

## Irish Church Quarterly

---

The Resurrection of the Body

Author(s): George Robert Wynne

Source: *The Irish Church Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 5 (Jan., 1909), pp. 27-41

Published by: [Irish Church Quarterly](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30067576>

Accessed: 17/06/2014 11:02

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Irish Church Quarterly* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Irish Church Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

### “THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.”

THE considerations which follow in this article are suggested by the difference which is found in the translations of a phrase of the Apostles' Creed in the different places where it occurs in the Book of Common Prayer. In Morning and Evening Prayer, and in the Church Catechism, we find the words, “The Resurrection of the Body,” while in the Baptismal Services and in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, the word used is “Flesh.” Whence has arisen this difference? Has it any significance?

In the primitive “Roman” Creed, and in the fully developed “Apostles'” Creed, the phrase everywhere used is “*resurrectionem carnis*,” or in its Greek equivalent, *σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν*. The words are peculiar to the Roman and Apostles' Creeds. Neither the Nicene nor the Athanasian Creed speaks of the resurrection of the flesh. The Athanasian asserts that “*omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis*.” The Constantinopolitan, or so-called Nicene Creed, speaks of the *ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν*, “*resurrectionem mortuorum*.” In these expressions of the two longer creeds there is not any variation, and the language used in both is clearly Scriptural. The Athanasian is a Scriptural generalization, and the expression used in the Nicene Creed, *ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν*, is found in quite a dozen places in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> No question arises as to the Scriptural character of the phrasing of the longer Creeds. It is when we deal with the Apostles' Creed that the difficulty presents itself. We shall review the language, first, of the Western Church generally, in whose formularies alone the problem occurs; and then of the Church of England, before, at, and after the Reformation.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxii. 31; Acts xvii. 32; xxiii. 6; xxiv. 15, 21; xxvi. 23 (?); Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21, 42; Heb. vi. 2. In a few places the reading is *ἐκ νεκρῶν*: Luke xx. 35; Acts iv. 2; to which may be added Acts xxvi. 23; Rom. i. 4, *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*.

## I.—THE APOSTLES' CREED IN THE WESTERN CHURCH.

The old Roman Creed came into existence about the middle of the second century. The recension known as the Apostles' Creed is of later origin, and is made up of the Roman Creed with additions. As the article of the resurrection of the flesh is common to both, they need not be considered separately. This Roman Creed had reached Ireland before the end of the seventh century, at latest, and it is found in use in the English Church in the ninth. Though they existed side by side for a time, the Apostles' Creed superseded the Roman everywhere after the beginning of the tenth century, and for a thousand years the Apostles' Creed has been the undisputed symbol of the Church of England. The examples given in Warren's book on the Celtic Liturgy and Ritual<sup>1</sup> shew that Ireland also used the Apostles' Creed in the same words. The Roman Creed ended with the words, "resurrectionem carnis," the later Creed added "vitam aeternam." This later Creed has held undisputed sway in the whole Western Church, with very unimportant variations. "Resurrectionem carnis" was universal. The Creed of Aquileia alone, so far as is known, probably urged by pressure of local circumstances, prefixed "hujus" to "carnis."<sup>2</sup> In the *Regula Fidei*, indeed, as quoted in one place by Tertullian,<sup>3</sup> we find the phrase, "facta utriusque partis resurrectione cum carnis restitutione"; but elsewhere in the same treatise he reverts to the universal form.<sup>4</sup> Turn where we will, we find that this is the language of the Western Church; language which marks it off by a distinct line from the Churches of the East which with rarest exceptions know nothing of "resurrectio carnis."<sup>5</sup> And in the West, we never find in

<sup>1</sup> F. E. Warren, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, 1881, pp. 166, 189.

<sup>2</sup> Rufinus, *In Symb. Apost.*, 36.

<sup>3</sup> *De praesc. haer.*, 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, 36. He is apparently quoting the *Regula Fidei*. Compare *De virg. vel.*, 1: "Regula quidem fidei una omnino est. . . per carnis etiam resurrectionem." Tertullian passionately justifies the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Flesh in his treatise under that title, chap. 9.

<sup>5</sup> With rarest exceptions, for we find *σάρκος* in Cyril's Creed

this Creed the occasional subsequent variations which might well have been suggested by contact with the Eastern, "resurrectionem corporis," or "resurrectionem mortuorum." This selection of a phrase, or word, which was at once not taken from Scripture, and which was not followed by the Creed-makers of the East, is, perhaps, not difficult to explain. It was made with the most deliberate and orthodox purpose. It had its origin in the supposed necessity for a categorical denial of the Docetic position, and was probably first used by Ignatius, himself an Eastern, and applied first by him to the Resurrection of Christ. As applied thus to our Lord, the words receive Scriptural support from the very remarkable, though unique, language of St. Luke xxiv. 39.<sup>1</sup>

The denial by the Docetic heretics of any *real* resurrection from the dead seemed to the Church to necessitate such a statement as should lie open to no ambiguity. It was felt that "corporis resurrectionem," or even "resurrectionem mortuorum," left some loop-

and in that delivered (see Socrates, i. 26) by Arius and Euzoius to Constantine in their quasi-recantation. The fact that the Constantinopolitan Creed adopted *νεκρῶν*, having the alternative *σαρκός* before it, inclines us to think that the alteration was made deliberately.

<sup>1</sup>The phrase in St. Luke, "flesh and bones," is only in this one place used for the resurrection body, either of Christ or of His people (see the curious echo of the words in Eph. v. 30, T.R.). It probably is really only intended to impress the Apostles with a conviction of the verity of His resurrection. In the two recensions, the longer and shorter, of Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans, it is interesting to observe the use of the two words, "body" and "flesh," as equivalents. In the shorter we have the words (c. 3, Lightfoot's translation): "For I know and believe that He was in the flesh (*ἐν σαρκί*) even after the resurrection." In the longer this is expanded as follows: "And I know that not only in His being born and crucified He was in the body (*ἐν σώματι*), but I know and believe that He was in the flesh (*ἐν σαρκί*) even after the resurrection." In the context of both recensions He is said to have assured His disciples that He is not a *δαίμονιον ἄσώματον*. In relief of the difficulty of that passage, it is suggested that His eating and drinking with the disciples after His resurrection, and the language He here used with them, were in the manner of accommodation to their as yet undeveloped faith, and not as actually defining the nature of His resurrection body. Such eating and drinking were not normal acts of the new condition, but were presented to them to assist them on that first sublime occasion to grasp the idea that He is the same human Saviour whom they knew. This theory is set forth by the writer of the Article on the Resurrection of Christ in Hastings's *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* in reasonable words.

hole for a denial of the true Resurrection of Christ's body ; but no such way of escape was left when the Confession used the words, " resurrection of the *flesh*." It is a little remarkable that the example thus set by the Roman Creed of the second century, and by Ignatius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and perhaps others, was not followed by the Fathers at Nicaea and Constantinople. The Scriptural words, however, had, for them, more weight than those to which a supposed necessity had led the unknown authors of the earliest symbol. Thenceforth for all the ages, down to the time of the Reformation, the Western Church held firmly to its special form of words, with consequences which we must think mischievous. If anyone wishes to see the superstructure that the Western Church built up on the one word, " flesh," let him read the unquotable words of Justin Martyr in the fragments of his lost work on the Resurrection,<sup>1</sup> and observe the manner in which he tries to evade the inference that the very statement of the faith in these words is itself a *reductio ad absurdum*.<sup>2</sup>

The phrase, once adopted as a bulwark of orthodoxy, lent itself, in truth, to all kinds of materialistic and extravagant development. In all places the orthodox, forgetting that the resurrection of the flesh is not an express doctrine of Scripture, proceeded to enlarge upon it to an extreme extent. It is needless to give examples, more especially as they would have to take the form of long quotations. The expounders of the Creed, from Irenaeus to Pearson, have always asserted that it is in no wise beyond the power of God, who originally created man's frame, to restore, in their entirety, its scattered particles on the Resurrection day, ignoring the fact that even during lifetime those particles have been in a state of continual flux, and that in this life personal identity does not consist in the continuance of one identical material substance. Augustine,<sup>3</sup> may be taken as the leader of the extremists

<sup>1</sup> *Opp.* ed. Otto ii. 210 ff. English translation in Clark's *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, ii. 341 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See also Augustine's strange speculations, *De civ. Dei*, bk. xxii., chap. 12 ff, and Tertullian, *De res. carn.*, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*

in this direction, when he states that if any particle had in succession formed a portion of two or more human bodies, it should, at the Resurrection, belong to that person of whom it had first (and why not last?) formed a part! The tenacity with which so-called orthodox writers, down to Pearson, and even later, have adhered to this materialistic conception, shews how completely they have been turned aside from Scriptural views by the supposed compelling force of language which is not, after all, enjoined on the Church by Scripture.

The adoption of the phrase, "resurrectio carnis," by the early Church was, however, very deliberate. They knew, of course, as well as we do, that it was not a Scriptural phrase (the language of Job xix. 26 being, when properly understood, not to the purpose); but they feared that the well-known Scriptural words needed further buttressing in the interests of a sound belief in the Resurrection. St. Jerome refers to heretical teachers of the school of Origen, who readily spoke of the resurrection of the body while meaning something less than the resurrection of the flesh. "That," he said, "may be a good confession, but as there are celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial, and even air, according to its nature, is called body, when the word body is mentioned, an orthodox person will understand 'flesh,' but a heretic 'spirit.'"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 84, ad Pammachium et Oceanum (Migne, *P.L.* xxii. 744). The passage is of such interest as to merit quotation: "Credimus, inquit resurrectionem corporum. Hoc, si bene dicatur, pura confessio est. Sed quia corpora sunt caelestia et terrestria, et aer iste et aura tenuis, iuxta naturam suam corpora nominantur, corpus ponunt, non carnem, ut orthodoxus corpus audiens carnem putet, haereticus spiritum recognoscat. Haec est eorum prima decipula: quae si deprehensa fuerit instruunt alios dolos, et innocentiam simulant, et malitiosos nos vocant, et quasi simpliciter credentes aiunt, credimus resurrectionem carnis. Hoc vero cum dixerint, vulgus indoctum putat sibi sufficere, maxime quia id ipsum et in symbolo creditur. Interrogas ultra circuli strepitus commovetur, fautores clamitant, Audisti resurrectionem carnis, quid quaeris amplius? et in perversum studiis commutatis, nos sycophantae, illi simplices appellantur. Quod si obduraveris frontem, et urgere coeperis, carnem digitis tenens, an ipsam dicant resurrectionem, quae cernitur, quae tangitur, quae incedit et loquitur, primo rident, deinde annuunt. . . . . Ultroque interrogant utrum credamus et genitalia utriusque sexus resurgere. . . . Singula membra negant et corpus quod constat ex membris dicunt resurgere."

In the same tone wrote an eighteenth century historian of the Creed:—

“In the Greek and Latin Creeds (Apostles’), as also in the modern French and Dutch (German), it is the ‘Resurrection of the flesh.’ Several heretics would equivocatingly assent to the resurrection of the body who denied that the same fleshly substance would rise again. . . . There were persons who imagined that at the Resurrection day there should be framed by the power of God thin, subtle, aerial bodies whereunto human souls should be joined, instead of those gross, material bodies which they now actuate and inform. Against these persons, the Fathers of the primitive Church chose to express the article by Resurrection of the flesh, not of the body, that latter word being capable of more subterfuge, and equivocating.”<sup>1</sup>

Then he proceeds to quote Jerome as above. Origen was charged with denying the resurrection of the flesh, because he spoke with characteristic rashness of our future bodies being thin, aerial, subtle, losing the present fleshy substance. He went further, and in unparalleled speculation spoke of an “*aerium corpus et paulatim in tenues auras dissolvendum post Resurrectionem introducendum.*” In Methodius’s epitome of Origen, he speaks of that Father as teaching that at the last day God would give to us other bodies which shall be subtle and spiritual, free from the material substance in which they are now clothed.<sup>2</sup> The following are brief extracts from his writings:—

“It is out of the animal body that the very power and grace of the resurrection will educe the spiritual body, when it transmutes it from a condition of indignity to one of glory.”<sup>3</sup> “The resurrection of the dead, that is the resurrection of bodies.”<sup>4</sup>

He speaks of a germ “always safe in the substance of the body,” which shall rise and repair it.<sup>5</sup>

“That germ, by God’s command, restores out of the earthly and animal body a spiritual one, capable of

<sup>1</sup> Jonathan Robinson, London, 1762, pp. 360, 398.

<sup>2</sup> Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 234.

<sup>3</sup> *De Princip.*, ii. 10, in Clark’s *Ante-Nicene Library*, x. 137.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, 139.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.*

inhabiting the heavens.”<sup>1</sup> “We do not maintain that the body which has undergone corruption resumes its original nature, any more than the grain of wheat, which has decayed, returns to its original condition.”<sup>2</sup>

So far Origen, whose bold speculations, sometimes wise, sometimes reckless, had few confessed supporters. Yet we cannot doubt that he unconsciously influenced some more guarded thinkers, and that in a right direction, on this matter, in which the tendency of the Church was practically to ignore the Scripture teaching of a spiritual body.

To illustrate the hesitating language which was sometimes used owing to the difficulty of independent thought while materialistic dogma was bound on the Church by the word “carnis,” words of St. Augustine may be quoted which seem to shew that that great mind, in speculating on the subject, had its times of comparative emancipation. In his *De Fide et Symbolo* (24) he writes:—

“The body shall rise again, according to the Christian faith, which cannot fail. . . . At that time of angelic change it will not be flesh and blood, but only body. For when the Apostle speaks of flesh, he says, ‘There is one flesh of beasts . . . and there are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial.’ He did not say, ‘And there is flesh celestial,’ but he said, ‘And there are celestial and terrestrial bodies ; for all flesh is also body, but not all body is flesh.’”

This statement, recalling that of Origen, St. Augustine did not allow to stand unchallenged by his own pen. He refers to it thus in his *Retractions*, saying that since our Lord’s flesh and bones were shewn to His disciples after His Resurrection, so it is not to be held that the earthly body is to be changed into a celestial body in any such wise as that those members and their substance shall exist no more. While in the context he explains, “Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God” of corruptible flesh and blood,

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.*, 140.

<sup>2</sup> *Cont. Cels.*, v. 23, *Ante-Nicene Lib.*, xxiii. 291.



or of wicked persons, that is, "those who live after the flesh."<sup>1</sup>

In the *De Civitate Dei*, he goes to extreme length in asserting, as we have seen, that every particle of the present body shall re-appear in the future body; and, further, is constrained to say that the "spiritual body" only means the body in which the "flesh shall be subject to the spirit," the converse of which is at present too often the case.

The above will shew the trend of thought in the great teachers of the Western Church. But whatever their speculations, no one ever proposed to alter the word which had been chosen as the bulwark of orthodoxy, which gave occasion to their extravagances.

## II.—THE APOSTLES' CREED IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

Our familiar Creed—and no branch of the Church is quite so familiar as our own with the use, in Catechism and worship, of this venerable symbol—is recited in morning and evening service, and taught in the Catechism to the children of the Anglican Communion, with the very important change of the word "flesh" into "body." For, although both in the Baptismal Services and in that for the Visitation of the Sick our Church retains the traditional word, the Daily Offices and the Catechism are so much more frequently in use, that probably not one out of thousands of her members, if asked to rehearse the articles of his belief, would mention "flesh."

This opens up an interesting question—how, when, and why did this rather daring alteration come to be made? Someone, and someone with no small share of authority, must have been the first to introduce an innovation, which in the face of the discussions of early ages, must have seemed objectionable to the upholders of a literal resurrection of the buried flesh in its true substance. We shall see that it was a Reformation innovation, and yet an innovation in which the modern

<sup>1</sup> *Retract.* i. 17.

Roman Catholic Church in these islands follows the Reformed Church. A brief glance at the times preceding the Reformation may prepare the way for quotations from authoritative Reformation documents. There are evidences that in the middle ages little or no attention had been given to any difference of meaning between the two words. They were used side by side. Ussher, quoting a confession of faith attributed by some to Athelstan, uses the word,<sup>1</sup> "Expectamus . . . resuscitandos nos (a morte) in his corporibus, et in eadem carne, qua nunc sumus, sicut et Ipse . . . resurrexit." Early Reformation theology, before the change of word had come into use, saw fit to tack on the word "body" to "flesh," as explanatory, when speaking on the subject. Thus, in the *Institution of a Christian Man* (1537), we have, "All . . . shall arise in the self-same flesh and body . . ." And this identification appears again in the later *Necessary Doctrine* (1543), a work in which the newer word "body" finds prominent place.

In the Mediaeval Primers we find the older word always used.<sup>2</sup> Maskell quotes the following, shewing the trend of all pre-Reformation confessions. From the *Ordo ad visitandum Infirmorum*, "In anima et carne veraciter suscitanda."<sup>3</sup> He also quotes from a quarto MS., circa 1400, in the British Museum, the words, "Forgyueness of synnes, agenrisyng of fleish, and euerlastyng lyf"<sup>4</sup>; from Cotton MS., Cleopatra, B. vi., f. 201 (thirteenth century), "The samninge of halges, forgifnes of sinnes, uprisigen of fleyes, and life withhuten ende"; from Harleian MS. 3724, f. 44 (thirteenth century), "Mone of alle halwen, forgivenes of sinne, fleiss up-rising, lyf withuten ende"; from

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, vii. 332.

<sup>2</sup> In the eleventh-century *Horae* in the British Museum MS., Roy. 2, B. v., the Creed is not found; but in the *Preces at Prime and Compline* we have "Credo in Deum. Carnis resurrectionem." See *Facsimiles of Horae de Beata Maria Virgine from English MSS. of the eleventh century*, Ed. E. S. Dewick (H. B. S.), 1902, cols. 9, 17.

<sup>3</sup> W. Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, ed. 2, Oxford, 1882, vol. i., p. 91.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, iii. 182.

Harleian MS. 2343, f. 2 (fourteenth century), "Comunynge of seyntis, forgeuenes of synnes, agenrisyng of fleisch"; from Douce MS. 246, in the Bodleian, "Comunying of seyntes, forgeuenesse of synnes, risyng of flesshe unto ay lastyng lif."<sup>1</sup>

Heurtley gives further pre-Reformation examples:—From a MS. in Lambeth Library (No. 427), of the ninth century, "Flæsces æriste." In a Cambridge MS., written in England, *circa* 1030, the words are almost exactly the same, "Flæsces ærist." In an English MS. in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, *circa* 1125 (R. 17), we have, "Flesces up arisnesse." There is a French translation attached, with the reading, "Resurrectiun de charn." In a British Museum MS., *circa* 1225 (Nero, A. 14), we find, "Vlesches up-ariste." Heurtley also quotes from an English MS. of the fourteenth century, "Rysyng of flech."<sup>2</sup>

The above will be sufficient to prove, for there is no evidence of the use of any other word than flesh, that the pre-Reformation Creed knew nothing of the word we use. The fact that the spelling varies so widely may point to the suggestion that the orthodox faith was handed down by lip rather than by standard documents.

This uniformity of wording continued down to the early stages of the Reformation. In the Prymers preceding 1538, the resurrection of the flesh is consistently confessed. The German Reformers held, and the Lutheran Church still holds, to the older form. Luther's *Drey Symbola* (1539) has "Auferstehung des Fleisches," and Hermann's *Deliberatio* (1543) has "Auferstandnuss des Fleysch." In the English Primer of 1535 (Marshall's), the comment is made, "This very flesh which was dead, buried, and consumed, or by other wayes destroyed, shall return to live again"; and in that Primer, in the Creed, the words are "the rising of flesh."

How comes it, then, that since that time so significant

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.*, p. 251 ff.

<sup>2</sup> C. A. Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, Oxford, 1858, pp. 90 ff, 97.

an innovation should have made its way as that which changes the word "flesh" into "body," an innovation which, as suggested above, has been followed by the Roman Catholic Church in English-speaking lands?<sup>1</sup>

The Reformed documents in which first the alteration of the word *flesh* in the Creed is to be found, seem to be the following:—

(1) Hilsey's Primer of 1539. John Hilsey was Bishop of Rochester, and the Primer was a semi-authoritative document, containing forms of prayer and praise, the usual instructions, and the "Oes." The original edition was printed in London by John Mayler, for John Wayland. It is one of the "Three Primers" of Henry VIII., which have been reprinted by Dr. Burton.<sup>2</sup> This Primer, though very far from one which the Reformers would approve, shews clear signs of a tendency in the direction of reform, first as regards its strong anti-popish leaning in the matter of supremacy, and secondly, in its endeavour to introduce

<sup>1</sup> The following few facts as to the use of the Creed in the Roman Catholic Church, may here find place. In Cardinal Pole's Primer, 1555, after the accession of Mary, the resurrection of the *flesh* is the expression used. In the Catechism of the Council of Trent it is laid down that *caro* is equivalent to *corpus* in St. John i. 14 and in the use of the Church. In the Creed in the Catechism set forth by that Council *carnis* is used, but throughout the ample explanations which follow, "the resurrection of *bodies*" is frequently mentioned, rarely "of flesh." "Four gifts," it says, "shall adorn the bodies of the blest after the Resurrection (Cat. Part I., ch. x., qu. xi.), viz. :—impassibility, brightness, agility, subtilty (1 Cor. xv. 44)." It is noteworthy that in the Douay Catechism—published in English and Irish, in 1752, by Ignatius Kelly—the English Creed follows our form so closely that in fact there are but three verbal differences, that of "flesh" for our word "body" being one. How comes the Roman Catholic Church to follow ours in its use of a practically identical English formulary? As to the word *flesh* in that Creed, it is afterwards explained that resurrection of the flesh means resurrection of bodies, "so that a glorified body shall become perfect like a spirit." In later times the Roman Catholic Church in English-speaking lands, so far as ascertained by the writer, has uniformly adopted the word "body." In a book called *Devotions in the Ancient Way* (Paris, 1668), "body" is used. In the present day, in the *Key of Heaven*, which is in all the people's hands, the same thing occurs, and also in Butler's Catechism.

It would be interesting to learn why the Roman Catholic Church translates and always recites the Lord's Prayer also exactly as we do, save that "who" is used for "which" in the first sentence.

<sup>2</sup> *Three Primers set forth in the reign of Henry VIII.*, Oxford, 1834, p. 305.

moderation into the cult of the Blessed Virgin. In this Primer, the Creed contains the word "body."

(2) At almost exactly the same date was penned a notable series of Annotations, by Cranmer, on King Henry VIII.'s Corrections of the *Institution of a Christian Man*. These Annotations of Cranmer are printed in the Parker Society's edition of his works,<sup>1</sup> with a note giving the date of the work as 1538, according to Lewis, and 1542, according to Strype. In this work, the Creed uses the word "body"; and at the end of the Creed, Cranmer has the note, "This *Credo* I have translated, as nigh as I can conveniently, word for word, according to the Latin."

(3) The *Necessary Erudition* of 1543;<sup>2</sup>

(4) The Primer set forth by the King's Majesty and his clergy, 1545, known as *The King's Primer*.

(5) Very shortly afterwards appeared Cranmer's Catechism of 1548, "A shorte Instruction into Christian Religion." This was translated by Cranmer (he seems to have formally acknowledged his authorship) from the Latin of Justus Jonas, who had himself translated from the German, in 1539, a catechism used in Nuremberg, "where Osiander was chief pastor."<sup>3</sup> Osiander and Cranmer were close friends, and Cranmer had married Osiander's niece. Although both in the original German and in Jonas's translation into Latin, "flesh" is the word used, yet Cranmer gives "body" in the Creed. This, set alongside his acknowledged original translation of the Creed in his "Annotations," seems to point rather clearly to the origin of the new word as Cranmer's doing.

<sup>1</sup> *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters*, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> This is the earliest use of the word noted by Bishop Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, p. 101. His description of the innovation as "an error for which there is no excuse" seems, in view of the facts in paragraphs (1) and (2) above, not fully justified, and probably the majority of theologians would hardly agree with the Bishop in his desire that "resurrection of the flesh" "should in all places be restored."

<sup>3</sup> These Catechisms were edited by Dr. E. Burton, and published by the Oxford University Press, in 1829.

## III.—THE PRAYER BOOKS OF EDWARD VI. AND ELIZABETH.

*Prayer Book of 1549.* In Matins and Evensong the Creed is not printed in full, but the rubric directs the minister to "say the Creed." As in the Catechism in this book, which in this and the following revision is incorporated with the Confirmation Service, the word "body" is found in the Creed, there is every reason to believe that the same was intended to hold good in Matins and Evensong. In both revisions the older word is retained, as in our present Book, in the Baptismal Services.

*Prayer Book of 1552.* The Creed is now printed in full, and "body" is the word used. So also in the Catechism.

*Prayer Book of 1559.* In this the same order prevails but in the form of Private Baptism, the word "Resurrection" stands alone.

*In 1552-3 was published a Short Catechism*, to which were joined the Forty-two Articles. In that Catechism the Creed, both in Latin and English, retained the old form; while to make the conservatism of this book more marked, in the 39th of the Forty-two Articles, headed, "Resurrectio mortuorum nondum est facta," we find the words, "tunc enim vita defunctis . . . propria corpora, carnes et ossa restituentur."

*In the Primer of 1553* is given a version of the Church Catechism practically identical with our present form, but ending with the explanation of the Lord's Prayer. In this Catechism, and in the form of Morning Prayer which follows, we have the word "body" in the Creed. In the Visitation Service in this Book, the Creed is directed to be said "as it is in Baptism."

## IV.—GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

From what has been stated above as to documentary evidence, it will be seen that the official beginning of the new use was (1), in the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition*, 1543; (2) in the *King's Primer*, 1545; (3) in the Prayer Books of Edward VI. The unofficial or

semi-official beginnings are found in Hilsey's *Primer*, 1539, and in Cranmer's *Annotations*, as above, of possibly 1538, or else 1542. We have not the slightest evidence that any doctrinal intention lies behind the change made ; and yet we cannot but feel glad, from a doctrinal point of view, that the thing was done. We have more "certain warrant of Holy Scripture" for the newer word than for the former, and we cannot help inclining strongly to the view that Cranmer was the man who gave the impetus to the change by his translations, and that this change had been prepared for by the recent publication of the Bible in English. The general tone of the annotations in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as shewn above, seem to indicate a tendency at that time to lean more to the word "body" than, with the ancients and the middle ages, to the traditional word.

May we conclude these remarks by some words less historical than doctrinal? We do not suggest that by the change of word, Cranmer, and those who worked with him, intended to introduce a new view of the Resurrection, or that the word was changed in the Creed to get rid of difficulties connected with a literal and material restoration of the particles of the flesh "sown in corruption." Nevertheless, we, who live in an age when these difficulties are acutely felt, have reason to be grateful to the theologian who has placed on the tongue of the people a phrase more consistent with a belief in a spiritual body. Origen had to some extent anticipated modern thought, and even Augustine had let fall words, only to be afterwards explained away, which point in the same direction. The splendid possibilities of the possession of a spiritual "body like unto His glorious Body," which are opened up to modern thought, certainly can be contemplated with more serenity by those who look for the Resurrection of *the body*, than by those held in trammels from which the ancients could not shake themselves free. Moreover, we can thus derive a deeper meaning from the

Apostle's fine language, "That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. But God giveth it a body, as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body."

Two or three expressions of what must be called the sanest believing thought of our own times on the subject of the Resurrection Body, may be added. "St. Paul," writes Mr. Bartlett,<sup>1</sup> "believed in a highly objective Resurrection, including a bodily somewhat, though of a non-fleshly order." The same thought is expressed in Bishop Gore's *The Body of Christ*:

"The Body of the Risen Christ was spiritual, not because it was less than before material, but because in it matter was wholly or finally subjugated to spirit, and not to the exigencies of physical life. Matter no longer restricted Him, nor hindered. It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose."<sup>2</sup>

And Mr. J. G. Simpson, in Hastings's *Dictionary of Christ and The Gospels*:

"At His death the self of Christ passed out of terrestrial conditions, leaving the fleshly conditions of the body behind, but by no means continuing bodiless."

"The self now exists under heavenly conditions. The fleshly organism would be useless there, because hopelessly unadaptable to such conditions."

<sup>1</sup> *Apostolic Age*, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> P. 127.

G. R. WYNNE.