking their lives in their hands to quench his thirst, and though he longed to drink he felt that that water was too costly and too sacred for him to drink. So he poured it out as an offering to God, for, said he, 'With the jeopardy of their lives they brought it.'

You may think the three heroes were very disappointed when they saw the water poured out on to the ground, but then they, too, would think that that was a way to offer it to God, and they would know how much David valued their courage. And David felt that if he drank that water it would choke him.