Oxford Church Text Books

The Athanasian Creed

BY

THE REV. A. E. BURN, D.D.

VICAR OF HALIFAX; HON. CANON OF WAKEFIELD CATHEDRAL
AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOPS
OF LICHFIELD AND WAKEFIELD
AUTHOR OF
'THE APOSTLES' CREED' AND 'THE NICENE CREED
(OXFORD CHURCH TEXT BOOKS)

SECOND EDITION

RIVINGTONS
34 *KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN*
LONDON
1918

BY THE REV. A. E. BURN, D.D.

1*s.* 6*d. each, net.*

Also in one vol. 4*s.* 6*d. net.*

The Apostles' Creed.

The Nicene Creed.

The Athanasian Creed.

Forming Volumes of the OXFORD CHURCH TEXT BOOKS.

TO

A. S. B.

CONTENTS

PART I.—THE HISTORY

PART II.—THE TEACHING

THE ATHANASIAN CREED

PART I—THE HISTORY

CHAPTER I

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE *QUICUMQUE*

INTRODUCTION

THE Athanasian Creed is a Private Profession of Faith, which was used in the first instance as an Instruction. In course of time it came into use as a Canticle, and at its first introduction into Western Service-Books had precisely the same authority as the *Te Deum*. In many MSS. from the eighth century onwards it was associated with the name of S. Athanasius, but there is no doubt that it was written in Latin, probably by some Gallican author, certainly not by S. Athanasius. All the Greek MSS. are plainly translations from the Latin text, and the internal evidence points to the fifth century rather than the fourth as the period when the original was composed. So far as it has done something to guard the great truth for which S. Athanasius sacrificed so much, we can pardon the mistake of attributing it to him, while to avoid misunderstanding we prefer to call it the *Quicumque*, after the analogy of the *Te Deum*. No doubt it derived much prestige from so great a name, but the reasoned argument of its unknown author in defence of the great verities of the Christian religion deserved to become famous. And when in the eighth century it first emerged from obscurity, it was considered in many circles only on its merits as an anonymous

formulary, and was valued as a concise exposition of the Catholic Faith.

Indeed more harm has been done by calling it a Creed than by calling it Athanasian, since a Creed proper is either Baptismal or Liturgical. In the one case, as in our Apostles' Creed, it should be a series of plain statements suited to the use of catechists. In the other, it may properly include some technical theological terms such as *homoousios* '*of one essence*,' and theological arguments such as may be built up on the simple use of prepositions.

In our Nicene Creed the old saying about 'much divinity in prepositions' is illustrated; *e.g.* '*For* us men and *for* our salvation,' 'one baptism *for* the remission of sins.' This Creed is the Creed for communicants, who should be instructed worshippers, but there is no elaborate argument, there is no straining of the spiritual sight. In our Nicene Creed we sum up the teaching of Holy Scripture. We confess that the Scriptures testify of Christ, and that we trust His words about His Father and the Holy Ghost, whom the Father hath sent in His Name, by whom the Church has been instructed in teaching on the administration of the Sacraments. The actual use of the Creed in public worship is comparatively late but is helpful to devotion, and is a fitting prelude to the offering of the Great Memorial, when with Angels and Archangels we worship the Holy Father and we plead the merits of the Sacrifice once offered and for ever pleaded by His Son our Lord.

When we turn from this Nicene Creed of ours to the *Quicumque*, we are transported into another region of thought, not unlike that occupied by the First Nicene Creed at the Council of Nicæa, when the representatives of the Church addressed solemn warnings to all who asserted the right of private judgment in flat opposition to her teaching. Reserving the more detailed consideration of the warning clauses for future treatment, I would point out that the whole style is hortatory from the beginning to the end, from 'Whosoever would be saved' to 'he cannot be saved.' It is a reasoned argument packed full of conjunctions. 'But,' 'for,' 'so

that,' 'although,' 'however,' 'altogether.' Its majestic rhythms may fairly be said to fit it for use as a Canticle, as we use didactic Psalms from the Old Testament, but we shall find reason presently to doubt whether this was the use which either its author or its first champions ever imagined for it. Speaking for myself, for it is impossible not to bring in personal predilections in such a matter, and it is best to state them honestly and clearly, I feel that the proper place from which to read it is neither the Altar nor the Prayer Desk but the Pulpit.

The time is now ripe for a calm and temperate discussion of the best way of using it, because we can now trace its history back to the fifth century with some confidence, and probably know as much as ever will be known of the early history of its use.

Imagination has run riot in supplying fictitious histories for the *Quicumque* as for the *Te Deum*. In an Italian Psalter of the eleventh century from Subiaco[1] in S. Italy, the writer of a preface to the *Te Deum* quotes a story to the effect that a certain Sisebut, delighted with the exposition which blessed Athanasius has given of the faith of the holy and undivided Trinity, which is called Catholic, broke out into the strains of the *Te Deum*! Many of the histories invented for the *Quicumque* are quite as fanciful.

For the sake of clearness I will at once quote a revised Translation of the Creed, quoting variations in the translation published by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee in the margin under the symbol C. or Cm. (=margin), and adding to it an analysis of the sequence of thought. For the sake of uniformity I will use, as they do, the Prayer Book numbering of the clauses, although in my *Introduction to the Creeds* I followed Waterland and Ommanney, numbering 40 clauses instead of 42.

[1] MS. 249.

Quicumque Vult

[1] Whosoever would be saved,* before all things it is needful that he hold† the Catholic Faith, [2] which Faith except a man have kept whole and undefiled‡ without doubt he shall perish eternally.

(*a*) *Divine Personality is triune*

I. i. [3] Now the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship the one God as a Trinity, and the Trinity as an Unity; [4] neither confusing the Persons nor dividing the Substance. [5] For there is a Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost; [6] but the Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is one, their glory equal, their majesty coeternal.

(*b*) *Attributes of the Godhead arranged in subsidiary antitheses*

[7] Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost; [8] the Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, the Holy Ghost uncreated; [9] the Father infinite, the Son infinite, the Holy Ghost infinite; [10] the Father eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal; [11] and yet they are not three eternals, but one eternal; [12] as also they are not three uncreated nor three infinites, but one uncreated and one infinite.§ [13] So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, the Holy Ghost almighty; [14] and yet they are not three almighties, but one almighty.

(*c*) *In which Christian Truth acknowledges the Trinity*

[15] So the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God; [16] and yet they are not three Gods, but one God. [17] So the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, the Holy Ghost Lord; [18] and yet they are not three Lords, but one Lord.

* *Or* desireth to be saved, Cm.

† Hold fast, C.

‡ *Or* uncorrupted, Cm.

§ One infinite and one uncreated, C.

[19] For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity * to confess each of the Persons by himself † to be both God and Lord; [20] so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to speak of three Gods or three Lords.

Divine Relationships in Scriptural terms are unique, coeternal, coequal

ii. [21] The Father is of none, not made, nor created, nor begotten. [22] The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten. [23] The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son; not made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. [24] There is therefore one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. [25] And in this Trinity none is before or after, none is greater or less; [26] but all three Persons are coeternal one with another and coequal.

[27] So that in all ways, as is aforesaid, both the Trinity is to be worshipped as an Unity, and the Unity as a Trinity. [28] Let him therefore that would be saved ‡ think thus of the Trinity. §

The Incarnation

II. [29] Furthermore, it is necessary to eternal salvation that he also believe faithfully the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. [30] The right Faith therefore is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is at once both God and Man;

We confess that Christ in Two Natures

i. [31] He is God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, || and He is Man, of the Substance of His Mother, born in the world ¶; [32] perfect

* *Or* by Christian truth, Cm.
† *Or* severally, Cm.
‡ *Or* desireth to be saved, Cm.
§ *Or* concerning the Trinity, Cm.
|| *Or* before all time, Cm.
¶ *Or* in time, Cm.

God, perfect Man, of reasoning* soul and human flesh consisting; [33] equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, less than the Father as touching His Manhood.

Is One Person

ii. [34] Who although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one† Christ; [35] One, however, not by change of Godhead into flesh, but by taking of Manhood into God; [36] One altogether, not by confusion of Substance, but by unity of Person. [37] For as reasoning‡ soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ;

The Redeemer, the Judge

iii. [38] Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell,§ rose again from the dead; [39] ascended into heaven, sat down at the right hand of the Father, to come from thence to judge the quick and the dead. [40] At whose coming all men shall rise again|| with their bodies and shall give account for their own deeds. [41] And they that have done good will go into life eternal, they that have done evil into eternal fire.

[42] This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man have faithfully and stedfastly believed he cannot be saved.

Beginnings of Criticism

The literary history of the Creed may be said to begin in the sixteenth century, when Cranmer and other reformers, who had no hesitation in calling it Athanasius' Creed, allowed themselves to be influenced in their translation by the Greek Text.¶ At the close of the century Richard Hooker followed Cardinal Baronius in ascribing it to S. Athanasius, but some doubts had begun to be spread abroad. The first doubts were expressed by Joachim Camerarius in 1551 or 1552, but he was so

* *Or* rational, Cm. † Is one, C. ‡ *Or* rational, Cm.
§ To the world below, C.; *Or* into Hades, Cm.
|| *Or* must rise again. Cm. ¶ See page 103.

fiercely attacked that in the Latin edition of his book he withdrew the passage.[1] Jewel, in his *Defence of the Apology* in 1569 described the Creed as written 'as some think by Athanasius; as some others by Eusebius Vercellensis.'

In 1642 Gerard Voss, a Dutch theologian who became a Prebendary of Canterbury, in his work on the Three Creeds, attacked the current opinion, and suggested that it was written by a Gallican writer of the ninth century. To him replied Archbishop Ussher, who produced evidence of a much earlier date.

In 1647, Dr. Jeremy Taylor, in his *Liberty of Prophesying*, expressed himself as doubtful on the authorship. Bishop Pearson, in his *Exposition of the Creed*, first published in 1669, thought that it was written in Latin by some member of the Latin Church, *c.* A.D. 600. The famous canonist, Paschasius Quesnel, in 1675, ascribed it to Vigilius of Thapsus, and was answered by another Parisian divine, Joseph Antelmi, who ascribed it to Vincentius of Lerins.

Some fifty years later appeared *A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, by the famous Dr. Waterland, at that time President of Magdalen College, Oxford. It is not too much to say that he closed the question for more than a century. His book contained all the available evidence, with a masterly discussion of all the problems of date, authorship, and interpretation. He came to the conclusion that it was written between 426 and 430 A.D. by Hilary, Bishop of Arles, sometime Abbot of Lerins. Perhaps the greatest compliment that was ever paid to it was the opinion of the great Duke of Wellington, who at a dinner party heard some one expressing his dislike for and objection to the Athanasian Creed. The Duke declined to discuss the subject at dinner, but when dinner was ended told him: 'After the war was over, I thought it my duty to inquire why I was a member of the Church of England, and I examined the Prayer Book, the Articles, and especially the Athanasian Creed, and after doing this, and reading that famous treatise

[1] *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, x. 1889, p. 497.

of Waterland's, I came to the conclusion that every word of it was borne out by Holy Scripture.'[1]

Dr. Waterland's arguments were not seriously questioned in England until 1854, when Mr. Harvey, in his able *History of the Creeds*, ascribed the authorship to Victricius, who was Bishop of Rouen at the beginning of the fifth century. There was not much interest felt in the subject, and the book did not receive the attention it merited.

The appointment of a Royal Commission on Ritual in 1867 gave occasion for the reopening of the question of the use of the Creed, and in the fourth and last Report of the Commission, while ten of the Commissioners agreed on a rubric explaining the warning clauses, no less than seventeen, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tait), dissented, preferring to advocate its disuse.

This was the cause of the great controversy which broke out in 1870, fomented by the wild theory of Mr. Ffoulkes, who tried to prove that the Creed was a forgery of Paulinus of Aquileia, which was soon followed by the more serious Two-document Theory of Professors Swainson and Lumby.

The Two-document Theory

The idea of the two-document theory was suggested, in the first instance, to Dr. Swainson by Dr. Westcott in connection with a fragment of an old sermon on the Creed, commonly called the Trèves fragment. The MS. (Paris, *Cod. lat.* 3836) is of the eighth century, and was regarded at the time as the oldest MS. known of the *Quicumque*. Inasmuch as the final warning clause is quoted in a positive not a negative form, it was confidently anticipated that critical investigation would prove that the warning clauses were not part of the original structure of the Creed. Indeed, the Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, appointed to prepare a revised translation of the Creed,

[1] *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1872, p. 447. Speech by Sir G. Prevost.

proposed that the last verse should be read in the form in which it is found in the Codex Colbertinus: 'which every man who desireth to attain to eternal life ought to know wholly and to guard faithfully.'

The MS. in question is called *Codex Colbertinus*, as belonging to the collection of Colbert now in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*. The fragment is found on fol. 89, in a Collection of Canons. The copyist says that he found it at Trèves. He was an Italian who had travelled and had visited Rome among other places. He used it to illustrate the Definition of Faith put forward by the Council of Chalcedon. He does not seem to have been acquainted with the *Quicumque*, because he uses the first words of the fragment as a title. His ignorance is not at all surprising. He wrote about 730 A.D., and the use of the Creed was as yet confined to Gaul. Unfortunately, no trace of the original can be found at Trèves, which was sacked by the Normans in 882 A.D. So we are reduced to conjecture as to the history of the sermon, which begins in the middle of verse 27 of the Creed.

The Trèves Fragment

This I found at Trèves written in a book beginning thus: 'Of our Lord Jesus Christ' and the rest . . .
29 Believe faithfully . . . of our Lord Jesus Christ.
30 The right faith therefore is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God
31 is at once God and Man. He is God, *from* the substance of the Father begotten before the worlds, and He is Man *from* the substance of His Mother,
32 born in the world. Perfect God, perfect Man, of a
33 reasoning soul and human flesh consisting; equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, less than the
34 Father as touching His Manhood. Who although He be God and Man yet He is not two but is one
35 Christ. One, however, not *because Godhead has been changed* into flesh, but *because Manhood* has been
36 *worthily* taken into God. He is one *Christ* not by confusion of Substance, but by unity of Person, who

38 *according to our faith* suffered *and died descending* into
39 hell, *and on the third day* rose again, *and* ascended into heaven, He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, *as was delivered to you in the Creed.* Thence *we believe and hope that* he will come to judge the
40 quick and the dead. At whose coming all men *without doubt* will rise again in their own bodies, and
41 will give account for their own works, *that* they who have done good *may go* into life eternal, they that
42 have done evil into eternal fire. This is the *holy and* Catholic Faith which *every man who desireth to attain to eternal life ought to know wholly and to guard faithfully.*

By the use of italics to mark variations from the usual text, it may be shown that we have before us the free quotations of a preacher, not a first draft of the *Quicumque* afterwards to be polished into our text.[1] He is obviously using the words as an expansion of the teaching of the Apostles' Creed, referring (verse 39) to the ceremony of the Delivery of the Creed. His omission of verse 37, the illustration of the Incarnation from the constitution of man, was intentional, because he has altered verse 38 to make it fit on to verse 36. The reason is not far to seek. If we suppose that the sermon was preached some fifty or sixty years before he copied it at Trèves, say *c.* 670-680 A.D., we come to a time when the heresy of Eutychianism was widely prevalent. That particular illustration was misused by the Eutychians, who taught that the Lord's Human Nature was absorbed into the Divine Nature, as a drop of vinegar would be swallowed up by the vast ocean. About that time (680 A.D.) the Synod of Hethfield met in England to condemn such teaching, and the Venerable Bede speaks of it as one of the dangers in the Church generally. It had then lasted for a long time. More than a century earlier, Nicetius, Archbishop of Trèves, 527-566 A.D., wrote a letter to the Emperor Justinian, to remonstrate with him on his lapse into a form of Eutychianism, in which more than one phrase reminds us of the *Quicumque.* He reminded Justinian of his Baptismal

[1] Loofs.

Vow: 'Thou hast borne witness to One Son remaining in two substances with the Father and the Holy Spirit, not two Christs . . . such as the Father is, such is the Son.' Nicetius appears to use the language of the Creed in another letter also,[1] so that it is quite possible that the sermon goes back to him. He was a learned theologian in his time, and was brought into contact with the school of Lerins, to which we shall trace the *Quicumque*, by his friend Florianus, Abbot of Romanus, a friend of Cæsarius of Arles. Indeed in a letter to Queen Chlodosinda he quotes the great names Germanus, Hilary, Lupus. In any case his letters help us to understand the use made of the *Quicumque* in this Trèves fragment.

Dr. Swainson went on to piece together with this Trèves fragment two other fragmentary quotations of the *Quicumque*, on which he built up his theory that the two portions of the Creed dealing respectively with the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were not put together until the ninth century. He first published it in an open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, called *A plea for time in dealing with the Athanasian Creed*,[2] in 1873, which he followed up in 1875 with a big book entitled *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, their literary history, together with an account of the growth and reception of the Sermon on the Faith, commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius*.[3] This book is worthy to be introduced to my readers, even by the whole of its title, because it contains an astonishing collection of new materials. As in his book on Greek Liturgies, which has been also neglected, Dr. Swainson was a pioneer, and deserves greater credit than he has often received.

Dr. Swainson found in a MS. at Vienna (*Cod.* 1261) of the twelfth century, a sermon in which the preacher quotes the *Quicumque* under the title *Fides Catholica*, in one passage quoting verse 3, in another verses 1-6, 24, 26*a*, with variations which find no support in any other MS. We infer that, like the preacher of the

[1] Cf. my *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 159.
[2] Published by Deighton, Bell and Co.
[3] Published by John Murray.

Trèves fragment, he was quoting freely. There is no reason whatever why we should not, in imagination, grant him the liberty of quoting what he wanted to quote without assuming that he was ignorant of the rest. But Dr. Swainson felt that this evidence confirmed his opinion that the so-called *Profession of Denebert* proved the existence of the first part of the *Quicumque* by itself.

In the year 798 A.D. Denebert, as Bishop elect of Worcester, sent to Ethelhard, Archbishop of Canterbury, a short exposition of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith, in a letter in which he promised Canonical obedience. It is contained in a MS. of the British Museum (Cleopatra, E. 1) of the twelfth century. Denebert quoted *from a written original* (*scriptum est*), verses 1, 3-6, 21-23, 25, 26 of the *Quicumque*, and promised further to observe the decrees of the Popes and the six Catholic Synods, and their Rule of Faith. Since he also undertook to be brief, and would find the doctrine of the Incarnation fully expounded by those Synods, it cannot be safely said that he would probably have quoted more from the *Quicumque* if he had known it. Such an argument from silence is proverbially dangerous. We now know an eighth century MS. of the whole of the *Quicumque* in the Royal Library at Munich,[1] written in an Anglo-Saxon hand, which as regards one small variation, the order of the words *enim est* in verse 5, agrees with the text quoted by Denebert against all other MSS. Some Anglo-Saxon clergy attended the Council of Frankfurt in 794 A.D. They may have brought the MS. over with them, or it may have been written in some colony of Saxon monks. At any rate, here is proof that Denebert was quoting the current text in use in the Anglo-Saxon Church of the eighth century, and that *the Anglo-Saxon Church had the whole Creed to quote from and not merely a fragment.*

Dr. Swainson himself suggested a reason why Denebert should have quoted only these particular clauses. Some of the Creeds of other Saxon Bishops in the collection in this British Museum MS. have a Sabellian

[1] *Cod. lat.* 6298. My attention was called to it by Dom Morin. I have published a facsimile for the Bradshaw Society, 1909.

sound. They run thus: 'I believe in God the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, born and suffered.' Unless such teaching is expanded, to make it clear that it was God the Son who was born and suffered, we are left in the clutch of the ancient heresy of Sabellius, which is the modern heresy of Swedenborg, that God is manifested in one Person under changing aspects; first as Father, then as Son, then as Holy Ghost. This is to 'confuse the persons.' I have no wish to impugn the orthodoxy of the Saxon Bishops, some of whom, no doubt, had very meagre theological training. Anyhow, Bishop Denebert had his eyes open and taught correctly.

Dr. Swainson must have felt that he was treading on thin ice when he argued from these three documents that the two portions of the *Quicumque* were put together and brought into its present form *c.* 860, in the diocese of Rheims. This theory committed him to assigning late dates to all the MSS. hitherto assigned to the borderline of the eighth and ninth centuries. He assumed also the silence of Alcuin and Paulinus of Aquileia about the Creed, and was forced to explain away the parallel passages in their writings.[1] At every point his theory was vulnerable, and at the end of his book the reader may well have the impression that he knew it. He is far more hesitating in his judgment than Dr. Lumby, who took up his theory and stated it most succinctly in his well-known book on the Three Creeds as follows:—

'(i) Before A.D. 809, there is no trustworthy evidence of any confession called by the name of St. Athanasius. (ii) Before that date two separate compositions existed, which form the groundwork of the present *Quicumque*. (iii) That for some time after that date all quotations are made only from the former of these compositions. (iv) That the *Quicumque* was not known down to A.D. 813, to those who were most likely to have heard of it, had it been in existence. (v) That it is found nearly as we use it in A.D. 870. (vi) A comparison of the various MSS. shows that after the combination of the two parts, the text was for some time in an unsettled or transition state. On every ground, therefore, both of internal and external evidence, it seems to be a sound

[1] Cf. my book *The Athanasian Creed*, p. xxxviii.

conclusion that somewhere between A.D. 813-850 the Creed was brought nearly into the form in which we use it.'[1]

During the last thirty years every one of these positions has been riddled with arguments. As I shall show later, we can produce some four MSS. which undoubtedly belong to the eighth century, others which belong to the early years of the ninth century, and with the support of the best palaeographers may assign the earliest MS., the famous *Cod. Ambrosianus*, to the end of the seventh century. I have edited for the Bradshaw Society facsimiles of the most important of these MSS., with palaeographical notes by the late Dr. Ludwig Traube, whose authority in these investigations was unrivalled. Some years ago Dr. Loofs, in his Article *Athanasianum* in Herzog's great *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*,[2] declared that the two-portion theory was dead. But while Dr. Harnack retains a modified form of it in his well-known *History of Dogma*,[3] it must be regarded as having still a sort of suspended animation, and it may be interesting to my readers to have definite information about the earliest MSS. both of the text of the creed and of the earliest commentaries which quote it. These are therefore described in Appendix B of this book.

Among recent books, which deserve mention, is a brilliant study of *The History and Use of Creeds*, by Mr. C. H. Turner, who follows Dom G. Morin, O.S.B., in selecting S. Cæsarius of Arles as the most probable author.

Dr. Karl Künstle of Freyburg, on the other hand, prefers a Spanish origin for the *Quicumque*, and in his book *Antipriscilliana* connects it with other documents of Spanish and Gallican origin which were called forth by the controversy with Priscillianism from the last quarter of the fourth century.

Dr. H. Brewer of Paderborn in 1909 sought to prove that the Creed was a work of S. Ambrose.

In 1914 Mr. D. Macleane, in his book on *the Athanasian Creed*, published a useful survey of the recent controversy on the use of the Creed, with a popular amount of recent researches into its history.

[1] *Hist. of the Creeds*, ed. 3, p. 259. [2] Ed. 3, ii. p. 177.
[3] Eng. Trans., iv. 134.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF THE USE OF THE *QUICUMQUE*

For our present purpose we must begin with the Canon of the Faith put forth by the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633 A.D. Of earlier possible quotations it only concerns us to note this, that Vincentius and Caesarius if they quoted it, and not merely current phrases about the Catholic Faith, quoted it as an instruction in the faith, a sort of elementary catechism, which is its proper use. The Toledan theologians made precisely the same use of it. They refer to the Divine Scriptures and the doctrine which they had received from the Holy Fathers, as the standard of the rule of faith which they were prepared to draw up, using the phrases of the *Quicumque* and of the Creed of Damasus, as they happened to come in.

The Fourth Council of Toledo was specially interested in counteracting the heresy of Priscillianism, which was still rife in parts of Spain. It is therefore necessary to say something about Priscillian.

Priscillian

In 1885 Dr. Schepss discovered some of Priscillian's writings in a fifth or sixth century MS. in the University Library at Würzburg. It is now possible to judge him out of his own mouth without relying on the testimony of opponents whom we must regard as biased. Priscillian was a wealthy Spanish layman of the fourth century, cultured and devout, who was a great student of the Scriptures, and to some extent of theology. But he had had no theological training, and when he quoted

S. Hilary of Poitiers, failed again and again to understand his argument, and in most cases fell into heresies, not one but many, simply through confused thinking. This became more serious when he came under the influence of Gnostic or Manichean teachers, and still more serious when he was made a bishop.

We are not now concerned with the history of his life and death. It was his miserable fate to suffer at the hands of the civil power the doom which, in fierce words, he had proposed for heretics. He appealed to the usurping Emperor Maximus, and was condemned no doubt on political rather than religious grounds, but that made no difference to saintly minds, *e.g.* to S. Martin of Tours, who regarded the execution with horror. Priscillian was venerated as a martyr and his sect increased.

Putting the most charitable construction upon his words, we cannot fail to find that he fell both into Sabellian and Apollinarian error. All his vehement professions of holding the true Catholic faith on the lines of the Apostles' Creed do not deceive us when we find him putting 'Holy Church' before 'Holy Ghost' in the Creed, thus throwing doubt on belief in the personality of the Holy Ghost, and then teaching that Christ is the one Person in the Godhead, as in the following :—

'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. He does not say "in the names" as in many, but in one, because Christ is one God venerable in threefold power, *all and in all* as it has been written. The promises were reckoned to Abraham and his seed; he saith not "and to seeds" as in many, but in one "and to thy seed," which is Christ . . . For to us Christ our God, the Son of God, suffered in the flesh according to the faith of the Creed, to those baptised and called to the priesthood, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, is all our faith, all our life, all our veneration.'[1]

In his *Blessing over the Faithful,* Priscillian begins with a quotation from S. Hilary's prayer, 'Holy Father, almighty God,'[2] but falls away again into Sabellian confusion of the Persons when he writes :—

[1] *Tract.* ii., fol. 45. [2] *De Trin.* xii. 52.

'For thou art God who . . . art believed as one God, invisible in the Father, visible in the Son, and art found as Holy Spirit united in the work of both.'[1]

It is clear that Orosius was not mistaken when he accused Priscillian of omitting the 'ands' in the Baptismal Formula, and of teaching that Father, Son, Holy Spirit are one Christ. Nor can there be any doubt that Priscillian believed that in the union of Godhead and Manhood in Christ the Divine soul took the place of the human soul:—

'Finally our God assuming flesh, assigning to Himself the form of God and Man, that is of Divine soul and human flesh, while He showed that one of these was the form of sin, the other was His Divine Nature, and the Word made flesh designates that as *instruments of unrighteousness* unto sin, this as *instruments of righteousness*[2] for our salvation.'[3]

For further evidence as to Priscillian's leaning to Gnosticism and Manicheism I must refer to my *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 142 ff. But enough has been said to show that the combination of Sabellian and Apollinarian teaching in his writings is precisely met by the main teaching of the *Quicumque*, which I ventured to suggest in my Book, was written for this purpose. The suggestion was warmly taken up by Dr. Künstle, Professor of Theology in the University of Freiburg, i. B.,[4] who in his book *Antipriscilliana* went a great deal further, and found traces of the controversy in a great many other formularies of the period, which he, without hesitation, assigns in a lump to Spain, the *Quicumque* included.

It is impossible now to discuss each formulary on its merits, but it is obvious that such a sweeping conclusion is, to say the least, rash. When Dr. Künstle argues that the *Treatise in form of a Creed* recently restored by Dom Morin to Bishop Pastor of Gallaecia,[5] has close parallels in thought to the *Quicumque*, and is followed by anathemas which are plainly antipriscillianist in character, he is fully justified. Its date is about 450 A.D.

[1] *Ed.* Schepss, p. 103.
[2] Rom. 6. 13.
[3] *Tract.* vi. § 99.
[4] Freiburg im Breisgau, 1905.
[5] *Revue Bénédictine*, 1893, p. 385.

Canon of Autun

Nearly a century after the Council of Toledo we find the creed referred to in a Canon of the Synod of Autun which met under Bishop Leodgar, *c.* 730 A.D.

'If any presbyter or deacon, subdeacon, cleric, shall not repeat without blame the Creed which the Apostles, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost have handed down, and the Faith of the holy prelate Athanasius, let him be condemned by the Bishop.'

At one time some doubts were expressed about the reference, because another profession of faith, known as the *Fides Romanorum*, was quoted by Ratramn of Corbie as a *Tract of Athanasius on the Faith*. Both he and Hincmar of Rheims were led to connect this formulary with the name of Athanasius by the work of Vigilius of Thapsus *On the Trinity*. But there is not a single MS. in which it is so described, whereas at least twenty of the early MSS. of the *Quicumque* describe it as the *Faith of S. Athanasius*, and the preface to the early Commentary called *Oratorian*, which speaks (*c.* 800 A.D.) of ancient MSS. as so entitling it! Moreover, only the *Quicumque* was ever recommended in this way to the clergy to be learnt by heart with the Apostles' Creed. This conception of its usefulness exactly corresponds to the use made of it by the Council of Toledo, as, if the quotations are allowed, by Cæsarius of Arles.

The earliest MS. now at Milan (*Cod. Ambrosianus*, O. 212 *sup.*) does not give any hint as to the use which might be made of the Creed, but the earliest Commentaries, which we are justified in carrying back to the eighth century, suggest that it was becoming known in different centres, without as well as with the name of Athanasius to recommend it. Thus the Fortunatus Commentary, the earliest MSS. of which are connected with S. Gallen and other Benedictine monasteries, and the Troyes Commentary dependent on the Fortunatus, use it as a summary of Catholic Faith, explaining difficult terms in the conventional way. On the other hand, the author of the Oratorian Commentary, in the extremely interesting preface quoted on p. 108, refers to it as recited in some

churches, and continually made the subject of recitation by our priests.

Dom Morin is right in his sarcastic allusion to the early dates formerly ascribed to these Commentaries.[1] I have to withdraw my opinion that we must trace the Fortunatus to so early a date as 700 A.D., but we cannot go lower than 750 A.D. to allow time for the spreading of the MSS., which in the ninth century became fairly numerous. If we surrender doubtful arguments based on internal evidence, we must begin with more zeal to piece together all that may be learnt from the now considerable list of MSS., in which this Commentary was extant in the ninth century. But for our present purpose it concerns us only to point out that the MSS. prove, as we should expect, use in the Benedictine Monasteries of S. Gallen, Murbach, and others.

If we may connect the Oratorian Commentary with Theodulf of Orleans, that gives a clue as to the use at Fleury at the end of the eighth century, by which time other MSS. come into view.

In 798 A.D. the Profession of Denebert, Bishop-elect of Worcester, shows us the familiar use of the *Quicumque* as a clear instruction on the Catholic Faith, and his possession of the whole text is guaranteed by the Munich MS. (*Cod. lat.* 6298). At the present moment it would be wearisome to collect all the details about the distribution of the different MSS. In the last ten years so many new ones have come to light that it would be worth while to spend some labour on tracking out their homes and the circumstances under which the commentaries appear.

One outstanding fact of importance is the way in which the Creed began to find its way into Psalters with the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Canticles.

We shall see[2] how Leidrat of Lyons introduced a collection of Creeds into an Introduction to the Psalter which he apparently prepared for Charles the Great,

[1] Ommanney would date the Fortunatus ± 600 and the Oratorian ± 700.

[2] Page 104.

since we find the same Creeds and most of the quotations which follow actually forming the Introduction to the famous Golden Psalter at Vienna (*Cod.* 1861), in which the *Quicumque* appears in what was, from this time forward, its usual place at the end of the Psalter. This led naturally to its use in the office of Prime as a hymn. The encouragement which Charles the Great gave to the study of church music as a part of the general Revival of Letters and Art, contributed to such use. Since it was written in the same rhythms as the *Te Deum*, there was a natural affinity with the tones of the Gregorian music.

The Paris Psalter (*Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. lat.* 13,159), which was written before 800 A.D., has been partially destroyed, but enough of the *Quicumque* is written in the original hand to prove that it belonged to the collection added to the Psalter.

The Utrecht Psalter was copied in the Diocese of Rheims at the beginning of the ninth century, apparently page by page, from an earlier MS., but we are too uncertain about it to prove that this was really the earliest Psalter in which it was added to the Canticles.

At the beginning of the ninth century a new idea was started by Abbot Angilbert of St. Riquier (*c.* 814), who records that the Faith of S. Athanasius was sung by his school in procession on Rogation Days with the Creeds and the Lord's Prayer.[1]

This use as a canticle spread rapidly during the ninth century. At the end of the century following, Allo of Fleury speaks of it as sung antiphonally both in France and England. But the earlier use as an instruction on the Faith did not pass away. Theodulf of Orleans used, in an Address to his Clergy, as in a treatise on the Holy Spirit (*c.* 820). So did Benedict d'Aniane, in the same diocese.

In 834 A.D. Florus, the Deacon of Lyons, wrote about the Creed to Abbot Hyldrad, who asked him for a corrected Psalter. He had corrected the Symbol, Lord's Prayer, Catholic Faith, and hymns for addition to the Psalter.

[1] Hariulf, *Chronique de l'Abb. de Saint-Riquier*, F. Lot. Paris, 1894.

Before 836 A.D. Hatto of Reichenau, Bishop of Basle, directed his clergy to learn and recite it on Sundays at Prime.

In 852, Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, referred to it in his *Capitula* as the *Treatise* (*Sermo*) *of S. Athanasius on the Faith*, which he wished his clergy to learn by heart and explain like a Catechism. And he set the example of using it as an authority in his own treatises, *On one not threefold Deity*, and *On Predestination*. Thus in the ninth century we see the use extending through the length and breadth of the empire of Charles the Great and his successors. And we find it used in professions made by Bishops before their consecration at Rome as Denebert had used it.

There is a strange confession of faith in a MS. at Munich of the eighth or ninth century (*Cod. lat.* 6435), written in an Anglo-Saxon hand, which well illustrates the stumbling way in which men tried to express themselves on the subject until they had the guidance of the *Quicumque*. (See above, p. 13.)

Use in England in the Middle Ages

We may now narrow the circle of our interest to the actual use made of the Creed in England. As we have seen, it was sung antiphonally in England from the tenth century. An Anglo-Saxon homily, *On the Catholic Faith*, by a monk, Aelfric, quotes it for the instruction of the people. In one Old English MS. of the ninth or tenth century it is called a Hymn, as in the Constitutions of some English Bishops of the thirteenth century it is called a Psalm.

The daily use enjoined by the Sarum Breviary corresponded to the use of the Church of Milan. In the Roman Breviary for the end of the thirteenth century the use seems to have been restricted to Sundays.

Dr. Wickham Legg, in his interesting book on *The Popular Use of the Athanasian Creed*, has shown that in England in the later Middle Ages the offices were combined. Mattins with Lauds, Prime, and Terce, with or without Sext and None, were said without break, by accumulation as it is called, and the whole service was named

'Mattins.' Lay folk of all classes attended Mattins as well as Mass on Sundays and holy days. An early sixteenth-century book, called the *Mirror of Our Lady*, written to explain the Brigittine Rite of Syon, the nuns' house at Isleworth, has the following note :—

'Therefore Holy Church hath ordained that it (*Quicumque vult*) should be sung each day openly at prime, both in token that faith is the first beginning of health, and also for people use that time most to come to church.'

In 1549, in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., Mattins became Morning Prayer, 'which contained on certain days the Athanasian Creed, just as Prime had contained it for daily use in the old rite. The difference was that the layman recited it with the priest in English and not in Latin.' Dr. Legg does not see in this change any great innovation. He is quite right to point out that the Creed had often found translators into Anglo-Saxon,[1] Norman-French,[2] Middle English,[3] but these attempts to make it known in the common tongue were spasmodic, and in the nature of the case very limited in their influence, until the invention of printing. Only the lettered classes could understand Latin, and only the wealthy could possess a Breviary. The great majority in the congregation said the Lord's Prayer and such other prayers as they knew by heart, occupying themselves with their private devotions, though of course in the Mass they could be taught to follow the action of the service. In 1539 Bishop Hilsey included the Creed in his *Manual of Prayers, a Primer of Private Devotion*. So it was quite to be expected that in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. it should be included

[1] A tenth century Psalter at Salisbury shows an Anglo-Saxon gloss between the lines.

[2] The Eadwine Psalter at Trinity College, Cambridge, has a Norman-French translation.

[3] The Bodleian MS. 425 contains an Old English version in metre and rhyme, probably written in the northernmost part of Lincolnshire, perhaps not far from Hull, *c.* 1240. The British Museum, Add. MSS. 17,376, of the fourteenth century, has another. A third, Cambridge University Library, Ee. 1. 10, has been ascribed to Wyclif or one of his followers. Dr. Swainson refers to other Anglo-Saxon versions (*op. cit.* p. 484).

in Mattins to be sung or said after the Benedictus on the Greater Feasts. The Apostles' Creed followed as part of the *Preces in prostratione*, all kneeling. In the Second Prayer Book it was directed that the Creeds should be said standing, but it was obviously intended that the *Quicumque* should precede the Apostles' Creed on certain festivals, the number of which was increased.[1] In 1662 the rubric was altered to 'At Morning Prayer instead of the Apostles' Creed.'

Use in the Present

The *Quicumque* has no place in the Offices of the Eastern Orthodox Church, but is found, without the words 'And the Son' (cf. clause 23), in the Appendix of many modern editions of the Horologion. Thus revised it is regarded as a good exposition of the Faith. In the Russian service books it does not appear in the Horologion (*Charoslov*), but at the beginning of the Psalter (*Psaltir*), under the title 'The Symbol, called the Confession of our Father amongst the Saints, Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria.' The second portion has the heading, 'Concerning Christ.' The words 'And the Son' are omitted, and it has abundant traces of having been translated from a Greek version and not from the original Latin. It is followed by other expositions. Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, to whom I am indebted for this information, thinks that it was introduced in the Niconian reforms of the middle of the seventeenth century, and not (as some have guessed) by Peter Moghila at Kieff. Moghila was educated as a Uniat at Rome, and would certainly have translated it from Latin.

Mr. Birkbeck has shown that 'wherever the Roman Catholic Church has allowed her offices to be said in the vernacular, there you will find the Athanasian Creed,' *e.g.* in the Utraquist Service-books written in the Bohemian language, which was used in Bohemia under the sanction of the Council of Basle for nearly two

[1] Cf. an interesting note by Henry Bradshaw, *Journal of Theological Studies*, v. p. 458.

hundred years. 'And quite down to the present time in Croatia and Dalmatia and other parts of the Austrian Empire where the Services for many centuries have been read and sung, not in Latin but in a Slavonian dialect, you will find the Athanasian Creed in the Service-books in its regular place, and the Offices, Prime included, are recited in the churches, and attended and joined in by crowds.'[1]

'In the use of the Roman Catholic Church in England some restriction has resulted from the gradual encroachment of the *Sanctuale* upon the *Temporale*, (1) through the multiplication of saints' days, and (2) to a less extent by the raising of the "*ritus*" or dignity of individual festivals. According to the general rubrics, if a "*festum duplex*" fall on an ordinary Sunday, "*fit officium de festo, commemoratio de Dominica.*" How often this occurs depends largely on the particular calendar in use; *e.g.* English Jesuits use the Roman calendar supplemented by the *Proprium Soc. Jesu* and by the *Proprium Angliæ*, with the result that hardly a Sunday in the year escapes "occurrence." But occurence—even with a "duplex"—does not crowd out the Sunday office in the case of the Sundays in Advent and Lent, or of Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima, so the *Quicumque* (with the rest of the Sunday office) survives on these, and (as regards the *Quicumque*) on Trinity Sunday. In the case of the secular clergy there will be fewer cases of occurrence, and the Sunday office is more frequently, or less infrequently recited.'

I am indebted for this clear statement to the Rev. H. Lucas, S.J., and have quoted it in full from my *Introduction to the Creeds*,[2] because there is often misunderstanding as to the exact position which the *Quicumque* still holds in the Roman Catholic Service-books. Dr. Legg calls attention to a 'Manual of Prayers for Congregational Use,' published by authority, which includes the Athanasian Creed in an Office called 'Prayers for the afternoon or evening service,' all of which are in the vernacular.[3] And in the new Roman Catholic

[1] *Prayer Book Revision*, p. 13. London, 1909.
[2] P. 184. [3] *Op. cit.* p. 15.

Cathedral at Westminster an English translation is provided for worshippers who do not understand Latin.

It is obvious, therefore, that there would be no break with Catholic usage if at any time the Church of England should authorise the use of the *Quicumque* in the Office of Prime, or the First Evensong of a Festival.

When we compare the Roman with the Anglican use, if it is not quite correct to say that 'the Church of England alone uses it in the mother-tongue in a popular service,' it is quite true to say that the use in Roman Catholic Churches in vernacular popular services is optional.

CHAPTER III

DATE AND AUTHORSHIP

It is far more important to fix the date of the *Quicumque*, even approximately, than to advance any theory as to the authorship. The recent lectures of Dom Morin at Oxford, published in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (January-April 1911), if they leave nothing certain before 633 A.D., have at least the merit of forcing us to go back to first principles and distinguish carefully between the proved and the probable. I cannot say I am convinced by Dom Morin's scepticism. I have never wavered from the fundamental position taken up by Waterland that the Creed belongs to Apollinarian times, and is written with Apollinarian, rather than Nestorian or Eutychian error in view throughout the teaching on the Incarnation. This brings us back to the first half of the fifth century as the probable date, and since it is generally agreed that the author was acquainted with S. Augustine's work *On the Trinity*, we may say in round numbers after A.D. 416 or 420-430.

Fourth Council of Toledo

In deference to the great learning of Dom Morin we must begin where he begins and work our way backwards. In his opinion the first certain quotation of the *Quicumque* was made in a canon of the faith composed by the Fourth Council of Toledo in A.D. 633. It was an important Council, and the most interesting thing about the quotation is that it is quoted side by side with the so-called Creed of Damasus. I will print the quotations of the *Quicumque* in leaded type, of the Creed of Damasus in italics :—

Canon 1. According to the divine Scriptures and

the doctrine which we have received from the holy fathers we confess the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost of one Godhead and substance, believing a Trinity in diversity of persons, preaching a Unity in divinity. We neither confound the persons nor divide the substance. We say that the Father is made of none nor begotten: We assert that the Son is from the Father, not made but begotten: We profess that the Holy Ghost is truly not created nor begotten, but proceeding from the Father and the Son. That our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, Son of God and creator of all things, begotten of the substance of the Father before the ages, *descended in the last time* for the redemption of the world from the Father, who never ceased to be with the Father, for He was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the holy glorious Mother of God the Virgin Mary, and was born of her, but only the Lord Jesus Christ; alone of the Holy Trinity, *perfect* in soul and flesh, without sin, *taking man upon Him, remaining what He was, assuming what He was not:* Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, less than the Father as touching His Manhood; having in one person the characteristics of two natures; for two natures in Him, God and Man, not however two Sons and two Gods, but one and the same person in either nature, bearing His passion and death for our salvation: not in virtue of Godhead but in weakness of manhood. He descended into hell, that He might rescue the saints who were held there; and *having conquered the power of death He rose again,* was then taken up into heaven, is about to come in the future for judgment on quick and dead: *cleansed by* whose *death and blood* we *have attained* remission of sins, meet to be raised up by Him in the last day in that flesh in which we now live, and in that form in which the same Lord rose, about to receive *from Him some eternal life* for the deserts of their righteousness, others *for their sins sentence of eternal punishment.* This is the Faith of the Catholic Church; this confession we have preserved and hold: which whosoever shall have guarded most firmly shall have perpetual salvation.

In both cases the authors of this canon seem to have quoted written documents, and the proper sequence of numbers in the quotations of the *Quicumque* prove that the text quoted contained both parts of the Creed, and so far as the quotations enable us to discover, was identical with that which we use. It is interesting to note that clause 35 is omitted because the phrase of the Creed of Damasus, which is also the phrase of the *Te Deum*, has been preferred (*suscipiens hominem*). This, by the way, was a favourite phrase of Isidore, Archbishop of Seville, who presided over the Council.[1]

Swainson, looking in vain for a quotation of the *Quicumque* in Isidore's writings, concluded 'that it was not known to him, or, if known, it had no authority.' Loofs also thought it more probable that the Toledan Councils did not use the *Quicumque*.[2] But I am glad to find Dom Morin in full agreement with my argument that the quotations in this canon are indisputable,[3] and to argue from Isidore's silence elsewhere is absurd.[4]

It is unfortunate that we cannot trace the use of the *Quicumque* any further back in the Spanish Church, nor have we any clue as to the date when it became known in Spain. But it is best to say so.

Cæsarius of Arles

Some years ago, in a remarkable article contributed to the *Benedictine Review*,[5] Dom Morin suggested that Cæsarius, the famous Archbishop of Arles (A.D. 503-543), was probably the first witness to the *Quicumque*. He was at that time prepared to follow the opinions of the Benedictines of S. Maur, who, in their Appendix to the works of S. Augustine, ascribed the Pseudo-Augustinian Sermon 244 without hesitation to Cæsarius. Unfortunately, he has come to the conclusion, in which he

[1] *De Eccles. Offic.* ii. 24. [2] *Op. cit.* p. 235.
[3] Real-Encycl., *Art. Athanasianum.*
[4] For further statement of this argument, see my *Introduction*, p. 155.
[5] Rev. Bénéd., Oct. 1901. *Le symbole d'Athanase et son premier témoin, S. Césaire d'Arles.*

is supported by Dr. W. Bergmann, that the authenticity of this sermon is doubtful.

The sermon is found in more than one form, in only one of which it begins:—

1 'I ask and admonish you, dearly beloved brethren, that
(42) *whosoever willeth to be saved* should learn *the right and Catholic faith, hold it firmly*, and preserve it *undefiled*. Accordingly, it behoves each one to take care that he believes the Father, that he believes the Son, that he believes the
15 Holy Ghost. *The Father is God, the Son is God, and the*
16 *Holy Ghost is God; but nevertheless not three Gods, but one*
7 *God. Such as the Father such is the Son, such also the Holy Ghost.* Nevertheless, let each one of the faithful believe that
33 *the Son is equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and less than the Father as touching the manhood* of the flesh which He assumed from ours; in truth the Holy Ghost proceeding from both.'

From the seventh century this sermon has been combined with another, the first words of which are, *Hear the Exposition*, the authorship of which is unknown, and which contained parallels to the clauses 6, 13, 15, 16, 31, 40.

Now I do not hide from myself the great importance of the fact that the Sermon 244 is not included in any recognised collection of Cæsarian sermons, or indeed in any collection the origin of which can be traced to Arles. There are phrases in it which might have come from the pen of Cæsarius, others, which in the opinion of Morin could not, though I am bound to say that merely grammatical errors might be due to a copyist.[1] For the present, however, we must give up the idea of Cæsarian authorship. But this conclusion by no means abolishes the sermon, which we must still consider as a sixth century quotation, even though its authorship is unknown.

Nor are we compelled to give up the idea that Cæsarius quoted the *Quicumque*. We have still to take into account what Dom Morin calls 'the remarkable similarity

[1] Dom Morin's judgment is supported by that of Dr. W. Bergmann, who has made a special study of South Gallican Sermon Literature.

in thought, expression, and rhythm, which is the result of a minute comparison between the smallest linguistic characteristics of the *Quicumque*, and that which remains to us of S. Cæsarius.' In his first article he quoted parallels which cannot be reproduced here. He had the advantage of referring to unpublished tracts and texts which he is preparing for his future edition of Cæsarius. But we cannot get away from the conclusion, which commended itself to Professor P. Lejay and Mr. Turner, that the question of quotation by Cæsarius has been settled. While M. Lejay was led on to the conclusion that the Creed is a composition of Cæsarius, Mr. Turner suggested that the parallels, without establishing a proof properly so called as to the identity of the author, gave Morin's hypothesis the right to occupy the ground until it was replaced by a better.

We may add that although the Sermon 244 does not occur in collections of Cæsarian sermons, the Creed itself does occur in conjunction with such a collection in the well-known Freising MS., now at Munich (*Cod. lat.* 6298) of the eighth century; also in another Munich MS. which contains the xlii. *Admonitions* of Cæsarius (*Cod. lat.* 6344). And this must be set off against Dom Morin's argument that we do not find the Creed in any collection of Canons which have any definite link with the archives of the Church at Arles.

It is very unsatisfactory to leave the question unsettled like this. It is impossible to quote all the parallels which made so strong an impression on the mind of Dom Morin nine years ago, but I am glad to find that, having passed through a phase of scepticism as to his former conclusions, he has returned to something akin to them. On my mind the impression remains, and in the absence of any proof that Cæsarius wrote the Creed, I am encouraged to resume my opinion that it had been taught him from his early years, and came as naturally to his lips as the phrases of our Church Catechism rise to our lips.

Anonymous Sermons of the Sixth and Seventh Centuries

As I said before, the Sermon 244 is not emptied of its importance if it is cut out of the literary remains of Cæsarius. It takes its place in another list which is growing slowly, and can only be handled with caution, because the dates given are after all provisional, but they establish a presumption that the Creed quoted in each of the sermons is of greater antiquity than say 500 A.D., when Cæsarius was at the height of his influence.

The list begins with the famous Trèves fragment (*Paris lat.* 3836), which I have described (p. 9). It is probably a sixth century sermon, possibly from the pen of Nicetius of Trèves. There is a sermon, which Morin found in a Colmar MS. (39), formerly belonging to Murbach.

A Sermon to Candidates for Baptism at Rouen (A. 214) has the same beginning as the Sermon 244, and must have some literary connection with it.

There is the *Holy Homily* published by Elmenhorst in 1614, which Kattenbusch has put back to the sixth century, but Morin prefers to regard it as a compilation of the eighth century. An instruction to the people in the style of Martin of Braga and Priminius in MSS. at Munich (Clm 6330), and Cassel (Theology, 40, 24), quotes clauses 40, 41.

Allocutions on the Catholic faith in a Vienne MS. of the eleventh century contain many quotations of the *Quicumque* in the midst of materials gathered from Arnobius the Younger, Cæsarius, and others.

To these I may add another sermon in a Munich MS. 14,508 (*saec.* x.), and as I said above Ps. Aug. Sermon 244 in both its forms, is almost as important, apart from the name of Cæsarius, as when attached to it.

At this point we have to leave the track which any definite quotation makes for us, and risk our steps on the shifting sands of speculation.

Possible Quotations of the Fifth Century

Dom Morin is astonished that I find it hard to surrender a sentence or two in the writings of Avitus, Bishop of

Vienne, 490-523. They are as follows—in a work on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit he quotes clause 23, 'whom we read of as neither made, nor begotten, nor created.' Again: 'As it is characteristic of the Holy Ghost to proceed from the Father and the Son, the Catholic Faith, although it has not persuaded gainsayers, nevertheless has not gone beyond that statement in its rule of discipline.' There are parallels to this clause in Fragment xii. of a Dialogue against Gundobad, and in Fragment xviii. to clauses 3, 4, as in a fragment against the Arians to clause 34.

Dom Morin may say that these are not sufficiently plain quotations. But the fact remains that no other creed-form is known to us which Avitus could be supposed to refer to, and his word 'read' shows that he was not speaking of general opinions about Catholic Faith but of some definite statement of it.

Behind Avitus we come to writers of the great monastery of Lerins, to which Cæsarius went as a boy, although his stay was short.

In the writings of Faustus, Bishop of Riez, whose ability as a theologian has been overshadowed by his Semi-Pelagianism, there are many parallels to the thought of the *Quicumque*, yet none which constrains us to say this must be a quotation. They would lose their force if translated, and must be studied in the original.[1]

The parallels in the *Warning against Heresies* by Vincentius, sometime a fellow monk of Faustus, are striking, and have led several writers, especially Antelmi and Ommanney, to suggest him as the author. For example, Vincentius teaches clearly: 'Because, forsooth, there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost, but nevertheless of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost there is not another, and another but one and the same nature.'[2] The parallel to clause 3, 4 is obvious, and it is noteworthy that Faustus has the same thought in his mind when he distinguishes Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the characteristic of the person as another (*alter*).[3]

[1] See my *Introduction*, p. 299.
[2] c. 19.
[3] *De Spu. Sco.* i.

But the parallels in Vincentius to the teaching on the Incarnation are many of them strongly anti-Nestorian, and he appears to give the very phrases of the *Quicumque* a turn to guard against Nestorian teaching about two Sons of God. Thus, in a parallel to clause 31, he writes '*The same* begotten of the Father before the world, *the same* born of His Mother in the world.'

The parallels are indeed 'close enough to warrant the conjecture that there is some relation between them and the Creed, and it is easier to believe that Vincentius used the Creed, than that any one in a subsequent generation or century, of less exact scholarship, picked out his phrases and wove them into a document of this kind.'[1] We must remember also that if Vincentius was quoting, he would not think of the *Quicumque* as an important document in the sense in which he regarded as important the letter of S. Capreolus, which was read at the Council of Ephesus, to which he refers in c. 42. If he had written it himself he regarded its phrases as now in need of sharpening against the new Nestorian error. If not, we have no means of judging to what extent it was commended to him by regard for the author, or only by its intrinsic merits.

A more important question lies behind that of the parallels in S. Augustine and S. Ambrose. We have to deal with a certain moment in the history of theological terms, when Arianism had been almost universally condemned, and no one could foretell its return to influence through the victories of the Goths. The common sense of the Church was busy at work on certain formulas which experience taught men they might safely employ in speaking of the Holy Trinity. The following quotation from S. Augustine appears to refer to such common talk rather than any formulary: 'But in this matter (*i.e.* the Catholic faith) some are disturbed when they hear that the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet they are not three Gods but one God.' In the pages that followed he did more than any one to vindicate such teaching.

[1] *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 135.

The recent work of Brewer shows that, to a far greater extent than was supposed, such parallels had already found expression in the teaching of S. Ambrose, to whom S. Augustine owed so much. These have been neglected hitherto, and our thanks are due to Dr. Brewer[1] for his work, even if we are unable to follow the argument by which he endeavours to prove that S. Ambrose was the author. From my point of view the parallels do not go so far as S. Augustine's work *On the Trinity*, and his *Enchiridion*, which were probably known to the writer of the *Quicumque*. But the important inference from the parallels in S. Ambrose is this. They show that all the elements for the construction of the theology of the *Quicumque* were in the possession of the common mind of Church teachers just at the time when Apollinarianism had been officially condemned, and also Priscillian, whose heresy on the Incarnation tended towards Apollinarianism as his teaching on the Trinity towards Sabellianism.

The Internal Evidence of the 'Quicumque'

As regards the teaching on the Trinity the argument of Dr. Waterland still holds good, that in strength and acuteness it compares very favourably with similar teaching of the latter part of the fifth century as given, *e.g.*, by Fulgentius. Dr. Waterland had not before him the evidence as to Priscillianism which is so exactly met.

But the teaching on the Incarnation gives better promise of fixing, if not a date, at any rate a movement in the logical development of thought.

Dom Morin makes merry over the old method which Waterland followed when he called attention to the absence of phrases found useful against Nestorius: 'There is not a word of the Mother of God, or of one Son only, in opposition to two sons, or of God's being born, suffering, dying: which kind of expressions the

[1] Brewer: *Das sogenannte Athanasianische Glaubensbekenntnis: ein Werk des heiligen Ambrosius.* Paderborn, 1909.

Creeds are full of after Nestorius's times, and after the Council of Ephesus.'[1]

Morin suggests that the title 'Mother of God' only appears in western formularies under special circumstances, *e.g.* in the *Constitution* of Pope Vigilius, and in the Profession of Faith of Pelagius I., but is absent from the great majority of other documents analogous to the *Quicumque*, from the Libellus of the Spanish Bishop Pastor in the middle of the fifth century to the Profession of Faith of Gregory the Great, *c.* 600. There is the same lack of insistence on the term 'only Son of God,' which, though found in the Retractation of Leporius, *c.* 418, is sought in vain in the other expositions of the faith, even after the condemnation of Nestorius. He even goes so far as to call it impertinence to demand that the author of the *Quicumque* should say absolutely everything that must be said, and that with all the precision imaginable. He then indignantly applies the same method of reasoning to Waterland's arguments in regard of the illustration from the constitution of man in clause 37, which was misused by Eutychians, so that some Catholic writers became shy of using it. Here Dom Morin makes a good point with a list of writers. Faustus of Riez, Mamertus Claudianus, Vigilius of Thapsus, John Maxentius, all continued to follow Augustine and Vincentius in using it despite the rise of Eutychianism. I have no doubt that Dom Morin is right in this instance, and that we shall have to drop using this as an argument for the early date of the *Quicumque*. But I do not think that he is quite fair to the preceding argument, in that neither Waterland nor any one else suggested that the author should have put in all these points against Nestorianism if the heresy had arisen. That would be impertinence indeed. But inasmuch as none of them occurs, it seems clear that the heresy did not loom on the horizon.

After all, the main gist of my argument is that the points raised are all anti-Apollinarian, the careful teaching on the two natures as whole and complete, the guarding against any idea of the conversion of the

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 149.

Godhead into flesh, and the insistence on the idea of 'one Christ,' one person in two natures, as against heretical misrepresentations of Catholic teaching. I repeat that it is precisely what was wanted to counteract Priscillian's teaching of Christ our God. And yet it is not written from a controversial, polemical standpoint, like the Spanish decrees. It is constructive in thought, written in a calm atmosphere, with regard to rhythm and style.

In this argument I am glad to claim the support of Mr. Bethune Baker, who writes on the whole section, verses 32-39. 'Let us see (1) what is opposed, (2) what is maintained. (1) Opposed is conversion of divinity into flesh, and confusion of substance which means "confusion of God and man," as passages in Vincent and Augustine clearly shew. To these charges Nestorius was certainly not open. Apollinarians as certainly were, in their desire to avoid the risk of a double personality. (2) Maintained is the completeness of the Godhead and of the manhood (the former being in substance the same as the Father's, the latter in substance the same as His Mother's), and the assumption of humanity into God, in such a way that there are not two persons, but one; that one being both God and man.

'That is to say, we may recognise to the full the two natures (though it is the inclusive term *substantia* that is used), without fear that by so doing we shall be involved in recognition of a double personality.

'There is nothing here that would hit Nestorians. The completeness of the humanity (as well as of the divinity) was a cardinal tenet with them, and they at any rate did not raise the difficulty of the union of the two substances in a single person.

'The real aim of the creed is to uphold (1) two complete substances, (2) united in one person. This is exactly what we should expect from an opponent of Apollinarianism; and the incidental phrases "of the substance of his mother," "born in the world," "of a reasoning soul and human flesh," and the reference later on in the Creed to the Descent into Hell, on which much stress is laid by writers against Apollinarius, favour the conclusion that the composition of the Creed may be assigned with the

greatest probability to the period during which Apollinarianism was rife, preceding the outbreak of Nestorianism in 428 A.D.'[1]

Theories of Authorship

It may seem needless to discuss any theories of authorship in view of Dom Morin's outspoken and very trenchant criticism. But the last word has not yet been spoken on the subject, and in the meantime we must retrace our steps over the familiar ground.

As I understand the drift of Dom Morin's argument, the style of the *Quicumque* points to some unknown later writer of the school of encyclopædists like Isidore, rather than a vigorous writer like Faustus. Opinions will always vary as to a point of this kind, but the distinction of the style of the *Quicumque* is so marked that I cannot look for it later than the fifth century. Cæsarius was in closer touch than Isidore with the culture of the past, when there was a living tradition, so to speak, not mere academic imitations. Cæsarius had known men like Faustus of the School of Lerins, living on in ripe old age while the rising tide of barbarism threatened to engulf art and learning. While I cannot believe that any writer of the sixth or seventh century could have written it except Cæsarius himself, I am still of opinion that further evidence is needed to prove that he wrote it, which can overrule the strong impression that it was known to Avitus and Vincentius before his time.

Of other possible authors I must name first Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, whose claim to consideration has been too often ignored. There is no doubt that he wrote an apology for his faith on the lines of the *Quicumque*, and on anti-Apollinarian lines too, but the evidence is too fragmentary to create a satisfactory argument.

The claims of Vincentius have been put forward very ably by Mr. Ommanney, but they depend entirely on the assumption that he is quoting the *Quicumque* in all the parallel passages of his *Warning against Heresies*, and

[1] *Introduction to Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 253. Methuen, 1903.

that is no proof of authorship. His style is more diffuse and abounds in poetic similies, whereas the *Quicumque* represents rather the grammar than the poetry of theology.

In spite of all that has been written against it, I still venture to put forward the name of Honoratus, the founder of Lerins, afterwards Archbishop of Arles. The attraction of his character, his force and ability, manifest in drawing round him such a wonderful group of men as the first monks of Lerins were without question, proves that in him we have before us one of the master minds of the age. The story has been often told, but it bears repetition, how there came to that island home men grown grey in public service, lawyers, men of affairs, men like Honoratus, himself of noble birth yet content to surrender wealth and position, if they might share the happiness of a simple life hid with Christ in God. But they did not hide their light under a bushel; fortified by prayer and meditation, many of them came out again to be leaders of the Gallican Church. Honoratus set the example, and was followed by his pupil Hilary in the see of Arles. Eucherius, who with his wife and family lived on a neighbouring island, yet shared their discipline and their hope, became, as Bishop of Lyons, in the opinion of a great thinker of the day, Mamertus Claudianus, one of the greatest of the great Bishops of his age. Lupus, as Bishop of Troyes, won distinction by persuading Attila, the dreaded Hun, to spare his city, and when he visited Britain to combat the heresy of Pelagius, won an extraordinary success by his learning and eloquence. Faustus, Bishop of Riez, though suspected as a semi-Pelagian, is coming now to his own as a theologian of rare capacity.

Bare as this summary is, it speaks plainly of Hilary's personal influence, and we know from Faustus and Hilary what careful instructions Honoratus used to give to his brethren, precisely on the lines laid down in the *Quicumque*. In their memorial sermons they speak with one voice.

Hilary writes:—

'A daily witness wert thou, moreover, in thy most sincere dis-

courses of the confession of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; nor, surely, has any one treated so emphatically, so clearly of the Trinity of the Godhead, since thou didst distinguish the Persons therein, and yet didst associate them in eternity and majesty of glory.'

Faustus writes :—

'Therefore, beloved, that we may gain that which he has obtained, let us first follow that which he taught; and first of all, let us hold the right faith: let us believe Father and Son and Holy Ghost (to be) one God. For where there is unity there cannot be inequality: and since the Son, because He is God, is perfect, complete, and full, that fulness cannot certainly be described as "less."'

I do not of course maintain that these references to the Instructions of Honoratus prove that he was the author of the *Quicumque*, but they are worthy of consideration if on other grounds the date of the composition is put back behind 450 A.D.

Dom Morin held for a time that Martin of Braga might have been the author. It is unlikely that the *Quicumque* can have had a Gallican origin if its date is later than 580 A.D. The conditions of culture in Gaul preclude such an idea, whereas in Spain Martin of Braga, who kept up a correspondence both with Gregory of Tours and Fortunatus of Poitiers, kept up also an excellent Latin style Dom Morin quoted a passage, which seemed to him to prove that Martin was capable of composing the *Quicumque*.[1] But he did not quote a single passage in which there is anything like a parallel to the thought of the Creed,

[1] *De formula honestae uitae.* Lauda parce, uitupera parcius. Nam similiter est reprehensibilis nimia laudatio, ut immoderata uituperatio; illa siquidem adulatione, ista malignitate suspecta habetur. Testimonium ueritati, non amicitiae reddas. Cum consideratione promitte: plenius quam promiseris praesta. Si prudens fuerit animus tuus, tribus temporibus dispensetur: praesentia ordina, futura praeuide, praeterita recordare. Nam qui praesentia non cogitat, obliuiosus et fatuus apellatur; qui nil de praeterito cogitat, perdit uitam; qui nil de futuro praemeditatur, in omnia incautus incidit . . . Prudens numquam marcet otio; aliquando animum remissum habet, numquam solutum: accelerat tarda, perplexa expedit, dura mollit, exaequat ardua . . . cunctus esto benignus, nemini blandus, paucis familiaris, omnibus aequus.

such as we find in the writings of Cæsarius. Discussion therefore of the two styles of Martin, the rustic, in which he wrote his popular sermons, and the classical, in which he discoursed learnedly on ethics, is beside the point. We should certainly like to find the *Rule of faith and of holy religion* with which he is credited by Isidore of Seville. But with his usual candour, Dom Morin gave us reasons for asserting that it is not likely to correspond to the *Quicumque*, because Martin never uses the expression 'without doubt' of verse 2; for *quicumque* he always uses *quisquis*, and in his teaching on the Resurrection inserts in his creed the word *alive* (*vivus*), which has no parallel in the *Quicumque*.

The one argument which I think must be more fully investigated is that based on the Spanish origin of documents similar to the *Quicumque*, of which Dr. Künstle also has made much.

The famous *Libellus Fidei*, sometimes known as the 'Faith of Phoebadius,' and in another form as the 'Faith of Damasus,' in which it was quoted by the Toledan Council of 633, has been traced by Dom Wilmart to the pen of Gregory of Elvira. The strange work *On the Trinity*, attributed to Athanasius, Vigilius of Thapsus, and others, had considerable influence on the development of Trinitarian teaching, also dates from the fifth century and is of Spanish origin. To the same movement of thought are attached the *Libellus in modum Symboli* of Pastor, and the *Regulae definitionum* of Syagrius, two Gallican Bishops of the fifth century. A century later Ps. Ambrosius, compiler of the *Tractatus de Trinitate*, is a Spanish writer, and Dom Morin is tempted to refer to Spain the *Contra Varimadum* of *Idatius Clarus* (Ps. Vigilius), and perhaps the *Breviarium fidei adversos hereticos*. There is much more spade work to do in the editing of these anonymous formularies, but we may grant, without prejudice, that they are of Spanish origin, and make it possible to believe that the *Quicumque* also is Spanish.

Dom Morin ventured, however, upon a dangerous argument when he inferred a Spanish origin for the *Quicumque* from the fact that it is quoted side by side with Spanish

writings in an important series of MSS. Mere juxtaposition with the writings of Isidore of Seville and Martin of Braga does not prove anything apart from evidence that the whole collection comes from Spain. Not one of these MSS. was actually written in Spain. The Ambrosian MS. O. 212 *Sup.* of the seventh or eighth century was written in Bobbio, and includes a book of Gennadius as well as Spanish documents. The S. Petersburg MS. Q. I. 15 is from Péronne, and the fact that works of Isidore follow does not prove that the monks got the *Quicumque* from Spain. The Karlsruhe MS. ccxxix. contains works by Isidore and Martin of Braga, and the Freising MS. at Munich (eighth century), *Cod. lat.* 6330, contains works of Isidore and of Gregory of Elvira, but there is nothing in either case to prove that the whole collection is Spanish!

The collections of Canons, at the head of which the *Quicumque* figures, those of S. Maur and Héroval, contain, it is true, some Spanish Canons, but not in immediate proximity to the *Quicumque* so as to suggest that it came from a similar source.

Dom Morin could not show us a single MS. written in Spain to back his argument. If the famous Benedictine Missionary Priminius was a Spaniard, this calls attention to the appearance of the *Quicumque* in the *Homilarium* of Freising (Clm. 6298, eighth century), and the Collection of Canons of Lorsch (*Vatic. Palat. lat.* 574, *s.* viii. ix.), along the route of Priminius and his friends, who spread the knowledge of the Creed at the end of the Merovingian period. I am grateful to Dom Morin for forcing us to weigh all such possibilities.

Although he has definitely abandoned his theory that Martin of Braga may have been the author,[1] his vigorous criticism has done good by helping us to study the whole problem from a new point of view, and the following sentences admirably express both the literary merit of the Creed and the inference that the author lived in touch with classical traditions:—

[1] Cf. an article in the *Guardian* of Oct. 27, 1911, in which I have discussed further details.

'This uninterrupted succession of compact propositions, this arranging in line of simple lucid formulas, almost dry in their majestic severity, which exclude all superfluous oratory and nevertheless are set so harmoniously in a rhythm full of charm; there is something artistic as well as authoritative about the whole combination, in which we recognise the master, admirably in touch with doctrinal tradition, but also accustomed to live in contact with the classics, and fashioning naturally on their lines the mould in which he shall throw the quintessence of his work.'

PART II.—THE TEACHING

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY

BEFORE we can rightly understand the balanced antitheses of the Athanasian Creed, before we can use the fourth Invocation of our Litany with true enlightenment, we must form a clear conception of the development of the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity in the early centuries.

The Old Testament, though it does not 'prove' the doctrine of the Trinity, contains wonderful hints of the glory of the future Revelation in Christ. We may read our fuller knowledge into the 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' of the Angelic Anthem in Isaiah's Vision (Is. 6^3), for our own purpose in devotional reading. We may note that the personification of the Divine Wisdom in the Psalms, and in later books, *e.g.* the Apocrypha, prepared the way for Christian doctrine in the future. But we shrink from pressing the meaning in any case. S. John speaks of Isaiah as seeing the glory of Christ, and speaking of Him (Jn. 12^{41}). This fits in with early Christian teaching that all Theophanies of the Old Testament were manifestations of the Eternal Word, not expositions of His relationship to the Father. Isaiah probably had no definite idea of the distinctions in the Godhead, which could not be intelligibly taught until the Apostles, through their spokesman S. Peter, had confessed their belief in the Lord as the Son of God, and after the Re-

surrection had attained firm conviction that such belief would be the foundation truth of their teaching.

For Apologetic purposes it is best to leave the Gospels for the moment, and to turn first to S. Paul's admitted Epistles as the earliest Christian documents, which may be proved to support the teaching of the Baptismal Formula (Matt. 28 [19]), and to explain the teaching of the Lord about the Holy Spirit as recorded in the Gospel of S. John. In these Epistles we see belief in the Spirit as Guide and Teacher put to the test and justified in the ordinary intercourse of human life.

The early Christians were conscious that in their spiritual experience they were reconciled to God in Christ, were sanctified by the Holy Ghost, were guided day by day, as no prophet or psalmist of the Old Testament had ever been guided before them, by an inward voice, sympathetic, tender, inspiring, whom they delighted to name the Spirit of Jesus. This 'deep consciousness of a changeless will to bless' was impressed on their minds. But they had no time to explain its different aspects, or to co-ordinate them. Our Christian theology is the analysis of our experience, ours and theirs, but it needs time for development and still more time for expression. Indeed we may fairly sum up the whole course of development under the three words, Impressions, Analysis, Expression.

From this point of view the New Testament writers and the Apostolic Fathers belong to the first period, and supply mainly Impressions, although S. Paul's letters give us the first beginnings of Analysis. Thus in the Benediction of 2 Cor. 13[14]: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all,' he states the facts of Christian experience as to the working of the Blessed Trinity in our Redemption and Sanctification, so that the Father's love is manifested in the Lord's grace, and that grace is assured in the possession of the indwelling Spirit. But the deep thought of 1 Cor. 2[10f], when he writes of the relation of the Spirit to the Father as part of his belief in Divine self-consciousness, taken with the passage in which he teaches that it is the Spirit who

teaches us to confess Jesus as the Lord (1 Cor. 12[3]), abundantly proves that S. Paul had worked out for himself a theological theory, which, while it fitted in with the discourses recorded in St. John's Gospel, whether known to him or not, was precisely on the lines of later speculation. And we may be thankful that the great Apostle of the Gentiles, during his quiet years of meditation, had been enabled so far to analyse the content of the Revelation which so profoundly changed his life, before the years of active enterprise and missionary effort, which left him little time for such thought.

Along the same lines we may interpret the mysterious teaching of the Baptismal Formula (Matt. 28[19]) by the discourses in the Gospel of St. John. When our Lord says of Himself, 'I and the Father are one' (John 10[30]), we understand 'one in nature.' But it is only fair to admit that the Arian controversy cleared up the ideas of Christian men, and showed how useless is any partial explanation of the great mystery of the Divine side of our Lord's life. Not by deification of His Manhood, by any process of adoption by God or communication of infused grace through the Divine Spirit, did He become what we recognise as 'the mystery of godliness; He who was manifest in the flesh' (1 Tim. 4[16]).

So in regard of His relation to the Spirit, who proceeds from the Father through the Son. After Pentecost, full understanding came of the words, 'the Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father . . . shall bear witness of me' (Jn. 15[26]). Sent in the Son's name, He shall teach, 'shall guide into all the truth: for He shall not speak from Himself' (John 16[13]). The familiar words are as music in our ears, telling of One whom we rightly worship and glorify with the Father and the Son as of one substance, power, and majesty. But the main point is that we do not, either in our analysis or our expression, go beyond what was impressed on the hearts of the first Christians. For S. Paul's admitted Epistles stand behind the Gospel of S. John to prove the existence of these elements in the earliest teaching. With entire confidence, therefore, we come to the great

summary of the whole Revelation in S. John's First Epistle (4 9): 'God is love.' It is no doubt true to say that the context leads us only to meditate on the spiritual and moral relation in which God stands to men, that the Gospel is the teaching of love in action, before any question can be raised as to God's love in the mystery of His Being. Even if S. John cannot be said to refer explicitly to eternal distinctions within the Godhead, such distinctions must be implied in the Revelation of Love, which is antecedent to the work of Creation, and must include one who is loved with one who loves. As we shall see later, S. Augustine was justified (*de Trin.* vi. and viii.) in his argument that, if God is essentially Love, Divine Personality must be regarded as Triune.

The Apostolic Fathers do not carry us much further in the direction of explicit statement about the Divine Persons into whose Name they baptized, *i.e.* into union with God our Father through the Son in the Spirit. Clement of Rome sounds the note of S. Paul's Benediction: 'Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace?' (1 Cor. 46 6). Ignatius of Antioch develops teaching concerning the life and work of the Lord familiar to us in our historic faith, expressing his belief in the Father and the Son and the Spirit (*ad Magn.* 13) in the same order.

We may readily admit that Hermas, the Christian prophet of Rome, made some confusion between the Lord's Divine Nature, 'the eternal spirit through which He offered Himself without blemish to God' (Heb. 9 14), and the Holy Spirit who led Him to the Cross as to the wilderness (Luke 4 2). There are passages in which Hermas comes much nearer to the truth than when he implies such a confusion. But for our present purpose it is enough to point out that Hermas does not use the technical language of systematic theologians even of his own age, and must not be judged by the same standard.

During the controversies of the second and third centuries the work of Analysis began on a wider scale with reflection on the doctrine of God the Son, whom S. John's Gospel taught them to speak of as the Word

(Logos) with respect to His timeless and pre-existent life.

According to Justin Martyr Christians are really Monotheists, yet recognise the Deity in Christ. He speaks of the Logos in relation to God before Creation as numerically other (or distinct), and as 'being with the Father,' *i.e.* as an individual person. He is not the absolute God who is unoriginate. His Mission is to interpret the Father to men.

Conflict with Gnosticism led Irenæus much further. He laid stress on the eternal coexistence of the Logos with the Father, denied that He was ever 'made,' distinguishing creation from generation. But in regard of the relations between the Father and the Son, he could only say 'The Father is God revealing Himself, the Son is God revealed.' The Father is the invisible of the Son, the Son is the visible of the Father. He is one and the same Person, Jesus Christ, the Logos, the Son of God, who created the world, was born as man, and suffered and ascended into heaven still man as well as God. He uses characteristic metaphors also to express the relation of the Spirit to the Father and the Son. He calls the Son and the Spirit the two hands of God. The Son is His Word, the Spirit His Wisdom. 'Together they minister to the Father, as the hands and intellect minister to man, not as though created or external to the Life of God, but eternal as God Himself.'[1]

It was Theophilus of Antioch who first used the term Triad (Trinity) speaking of God and His Word and His Wisdom. He applied Philo's terms 'indwelling' and 'proceeding' to the Logos. Till the creation the Logos dwelt in God as His mind and intelligence. Then God begat Him as proceeding, firstborn of all creation, not Himself being made empty of the Logos but begetting the Logos and continually consorting with His Logos.

There was some danger in such speculation lest the Logos should be identified with the Father. The speculations of the Modalist Monarchians, as they are called, who thought of the Son and the Spirit only as temporary

[1] *Adv. Haer.* see iv. *praef.* and 14 and 34. Bethune Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 200 n.

aspects of the Father, brought the question to a clear issue. Is the Trinity only a series of changing aspects, as Sabellius taught then, and as Swedenborg taught in modern times?

There was need of advance in terminology through which to express the eternal distinctions in the unchanging Being of God. The terms Person and Substance, which afterwards became current coin in Western theology, were freely used by the African lawyer Tertullian. Through his training as a jurist he was led into some dangerous speculations. As in the doctrine of the Atonement, so in the doctrine of the Trinity, legal interpretations of such terms are apt to be misleading. If a Person (*persona*) in the eye of the law is one who possesses property, a corporation may be called a person, and a theory of fictitious personalities may be set up. Similarly, 'Substance' in law means property, as when we speak of a man of substance, meaning a man of fortune. There might be different kinds of 'substance,' each marked by special characteristics or 'properties.' So the description of the Divine existence would be—one substance shared by three persons in one condition. At the same time, since 'manhood' is a substance owned by all men as men, there is no confusion of thought in speaking of Christ, who is God and Man, as possessing the substance of Godhead and of Manhood while He is one Person.

Tertullian writes of 'the mystery of the providential order which arranged the unity in a trinity, setting in their order three—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—three, however, not in condition but in relation, and not in substance but in mode of existence, and not in power but in special characteristics; yes, rather of one substance and of one status and power, inasmuch as it is one God from whom these relations and modes and special characteristics are reckoned in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.'[1]

Tertullian's teaching has led Dr. Harnack to put forward his theory that dogmatic teaching on the Trinity has been built up on 'a theory of legal fictions' with no

[1] *Adv. Prax.* 2.

more foundation in fact than the conscienceless personality of a Joint-stock Company created by lawyers for legal purposes. This is an unfortunate analogy, and the argument is untrustworthy. Tertullian also employed the wider philosophical use of the terms 'person' and 'substance,' afterwards put to better account by Hilary of Poitiers. 'Substance is that which is.' 'A person is one who acts.' Thus in *Adv. Prax.* 12 Tertullian maintains, in regard to the Godhead, the substance in three (*sc.* 'persons') who together form the whole. 'The Son I derive from no other source but from the substance of the Father.' 'We say that the Son is produced from the Father, but not separated from Him. Thus the root produces the shrub, the spring the stream, and the sun the ray. The being of both is one and the same. That which proceeds is second to that from which it proceeds, and when you say 'second' you say that there are two. Thus he taught the distinct personality of the Son, without thought of subordination. He continues: 'The Spirit is third from God and the Son, just as the fruit which comes from the shrub is third from the root, and the river which flows from the stream is third from the spring, and the peak of the ray third from the sun.'[1]

It is obvious that Tertullian's language is open to criticism, but when theological language was in the making, it was no small achievement to move about thus easily in regions of thought not before realised. Later theologians were not misled but were able to sift Tertullian's speculations, and assimilated the thoughts which had approved themselves to the Christian consciousness.

For the next great step in analysis we must turn to the Christian Platonists of Alexandria. Clement raised 'the idea of the Logos, who is Christ, into the highest principle in the religious explanation of the world and in the exposition of Christianity.' He taught that the Logos was eternally with the Father, who never was without Him as Son. The being, which He has, is the same as the being of God the Father. One must assume, says Dr. Harnack, that the word *Homoousios*, 'of one

[1] *Adv. Prax.* 8.

essence,' was really familiar to Clement as a designation of the community of nature both with God and with men possessed by the Logos. The word was misused by heretics and fell into disfavour, so that it was a long time before its use in the Creed of the Nicene Council ceased to be opposed in certain schools of thought.

Clement's greater pupil Origen advanced to the thought of an Eternal Generation, the Son proceeding from the Father as the will from the mind, or the radiance from the light. It cannot be said that there was a time when the Son was not. Origen maintained His distinct personality, His essential Godhead, and His co-eternity with the Father, though he placed Him as an intermediary between God and the universe, and spoke of the unity of the Father and the Son as moral, and insisted on the Father's pre-eminence as the one source and fountain of Godhead in such terms as to lead many to emphasise unduly the subordination of the Son. He was the first to use the term God-Man to describe the unity in which the two natures are combined in Christ.

Origen's teaching brings us by an easy stage to the great controversy of the fourth century.

Arius and his friends were disciples of Lucius the Martyr in the school of Antioch, which, to say the least, minimised the Divine Glory of Christ, and expounded the Scriptures with a false literalism. The extreme lengths to which Alexandrine teachers had gone in allegorical teaching led inevitably to a reaction. But when Arius demanded that the mystery of the Incarnation should be rationalised by adherence to a cold, bare logic, when he asserted that the Son of God, because He is a Son, must have come into existence after His Father, when he argued that He is in some sense a created Being, holier than angels, fairer than all sons of men in moral excellence, good supremely, but not 'God of God' as sharing from all eternity the very Being of God, then the common-sense of the Church declared against him in terms which were adopted by the First Council of Nicæa, with only two dissentients. Their opinion was endorsed by subsequent Councils, and by the consentient voice of the whole Catholic Church, in the use of our Nicene

Creed. I say our Nicene Creed to distinguish it from the Creed of the First Nicene Council, because it represents a form of Baptismal Creed, probably of the Jerusalem Church, into which the most important phrases of that Council's Creed have been grafted. But we need not concern ourselves here with the details of the Arian Controversy or with the history of the Nicene Creed, on which I have written in another volume of this series.[1]

The most important of the phrases referred to was the ancient term *Homoousios*, '*of one essence* or *substance*,' which was brought out to meet the evasions of Arian theologians in spite of much uncertainty as to the question whether or not it had been put out of court by the condemnation of Paul of Samosata, who had probably used it in some unorthodox way. S. Athanasius was only a deacon at the Council of Nicæa, and it is not known what measure of influence he exercised in its deliberations. To the end he was loyal to it, or rather to the truth which it guarded. Thus, when men like Cyril of Jerusalem were prepared to come over to the Nicene position, he was willing to plead with them gently as to the use of their own term *Homoiousios*, 'of like substance,' as being true so far as it went, yet as not fully guarding against Arian mistakes. If any loophole is left for thinking of Christ as a created being, it is idolatry for us to worship Him. And for Athanasius not less than the author of the Athanasian Creed, 'The Catholic Faith is this—that we worship.' Faith is the root but devotion is the flower. Cut the root and the flower must wither. This metaphor suggests a reflection upon a phase of the Arian controversy which is often forgotten. The Catholics and the Arians used the same Scriptures, the same church buildings, the same Liturgies, the same hymns, though the pressure of controversy soon led to the composition of hymns of the day embodying the rival theologies; when strife waxed hot rival congregations grew up which alternately appropriated churches to their exclusive use until the year 381, when a decree of the Emperor Theodosius began: 'Let the heretics possess no place

[1] *The Nicene Creed.* Rivingtons.

for celebrating their mysteries.' The decree became of course a dead letter when Arian Goths successfully invaded the Western Empire. But whenever Arianism was raised to power it failed utterly through 'the incurable defect of its method.' In plain words, it proposed worship which was no better than idolatry. As Professor Gwatkin has so clearly shown: 'Arianism was an illogical compromise. It went too far for heathenism, not far enough for Christianity. It conceded Christian worship to the Lord, though it made Him no better than a heathen demigod.'[1]

The history of the decaying inspiration of Arian hymns and prayers is as yet an unwritten chapter of general Church History, partly because the materials have not been collected, partly because the importance of the subject has not been recognised. Yet such a study could scarcely fail to prove illuminating when one considers on the one hand the perennial freshness and beauty of thought in the great hymn *Te Deum laudamus*, which comes to us from the close of the Arian Controversy, and on the other the religious failure of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, despite the extraordinary genius of the poet, as due to the Arianising tendency of his theology.

To return to S. Athanasius. The main difficulty which confronted him when he tried to express the teaching of the Church on the Trinity in Unity was this, that he had no word to express Personality. When he came to explain the relations of the Divine Persons he could only say ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος. But according to the phraseology of the Nicene Council ὑπόστασις (*hypostasis*) substance = οὐσία (*ousia*) being, and he dared not use the term πρόσωπον (*prosopon*) aspect, as savouring of Sabellianism.

The word οὐσία (*ousia*) expresses primarily real existence, actual being. Plato's Ideas are the realities as contrasted with appearances on earth. Each class of things has its particular οὐσία = idea. But it was Aristotle who fixed for later times the usages of the word. To him, beside the meaning possessions, property (= Lat. *substantia*), it expressed real, concrete existence.

[1] *Studies of Arianism*, p. 273.

It may be used of the whole entity, or of the matter, or the form of which every perceptible substance is conceived by Aristotle as consisting. Or it may be used = φύσις, nature, the sum-total of the attributes.

ὑπόστασις (*hypostasis*) is a later word and rare. It meant literally 'a standing beneath,' *i.e.* of the action of subsiding, or that which remains as the result, a sediment. But by philosophers it was used as an equivalent for οὐσία, expressing the essential substratum, foundation of a thing = vehicle of all its qualities. Origen tried to distinguish οὐσία (*ousia*) from ὑπόστασις (*hypostasis*), but the use of *hypostasis* as the equivalent of *ousia* stood firm. As the Arian controversy proceeded some theologians distinguished *ousia* as expressing existence or essence or substantial entity of the Trinity as God, and *hypostasis* as expressing the existence in a particular mode, the manner of being of the Three Persons. The Cappadocian Fathers, Basil and the Gregories, were active in securing currency for this use. So the terms passed together into Catholic use.

πρόσωπον (*prosopon*) in the New Testament means presence, or outward show, or character. In 2 Cor. 4^6 S. Paul uses it of Christ, 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,' where it is almost like the use of the Latin word *persona* = an actor's mask. But the word was spoilt by Sabellian misuse, though, like *persona*, it was just the word that was wanted to express permanent personality attached to the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and properly safeguarded that personality.

As a matter of fact, a distinct advance in the study of psychology was needed before terms could be settled. Thus it is that the influence of S. Augustine has been so marked and so beneficial in the history of Christian doctrine. Led on in his strivings after self-knowledge, of which he has given us so vivid a record in his *Confessions*, he was called to analyse the mystery of his own triune personality and illustrate it with psychological metaphors. Then it became possible to use the term *persona*, person, and mean by it permanent personality without danger. So that we may even say, paradoxical

as it may seem, that the Athanasian Creed, which owes so much to the influence of S. Augustine, is not the mere outcome of subtle metaphysical speculation that it is often asserted to be, but represents the advent of Psychology to aid Theology when Metaphysics could do no more. And this is a point which should interest the present generation, so prone as they are to complain of metaphysical subleties in the Creeds, which modern Psychology is to brush away like cobwebs! The fact is that S. Augustine's *Confessions* are coming to be regarded in their true light as one of the few epoch-making books in the history of human thought.

Before we study the *Confessions*, however, we must turn to another writer, S. Hilary of Poitiers, to find the connecting link between the teaching of S. Athanasius and the teaching of S. Augustine on the triune Personality of God.

S. Hilary of Poitiers.

S. Hilary of Poitiers came to Christian belief from philosophic paganism late in life. He was a man trained in affairs, steeped in the culture of his age. He accepted the teaching of the Old Testament because he found in the Revelation of God to Moses at the Burning Bush, when the Name '*I am that I am*' was spoken, just what his mind craved for of belief in one almighty Creator and Preserver of the universe. Then in the first chapter of S. John's Gospel he was led on to believe that in the mystery of Divine Being God was not solitary, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God' (John 1[1]). His own account of his conversion by this line of study is one of the most interesting passages in early Christian literature. He became a Christian and even a Bishop before he heard of the Arian controversy.[1] He was at first suspicious of S. Athanasius, having heard garbled reports about his teaching, but he rejected Arian teaching by instinct as unworthy of a Christian regenerated by fellowship with the Trinity. He tells us that he had never heard the

[1] *De Syn.* 91.

first Nicene Creed until he was about to go into exile for the faith which it guarded. He concentrated all the powers of his mind upon the construction of a philosophy of religion which should offer a working hypothesis of pure thought in relation to the Baptismal Formula, '*into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*' (Matt. 28[29]). He spent some of the best years of his life working out his train of thought. His great work *On the Incarnation*, better known to us as his work *On the Trinity*, a solid attempt to build up a constructive argument on the foundation thought of Divine Self-Consciousness, the deep conviction that God the Father must find for the satisfaction of His eternal thought, not without but within Himself, the eternal object of His thought in the Eternal Word. It was S. Hilary's profound interpretation of the philosophical aspect of the Scriptural doctrine of Baptism 'into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' that justifies the speculation of the first part of the *Quicumque*. But it was his misfortune that he was more misquoted by Priscillian than he was quoted by any other writer in the next half century! Commenting on the words, *Believe, if only by My works, that the Father is in Me, and I in the Father* (John 10[38], cf. 14[11]), and again, *I and the Father are one* (John 10[30]), he writes:—

'If the names which correspond to realities, when intelligibly used, impart to us any true information, then He who is seen in Another by the eye of understanding is not different in nature from that Other; not different in kind, since He abides in the Father, and the Father in Him; not separate, since Both are One. Perceive their unity in the indivisibility of their nature, and apprehend the mystery of that indivisible nature by regarding the One as the mirror of the Other. But remember that He is the mirror, not as the image reflected by the splendour of a nature outside Himself, but as being a living nature, indistinguishable from the Father's living nature, derived wholly from the whole of His Father's, having the Father's in Him, because He is the Only-begotten, and abiding in the Father, because He is God.'[1]

S. Hilary used the terms *persona*, person, and *substantia*, substance, as one would expect, with a philosophical, not

[1] *De Trin.* ix. 69.

a legal trend of meaning. For him *persona* is one who acts, and *substantia* is that which exists. He was a great student of Origen, but owed more to his own reflections on the teaching of Holy Scripture than to any teacher.

Converted late in life from philosophic paganism, he brought to the service of the Church a well-trained mind, and a sincere and sympathetic spirit, in which he shrank from the perils of speculation. The following paragraphs may suffice to show how clearly he saw through Arianism, how profoundly he had meditated on the mystery of the Divine Name:—

'Certain teachers of our present day assert that the Image and Wisdom and Power of God was produced out of nothing and in time. They do this to save God, regarded as Father of the Son, from being lowered to the Son's level. They are fearful lest this birth of the Son from Him should deprive Him of His glory, and therefore come to God's rescue by styling His Son a creature made out of nothing, in order that God may live on in solitary perfection without a Son born of Himself and partaking His nature. What wonder that their doctrine of the Holy Ghost should be different from ours, when they presume to subject the Giver of that Holy Ghost to creation, and change, and non-existence. Thus do they destroy the consistency and completeness of the mystery of the faith. They break up the absolute unity of God by assigning differences of nature where all is clearly common to Each; they deny the Father by robbing the Son of his true Sonship; they deny the Holy Ghost in their blindness to the facts that we possess Him, and that Christ gave Him. They betray ill-trained souls to ruin by their boast of the logical perfection of their doctrine; they deceive their hearers by emptying terms of their meaning, though the Names remain to bear witness to the truth. . . .

'5. Their treason involves us in the difficult and dangerous position of having to make a definite pronouncement, beyond the statements of Scripture, upon this grave and abstruse matter. The Lord said that the nations were to be baptized *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* The words of the faith are clear; the heretics do their utmost to involve the meaning in doubt. We may not on this account add to the appointed form, yet we must set a limit to their license of interpretation. Since their malice, inspired by the devil's cruel cunning, empties the doctrine of its meaning while it retains the Names which convey the truth, we must emphasise the truth which these Names convey. We must proclaim, exactly as we shall find them in the words of Scripture, the majesty and functions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and so debar the heretics from

robbing those Names of their connotation of Divine character, and compel them, by means of these very Names, to confine their use of terms to their proper meaning. I cannot conceive what manner of mind our opponents have, who pervert the truth, darken the light, divide the indivisible, rend the scatheless, dissolve the perfect unity. It may seem to them a light thing to tear up Perfection, to make laws for Omnipotence, to limit Infinity; as for me, the task of answering them fills me with anxiety; my brain whirls, my intellect is stunned, my very words must be a confession, not that I am weak of utterance, but that I am dumb. Yet a wish to undertake the task forces itself upon me; it means withstanding the proud, guiding the wanderer, warning the ignorant. But the subject is inexhaustible; I can see no limit to my venture of speaking concerning God in terms more precise than He Himself has used. He has assigned the Names—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—which are our information of the Divine Nature. Words cannot express, or feeling embrace or reason apprehend, the results of enquiry carried further; all is ineffable, unattainable, incomprehensible. Language is exhausted by the magnitude of the theme, the splendour of its effulgence blinds the gazing eye, the intellect cannot compass its boundless extent. Still, under the necessity that is laid upon us, with a prayer for pardon to Him Whose attributes these are, we will venture, enquire, and speak; and moreover—it is the only promise that in so grave a matter we dare to make—we will accept whatever conclusion He shall indicate.'[1]

It would be easy to multiply quotations but these must suffice. The writings of S. Hilary have been sadly neglected, mainly because he wrote in a difficult Latin style, but the excellent translation published by Canon Watson and Mr. Pullan removes this hindrance. Let us note that not less than S. Athanasius and S. Augustine, S. Hilary bears witness to the fact that Church teachers of the Creed-making epoch did not claim a greater knowledge of God than S. Paul and S. John, because they used technical terms in which to formulate their knowledge. Advance in methods of analysis led naturally to wider modes of expression.

S. Hilary's teaching is so important because, in the first place, it had immense influence on the mind of S. Augustine, and also on Pope Leo. With the advent of barbarism it sank into oblivion, though we still find him quoted by Cyprian of Toulon at the beginning of the

[1] *De Trin.* ii. 4, 5.

fifth century. It was practically only through Augustine that he influenced the Middle Ages. Secondly, S. Hilary puts into our hands the key to the problem from the philosophical point of view. If the Unitarian tries to think out his intellectual position he finds it difficult to think of God as a lonely being with no object for His love or interest. In Dean Strong's words: 'How can this lonely solitary Being while away the endless years till the creation dawns upon it? The whole theory becomes repulsive, and the warmth of life which Pantheism brings becomes attractive. For Pantheism never leaves God alone. The world is always there, always expressing the will of the Spirit, from whose will it springs, or rather, whose will it perpetually represents. In one case, and as far as we know, one only, space is made to play the part of the object of the Divine activity. This is in Dr. Martineau's *Study of Religion*, Bk. ii. ch. i. We do not propose to discuss it at length, because we do not think that the theory as it stands is likely to be popular. We only mention it to illustrate the straits to which pure Theism is driven in its endeavour to avoid Pantheism and Deism alike.'[1]

S. Augustine

No one can properly understand S. Augustine's book *On the Trinity* who has not carefully studied his *Confessions*. His speculations were not mere essays in phrase-making, they were the outcome of acute mental distress. Who can listen unmoved to the cry, 'Thou hast made us for Thyself and our heart is restless until it find rest in Thee'? Therefore his *Confessions* has been truly called an epoch-making book. Its sincerity is transparent. We need not for a moment hesitate to trust the honesty of the intellectual conclusions to which the writer was so wonderfully led. Disappointment was his teacher. Unsatisfied by fleshly self-indulgence he tried Manicheism, but it could not explain the facts of his experience. Conscience, Intellect, Emotion, all rebelled against both teaching and teachers. Then he tried

[1] *Manual of Theology*, p. 195.

Platonism, probably through a Latin translation of the *Enneads* of Plotinus made by Victorinus Afer, whose conversion had a great influence on him, and who taught him subsequently to think of the Holy Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son.

From Plotinus Augustine learnt to think of God as a Spirit, immaterial, eternal, and unchangeable, as the Soul of souls and Life of lives. 'Yet further the Platonist taught him that this supreme Unity is one, as the human spirit is one, or even as the human body is one, not with the logical unity of absolute sameness, but with the real organic unity of life, with a unity which admits of differences, and of personal differences. Three such personal differences Plotinus admitted in the unity of the Divine—the Good, the Intelligence, and the Soul. The eternal Intelligence he called the Creator. All things exist by virtue of the divine thought or "word"; they are in so far as they answer to the divine purpose. How closely this teaching corresponds to the opening of St. John's Gospel Augustine himself points out (vii. 9)'. It is a great philosophy, and Augustine became an adept in it in the ecstasy in which (as he says), with the flash of one trembling glance, he arrived at that which is (vii. 17). But it did not satisfy him, because to the Platonist the truly divine, the truly personal, is the intellect alone. 'God is the great Geometer, eternally blessed in the contemplation of unclouded truth, but not the Father who loves or grieves over His children, not the Shepherd who calleth His own sheep by name.' Such a Deity may satisfy those calm impersonal spirits whose lives are shielded from moral evil. Augustine wanted 'not knowledge but deliverance.'[1]

The Platonist held that moral evil could be got rid of by moral discipline. It did not affect the personality: it was like weeds and shells clinging to a statue that has lain for long at the bottom of the sea. Cleanse off the rubbish and the statue is as beautiful as ever. But Augustine knew that sin is not merely ignorance, that emotion and will are also involved, for a perverted will

[1] Dr. Bigg's *The Confessions of Saint Augustine*, p. 21, Methuen, 1903.

taints emotion. He found deliverance in Christ. Like Pascal, he reached his conclusion by throwing his heart into the scales. He felt the attraction of the life of Christ, and the love of Christ in the characters of men like S. Ambrose. He longed to follow. At the supreme moment the voice of a little child bade him 'Take up and read.' He read and obeyed, he *put on the Lord Jesus Christ* (Rom. 13 [14]), and found in Him the key to all the problems of thought and life.

As Dr. Bigg shows, he had faced all the difficulties besetting the theory of knowledge. 'He says quite frankly that religious belief is not capable of proof, or not to all men.' His faith was built on the evidence of his own personality. 'He saw law and order in the world, and he took for granted that they flowed from a personality like his own.'[1] He was led from reflection on his own personality to a deeper insight into the mystery of Divine Personality. He was a ready pupil in the school of S. Hilary, who directed his thoughts away from the metaphysical arguments of Greek teachers to psychology.

S. Athanasius had no word for 'Person.' He could only say 'Another, and another, and another.' His followers are constrained to distinguish *hypostasis* (ὑπόστασις) from *ousia* (οὐσία), and speak of three subsistences in one essence, that is to say of a Trinity of eternal distinctions.

It is important to remember that Eastern theologians approached the problem from the point of view of the *Œconomic* Trinity, the Trinity of Divine Workers in Creation and Redemption. On the other hand Augustine, inspired by Hilary, led Western theologians to contemplate the *Immanent* Trinity, the Trinity of eternal relationships. The Greeks began with the Trinity and reconciled it as best they could with the Unity. 'Augustine affirmed that God is rigorously One, and took the consequences of his assertion. His difficulty is to avoid modalism, and explain the real plurality of the persons.'[2] Modalism is the theory that God is revealed under changing aspects as One Person who

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 25.

[2] Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, ii. p. 365.

appears now as Father, now as Son, now as Holy Ghost. Augustine, in reply, worked out a theory of *Relationships*.

'It is possible to predicate of God "according to substance — that is in respect to Himself (as good, great), or relatively—that is in respect to something not Himself (as Father in respect to the Son and Lord in respect to the Creature). Whatever is spoken of God "according to substance" is spoken of each person severally and together of the Trinity itself, which is rightly described as one essence, three hypostases or persons, though the term persons is only used for want of a better way of expressing the facts. "For indeed since the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Father, and the Holy Spirit, who is also called the Gift of God, is neither Father nor Son, they are certainly three." And so it is said in the plural, "I and my Father are one," for He did not say "is one," as the Sabellians say, but "are one." Yet when it is asked what the three are, human utterance is weighed down by deep poverty of speech. All the same, we say three "persons," not that we wish to say it, but that we may not be reduced to silence.'[1]

'The persons are not the Trinity, but the Trinity can be ca' ed also [the] Holy Spirit, because all three are God and Spirit and Holy. He is the Gift of both the Father and the Son, the communion of them both, called specially what they are called in common. This communion or unity or holiness which links each to the other is properly called love, for it is written "God is love." And herein may be seen how the Persons in the Deity are three and not more than three: One who loves Him who is from Himself, and One who loves Him from whom He is, and Love itself. And in this Trinity is the supreme source of all things, and the most perfect beauty and the most blessed delight.'[2]

Augustine delighted to analyse his own triune personality and illustrate it with psychological images. 'I exist and I am conscious that I exist, and I love the existence and the consciousness, and all this independently of any external influence.' Thus he carried on a step further S. Hilary's argument from Divine self-consciousness and applied it to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He drew from Victorinus the thought of the Holy Spirit as the bond of union, the co-eternal Love which unites the Father and the Son, and made it current coin, illustrating it in a variety of ways, and vindicating

[1] *De Trin.* v. 10.
[2] *Ibid.* vii. 24.

it as a true expression alike of present Christian experience and primitive Christian faith. 'Thus he rises,' writes Illingworth, 'to the thought of God, whose Triunity has nothing potential or unrealised about it; whose triune elements are eternally actualised, by no outward influence but from within, a Trinity in Unity.'[1]

This is the proper end of our enquiry if we may assign the *Quicumque* to the first half of the fifth century, when the new spirit, which S. Augustine brought into theological speculation, was still fresh and vigorous. With this understanding we can explain the genesis of the *Quicumque* in that period so far as its Trinitarian teaching is concerned. Even more important is the consideration that we are justified if we interpret this teaching in the light of the *Confessions* of S. Augustine as a theology in touch with the problems and difficulties of life. In the sixth century theology became more scholastic, a collection of statements supported by great names. As in a picture gallery we prefer to have an artist as our guide rather than a custodian who can only repeat the catalogue, so we feel that the teaching of our creed needs interpretation by the voice of a leader in the development of our Western theology rather than a mere student, who in the sixth century had but a small library to help him and no really great teacher. The name of Cæsarius of Arles must be excepted, because in the settlement of the Pelagian Controversy he showed himself a theologian of no mean ability. From this point of view he is a possible author of the *Quicumque*, and his claim should be duly considered. But as a theologian he is dependent on the teaching of his predecessors, and with him the early history of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is ended.

[1] *Personality, Human and Divine*, p. 74.

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

'THE Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ' is an abstract way of expressing the fundamental belief of Christians in all ages. It is an expansion of the primitive Creed, 'Jesus is the Lord,' just as the Prologue to S. John's Gospel is an expansion of the confession of faith with which S. Peter responded to the Lord's searching question, *But who say ye that I am? Thou art the Christ.* (Mark 8^{27}.)

When questions had been asked, By what authority did He claim to rule over the consciences of men, and the Gospel had been not only written, but deeply studied, the conviction shaped itself more and more clearly in the common mind of the Church that the only explanation of the great mystery of godliness was that expressed in the Apostolic words, 'God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit.' Flesh and blood may well shrink from the venture of faith to which we are led. But having made it we find ourselves in a land of uprightness, a higher region of spiritual experience, in which fine air invigorates us as we climb towards the likeness of Christ. If it were not so, the Church could not have survived the wounds which the teaching of faithless members has inflicted age after age. If it were not so, we could not ourselves endure to see our poor endeavour matched with our Lord's endurance and self sacrifice.

'O loving wisdom of our God!
When all was sin and shame,
A second Adam to the fight
And to the rescue came.'

The Word of God, who from the beginning was with God, 'of the substance of the Father,' sharing that is in all the attributes of the Godhead, uncreate, infinite, eternal, almighty, laid aside His glory and humbled Himself in taking our manhood upon Him, of the substance of His Mother, flesh of her flesh, fashioned by the power of the Holy Ghost, and uniting to it a reasoning mind, so that He grew with a truly human growth in wisdom as He grew in stature. 'The right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God is equally God and Man.' Because He is God He is merciful. *He knoweth whereof we are made. He remembereth that we are but dust* (Ps. 103[14]). Because He is Man He is exacting. He demands an allegiance which shall transcend all other calls of duty, shall transfigure all other relationships, so that the man or woman called to set His love above the love of any other, shall find in Him the love sacrificed raised as it were from the dead.

The strength of this argument is not impaired by any conclusion that recent Higher Criticism has succeeded in establishing, or is likely to establish. It can be based, if necessary, solely on the record of S. Mark's Gospel. But it is obvious that it can be supported with great advantage by quotations from S. Luke's Gospel, the authenticity of which may be regarded as beyond dispute. And, apart from the question of authorship, it brings welcome testimony to the theological value of the portraiture depicted in S. John's Gospel. Much of the recent discussion on the subject, 'Jesus or Christ,' seems, to one who has based his belief on this simple and steadfast foundation, beside the point. And, after all, argument is superficial which does not lead to the great venture of faith. Many faithful hearts feel that the mystery of the holy Incarnation is a subject for meditation rather than discussion. They are distressed by the use of technical terms, such as 'substance' and 'subsisting,' and the great daring of assertions such as 'inferior to the Father as touching His Manhood.' Let them remember the long experience of the Church in this matter. Our theology is the analysis of our experience,

and there is no doubt that, while experience worketh patience, for there is need to go over the ground again and again, patience thus exercised worketh hope, hope that the faith, so often verified by experience, maketh not ashamed of the doctrines eventually formulated by the Church, not ashamed of the technical terms used to guard against the return of ancient errors.

But it would be a mistake to assume that the term 'substance' was only of service in Anti-Arian polemics. It would be easy and, if space permitted, profitable to quote passages from many early writers who had begun to develop this line of teaching before the rise of Arianism. I must be content with a few.

Tertullian

Thus, in working out his doctrine of the Person of Christ, Tertullian, the great Apologist of the African Church, uses the expression 'two substances,' meaning that the one person Jesus Christ possesses both Godhead and Manhood. I will quote Mr. Bethune Baker's admirable summary: 'It is in describing the nature of the relation between the Son and the Father that he most loses sight of the legal sense of the term 'substance,'[1] and employs it to express a particular form of existence; which is, however, still regarded as concrete. 'The Son I derive from no other source but from the substance of the Father,'[2] where the substance of the Father is only an exegetical periphrasis for the Father Himself—His own being: so that he can use the single word, 'we say that the Son is produced (projected) from the Father, but not separated from Him.'[3] He who is emitted from the substance of the Father must of course be of that substance,[4] and there is no separation between the two. The Word is 'always in the Father . . . and always with God . . . and never separated from the Father or different from the Father.' He speaks, it is

[1] For some hint of the difficulties caused by this legal sense, see p. 48, *supra*.

[2] *Adv. Prax.* 4. [3] *Ibid.* 8. [4] *Ibid.* 7.

true, of the Father as being 'the whole substance,' while the Son is 'a derivation from, and portion of the whole,' and so 'made less' than the Father;[1] but his only purpose is to mark the distinction between them as real, and not as involving diversity between them or division of the one substance. The relation between them may be illustrated by human analogies. The root produces (emits) the shrub, the spring the stream, and the sun the ray. The former is in each case, as it were, the parent, and the latter the offspring: they are two things, but they are inseparably connected. The being of both is one and the same. That which proceeds, moreover, is second to that from which it proceeds, and when you say 'second,' you say that there are two. It is in order to mark clearly the distinct personality of the Son that he calls him 'second.' There is no suggestion or thought of subordination, in any other sense than in regard to origin, and even that is merged in the unity of substance.'[2]

Tertullian discusses further the relation between the spirit and the flesh in the constitution of the person of Jesus Christ. There was no transformation because God is unchangeable, there was no kind of mixture, because in Him both Godhead and Manhood retained their own characteristics. 'We see,' he says, 'the double status, the two not confused but conjoined in one person, God and man (Jesus) . . .' This is Christ. 'And the peculiar properties of each substance are preserved intact, so that in Him the spirit conducted its own affairs, that is the deeds of power and works and signs, . . . and the flesh underwent its sufferings, hungering in the instance of the Devil (the Temptation), thirsting in the instance of the Samaritan woman, weeping for Lazarus, sorrowful unto death; and finally it died.' As man He died, as Son of God He was immortal. 'It is not in respect of the Divine substance, but in respect of the human that we say He died.'[3]

[1] *Adv. Prax.* 11.
[2] *Introduction to Christian Doctrine*, p. 141.
[3] *Ibid.* 29, quoted by Bethune Baker, p. 144.

It is wonderful how Tertullian anticipated later developments of doctrine, how consonant his teaching is with that of the *Quicumque*. Surely it is these deep underlying correspondences which give us confidence, when we compare the thought of one age with another, to assert our belief that Truth is one, and that we are not adding to it when we draw out new meanings from the depths of unfathomable mystery which the Incarnation, believed in as a fact, involves.

Origen and S. Athanasius.

Passing on to Origen, we find that that great constructive thinker had large views on the fitness of the Incarnation and the importance of the recognition of the human soul through which the Divine Word was united with the man Christ Jesus. He was the first to use the term God-Man, and used the metaphor of iron glowing with fiery heat in which the fire and the metal are one, and yet the iron is not changed into anything else.[1] Thus the manhood by its union with the Godhead is glorified but does not cease to be manhood.

As the Bishop of Exeter has well said, 'To Origen, with all his Platonism, belongs the honour of enthroning the God of Love at the head and centre of a systematic theology. Yet the theology of the third century assimilated secondary results of Origen's system rather than his underlying idea. On the one hand was the rule of faith with the whole round of Christian life and worship, determining the religious instinct of the Church; on the other, the inability to formulate this instinct in a coherent system so long as the central problem was overlooked or inadequately dealt with.'[2]

Arianism attempted to solve the problem and failed. But when we come to the period of Arian controversy we find in operation what we may venture to call God's love of compensation. For all the mischief that is done by unbalanced argument, incautious and proud speculation, vehement insistence on bare logic, which is never

[1] Bethune Baker, *op. cit.* p. 150.
[2] A. Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. xxix.

a safe prop either of the mind or the heart, there is compensation through the heightened earnestness of those who are loyal to the faith of the Gospel, who on wings of faith and prayer rise to the height of some great argument, in which justice is done to both sides of a truth which cannot be confined within a syllogism. We may compare the quiet pondering on great mysteries, which is the characteristic beauty of the first treatise of S. Athanasius, with the quiet reflections of the grey-haired saint at the end of the long strife. The years of storm and stress have left their mark. He has been constrained to speak and write vehemently in the heat of his spirit, but as the day draws near when no man can work, a great peace settles down upon his soul. He knows in whom he has believed. Indeed, it is 'the Spirit of Jesus' that bids him hold out the olive branch of conciliation to the Semi-Arians, men like Cyril of Jerusalem, who have been timid about acceptance of technical terms such as 'substance,' while they were loyal to the truth. He counsels men 'not to fight about words to no useful purpose . . . but to argue in the spirit of piety.' At the same time, in view of new questions, he is careful to teach that the human nature of Christ is complete, not Body only, without a soul, nor without sense or intelligence.[1] So that we find S. Athanasius teaching in substance the whole doctrine of the two Natures as developed in the *Quicunque*.

In like manner S. Hilary of Poitiers writes of our Lord's words about confessing Him before men:—

'So said the Word made flesh; so taught the Man Jesus Christ, the Lord of majesty, constituted Mediator in His own person for the salvation of the Church, and being in that very mystery of mediatorship between men and God, Himself one Person, both Man and God. For He, being of two natures united for that mediatorship, is the full reality of each nature; while abiding in each, he is wanting in neither; He does not cease to be God because He becomes Man, nor fail to be Man because He remains for ever God.'[2]

'The use of the one word "form" to describe both natures

[1] *Letter to the Church of Antioch in* 362 A.D.
[2] *De Trin.* ix. 3.

compels us to recognise that He truly possessed both. He is in the *form* of a servant, Who is also in the *form* of God. And though He is the latter by His eternal nature, and the former in accordance with the Divine plan of grace, the word has its true significance equally in both cases, because He *is* both: as truly in the form of God as in the form of Man. Just as to take the form of a servant is none other than to be born a man, so to be in the form of God is none other than to be God: and we confess Him as one and the same Person, not by loss of the Godhead, but by assumption of the manhood.'[1]

S. Augustine also found great scope for his powers of illustration and analysis. I will quote from his works some parallels with the *Quicumque*:—

Cl. 31. Thus having taught that Christ Jesus the Son of God is both God and Man, he continues: 'God before all ages; Man in our age—one Son of God and the same Son of Man.'[2]

Cl. 33. 'Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, but less than the Father as touching His flesh, that is, as touching His manhood (*hominem*).'[3]

Cl. 34. 'Let us recognise the twin substance of Christ the Divine, forsooth, in which He is equal to the Father, the Human in which the Father is greater: but in either case He is not two at once but is one Christ.'[4]

Cl. 35. 'The Word was made flesh, flesh having been taken up by the Godhead, not by the Godhead having been changed into flesh.'[5]

Cl. 36. 'The same is God who is Man, and the same is Man who is God, not by confusion of nature, but by unity of person.'[6]

Cl. 37. 'For as reasoning soul and flesh is one man so God and Man is one Christ.'[7]

These typical quotations from S. Augustine prove that he came very near to the teaching of the *Quicumque* in his analysis of 'perfect Manhood.' He brought men to the edge of the position taken up in the Creed, but did

[1] *De Trin.* x. 22.
[2] *Enchiridion*, c. 35.
[3] *Ep.* 137.
[4] *In Johan. Tract.* 78, § 3.
[5] *Enchiridion*, c. 34.
[6] *Serm.* 186.
[7] *In Johan. Tract.* 78, § 3.

not overlap it, so that any one can plausibly argue that he knew it, or had written it.

We pass in the fifth century from the Nicene age to the Chalcedonian, that is, to an age which found its highwater mark of theological expression in the famous Definition of the Council of Chalcedon, which represents the final word of the Universal Church on the four great heresies—Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, and Eutychianism. They have been admirably summarised in the following paragraphs of Bishop Gore's Bampton Lectures:—

'The first division, as against Arius, assigned to Christ as Son of God the epithet ὁμοούσιος, 'of one substance with the Father.' Arius' conception of Christ, whatever the intellectual motives which produced it, assigned to Him in effect the position of a demi-god. Current non-Christian beliefs, popular and philosophical, had made men familiar with the notion of intermediate beings, the objects of religious worship, who represented on a lower plane something greater and more eternal behind themselves. In particular, philosophical paganism had given currency to the notion of a mediating Mind, which stood halfway between the material world and the absolute and unknowable God. On this model Arius moulded his conception of Christ: a Christ whom men were to worship and treat as God, while all the time He only represented God, and was not God, but was in fact a creature, though the supreme creature, and if older than all others, yet not eternal nor really belonging to the being of God. Observe then that in repudiating this conception of Christ, and in declaring it to be un-Christian, the Church was not only for her Lord's honour vindicating His real Godhead, was not only, as she believed, defending Scripture and tradition, but was also reasserting the first principle of theism as distinct from pantheism and idolatry. . . .

'That Christ was very God of very God, fixed itself in the mind of an able and interesting man, Apollinarius of Laodicea. As being God, Christ, he went on to argue, must be morally unalterable; yet He is in some sort human, and the human mind and will is alterable, liable to sin—nay, he seems to have thought, necessarily sinful. How then can Jesus be human? To solve this problem, Apollinarius endeavoured to develop a systematic theory of the person of Christ on the basis of a more or less philosophical psychology. He drew a distinction between the body, the soul or animal life, and the reason or spirit, in man's nature—a distinction to some extent sanctioned by S. Paul; and he conceived that in Christ the eternal and immutable mind or spirit, the Word of God, took the place of the human

mind, and united itself to the soul and body that is the animated body, so that Christ was made up of the Godhead, manifesting Himself in the living body of man. That Christ was, as thus conceived, if like man, yet not really man, because without that human mind or spirit, in virtue of which alone the body in man becomes human and not merely animal,—Apollinarius frankly recognised. Yet he seems to have suggested, that the archetype of manhood exists in God, who made man after His own image, so that man's nature in some sense pre-existed in God. The Son of God was eternally human, and he could fill the place of the human mind in Christ without His thereby ceasing to be in some sense human. Such refinements, when their point was plain, the Church again met with a very emphatic negative: if man is made in God's image, yet man is not God, nor God man. It is, again, a first principle of theism, as distinct from pantheism, that manhood at the bottom is not the same thing as Godhead. This is a principle intimately bound up with man's moral responsibility and the reality of sin. Thus the interests of theism were at stake in this controversy no less really, though less obviously, than the reality of Christ's human sympathies. At any rate, the Church could not have Christ's real humanity explained away. He had a really human will, human mind, human reflectiveness, human sympathies: He was completely man in all human faculties, to be tempted, to pray, to suffer, to learn, as truly as He was very God. That was the second determination—reasserted in the sixth century against the Monothelites, in connection with the truth of Christ's human will.

But if Christ was God and man, how was the union to be conceived of the Godhead and manhood? The manhood—so insisted a school of theologians from Antioch—if it be truly manhood, must have free will and self-determination. Christ then must be really a free human Person, how then is He God? Because, they replied, God unites Himself to man; to all men in proportion to their merit, to Christ in a unique and exceptional manner on account of His unique and exceptional merit. As this merit was foreseen, so the man Christ Jesus was from the first united in a special degree with God. But that which was born of Mary was not, properly speaking, God the Son: it was a human child Jesus who, when He had grown to manhood, became Son of God by adoption at His baptism, and at last was made one with God in glory. This was the theory which, as originated or suggested by the famous commentator, Theodore of Mopsuestia, was adopted and popularised by Nestorius. But the Church saw clearly enough that it is not what the Bible teaches, or what our redemption requires. . . . The Nestorian theory, then, was met with a negative as emphatic as possible in the decree of Ephesus. . . .

'Christ then is God incarnate. In Him the human nature is assumed by the Divine Person. But, in that case, can the human

nature be said to remain? No, persisted an abbot of Constantinople, named Eutyches; distinct as manhood and Godhead are before the incarnation, by the incarnation the manhood loses its own proper and distinct nature. It is transubstantiated into that which assumed it: it is no longer of our substance. Once more, this position was met by the Church with an emphatic negative in the Council of Chalcedon. The humanity in Christ remains distinctively what it was: it is not transmuted out of its own proper character; the eternal person assumes the human nature, and acts through it, without its ceasing to be human. Christ, who is of one substance with the Father in respect of His Godhead, is of one substance with us in respect of our manhood, and that for ever. In Him the two natures, divine and human, subsist in the unity of the one person.'[1]

As students of the *Quicumque* we are concerned mainly with the Western point of view, which is summed up in the masterly Tome of Pope Leo.

S. Leo contrasts the simple teaching of the Baptismal Creed of Rome, the archetype of our Apostles' Creed, with the new explanations by which heretical minds would impoverish or destroy the fulness or the balance of Church teaching. As the advent of Arianism made inevitable the process by which the ancient historic faith of Jerusalem was transformed into our Nicene Creed, so the advent of Apollinarianism and Nestorianism made necessary the insistence on the Unity of the Person of Christ, while at the same time the perfectness of His natures, Godhead and Manhood, was guarded, and all possibility of confusion, whether Apollinarian or Eutychian, was done away.

Since heresies grow out of natural tendencies in the human mind common to every age, it is inevitable that they should recur. We have seen how the heresy of Leporius anticipated Nestorianism. And Nestorian error was reproduced in the eighth century by the Adoptionists, partly, it is true, under the influence of the older Nestorianism, but also because the pendulum had swung back, and a national reaction had set in towards that direction of thought.

The very interesting researches of Mr. Bethune Baker prove that Nestorius himself has received but scant

[1] *The Incarnation of the Son of God*, p. 89 ff. Murray, 1892.

justice, that his teaching was often misrepresented. We may grant as much as that, and yet with perfect fairness maintain that he taught that Jesus Christ was two distinct persons or agents, one of which might be called by the same name as the other.

We are concerned, however, chiefly with the view that was taken of Nestorian error in such a centre of Gallican Church life as Lerins, a centre of culture where intellectual interest was felt in the precise terms in which Nestorianism might be condemned.

It would be hard to find other such centres in Gaul before 450, and impossible at a later time. The fifth century witnessed the irruption into Gaul of the Goths and Huns. Cæsarius of Arles, though he carried on the Lerins tradition, had the heresy of Pelagius to contend with, so that Christology was somewhat left out of account. I do not mean that it was neglected, but the existing modes of expression sufficed, whereas on the subject of free will it was necessary to advance to the discovery of new formulae which in guarding the truth should guard it as a whole without neglecting any one aspect.

The following passage from Leo's Letter to Flavian shows how far opposition to Nestorianism and Eutychianism had altered the situation which the theologians of the first decades of the fifth century had to face :—

'Since, then, the properties of both natures and substances were preserved and co-existed in One Person, humility was embraced by majesty, weakness by strength, mortality by eternity; and to pay the debt of our condition, the inviolable nature was united to a passible nature; so that, as was necessary for our healing, there was one and the same "Mediator between God and man, the Man Jesus Christ," who was capable of death in one nature and incapable of it in the other. In the complete and perfect nature, therefore, of very man, very God was born—complete in what belonged to Him, complete in what belonged to us.[1]

'For the Self-same who is very God is also very Man; and there is nothing false in this union, whilst the lowliness of the Manhood and the loftiness of the Divinity have their separate spheres. For as the Godhead is not changed by the compassion, so the Manhood is not absorbed by the dignity.'[2]

---

[1] *C.* 3. [2] *C.* 4.

'When, however, Eutyches, in response to your cross-examination, said, "I confess that our Lord was from two natures before the Union, but after the Union I admit but one nature," I am amazed that so absurd and perverse a profession as this of his was not severely censured by the judges.'[1]

We may fairly argue, on the one hand, that the need of asserting the permanent distinction of the two natures, as against Eutyches, was not present to the mind of the author of the *Quicumque*. He has the Apollinarian confusion of the natures in his mind. On the other hand, the Unity of Person is also asserted to guard the integrity rather than the Unity of Christ's Person, again in opposition to Apollinarian rather than Nestorian mistakes. To substitute the Divine Word for the Human Soul was a short cut to the glorification of the Divine Person, which the confession of that Human Soul might seem to imperil until it is clearly understood that He assumed an impersonal nature. The raising of Manhood from the dust, not the degradation of Godhead by any process of change, is the great truth which expresses the highest dignity of Man, the Gospel of his creation. As S. Hilary puts it: 'The assumption of our nature was no advancement for God, but his willingness to lower Himself is our promotion, for He did not resign His Divinity but conferred Divinity on man.'[2]

Here we must leave the question, acknowledging humbly that any argument based on the internal evidence of the *Quicumque* has to run the gauntlet of renewed attack on the lines of Dom Morin's recent lectures, to which I have referred above.[3] I have endeavoured to quote enough from dated fifth century writings to prove that the *Quicumque* more closely corresponds to them than to later formulations of the faith. But I willingly admit there is much to be said on the other side, and we must wait for Dom Morin's edition of S. Cæsarius before we can attain to a final decision. For practical purposes it does not matter. Our deep concern at the present day is to defend the

[1] *C.* 6. [2] *De Trin.* ix. 4. [3] Page 34.

doctrine of the Incarnation taught in this Creed, whatever its date. And it is of no small advantage to discover, as any earnest student may soon do for himself, how much alike the true believers of the centuries past are to those of the present day, and that a man of affairs like S. Hilary of Poitiers, could see through all the chief fallacies which hold men back from acceptance of the truth.

'It is manifest that there is nothing which men have ever said which is not liable to opposition. Where the will dissents the mind also dissents: under the bias of opposing judgment it joins battle, and denies the assertions to which it objects. Though every word we say be incontrovertible if gauged by the standard of truth, yet so long as men think or feel differently, the truth is always exposed to the cavils of opponents, because they attack, under the delusion of error or prejudice, the truth they misunderstand or dislike. For decisions once formed cling with excessive obstinacy: and the passion of controversy cannot be driven from the course it has taken, when the will is not subject to the reason. Enquiry after truth gives way to the search for proofs of what we wish to believe; desire is paramount over truth. Then the theories we concoct build themselves on names rather than things: the logic of truth gives place to the logic of prejudice: a logic which the will adjusts to defend its fancies, not one which stimulates the will through the understanding of truth by the reason. From these defects of partisan spirit arise all controversies between opposing theories. Then follows an obstinate battle between truth asserting itself and prejudice defending itself: truth maintains its ground and prejudice resists. But if desire had not forestalled reason: if the understanding of the truth had moved us to desire what is true: instead of trying to set up our desires as doctrines, we should let our doctrines dictate our desires; there would be no contradiction of the truth, for every one would begin by desiring what was true, not by defending the truth of that which he desired.'[1]

[1] *De Trin.* x. 1.

CHAPTER VI

A SHORT COMMENTARY

To obtain a clear understanding of the *Quicumque* it is very necessary to read it paragraph by paragraph, and not clause by clause, as it is printed for use as a canticle. It is essentially an Instruction, with a prolonged argument. We will divide it up as such, and endeavour to explain the sequence of thought and the more difficult phrases as we go along.

Introduction

1. *Whosoever would*[1] *be saved.*

There has been much discussion on the translation of the word *vult*. It seems wise to keep the old English 'would,' explained by the modern English 'desireth.' This does not, however, deliver us from controversy as to whether *salvus* means 'saved' or 'in a state of salvation.' From our modern point of view we wish it to mean the latter, and Bishop Gibson is quite right when he says that 'the word is ambiguous, and instances of either meaning may be found in Latin writers of the fourth and fifth centuries.'[2] But the reference in the next verse to the eternal issues of our belief or unbelief leave little doubt that 'future' and not 'present salvation' was in the author's mind.

Before all things it is needful that he hold the Catholic Faith.

There is no other Saviour, so from the Christian point of view it is all-important that we should know Christ and 'be found in him' (Phil. 3[9]). But the simple

[1] *Or* desireth.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 211.

Creed, 'Jesus is the Lord' (Rom. 10^9) with which the Church began, which Christians carried into all lands as a message of salvation, needed expansion when it became the Catholic (= universal) Faith, apart from any question of misinterpretation. Belief in Christ implied new knowledge of the mystery of the Being of God, that God is Love, that He is not a solitary Being, that in the highest heaven the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost share the eternal life of love.

The Church was slow to believe all that the Lord had spoken, but experience of the guidance of His Spirit led them on, as we have seen, to interpret their belief about God. S. Paul's letter to Timothy (1 Tim. 6^{20}) shows that he regarded it as a sacred deposit, a trust for others, to be guarded and handed on faithfully. Meditation about the relation of Christ to the Father and the Spirit led to the development of the Doctrine of the Trinity. Mistaken opinions on the Person of Christ led to more elaborate statements of the Doctrine of the Incarnation. The *Quicumque* is a summary of conclusions to which the Church was led along each of these lines of thought, and the Catholic Faith of the Church was enlarged.

2. *Which Faith except a man hath kept whole and undefiled*[1] *without doubt he shall perish eternally.*

To keep the faith *whole* is to preserve what S. Paul calls its 'proportion.' In hearing sermons, in private conversation, and in private study of the Holy Scripture, we find many interesting lines of thought are opened out which may lead to profitable speculation on the Christian Revelation. But it must not become onesided. Thus in the fifth century Pelagius, who was sound on the subjects of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, as dealt with in the *Quicumque*, was led by unbalanced assertions on the power of Divine Grace to make equally unbalanced assertions about human free will. There was a certain affinity between his magnifying of the human 'will' and the Nestorian error which identified 'will' with 'personality,' teaching two Persons in Christ. This shows the necessity for clear thinking about the great

[1] *Or* uncorrupted.

truths mysteriously linked with the central doctrine of the Person of Christ. We may be thankful that the daily round of teaching in the Christian year brings them all in turn before our eyes, and makes it easier to do justice to both aspects in the final antithesis which appears to exist between Grace and Free Will.

The alternative rendering, 'uncorrupted,' suggests a metaphor which is not so plainly in accord with the original use of the Latin word. Cicero speaks of friendship as preserved 'unhurt' (*inviolata*). This brings in perhaps a better metaphor than 'undefiled' if we regard our faith, as did the early Christians, as our compact with Christ, to be loyally observed, and to be sealed and delivered with the added seal of our own experience: '*He that hath received his witness hath set his seal to this that God is true*' (S. John 3[33]).

Obviously the teaching of this clause is addressed to members of the Church only. A man cannot keep what he has never possessed. The warning is against disloyalty. All men agree that any sort of disloyalty must have a pernicious effect on character. From this point of view the assertion may be justified that lack of loyalty to the faith leads to the eternal perishing from which we pray to be delivered. We must take this clause with clause 28. If the gradual advance of the Creed into general use as an approved instruction be held to give it a certificate of acceptance as part of the deposit of Faith, yet no instructed theologian, either of the East or of the West, would condemn to eternal perdition the heretics whose errors are exposed by this Creed without making some exceptions, *e.g.* for the case of invincible ignorance on the part of such heretics.

This difficulty has lain at the root of all attempts to explain the meaning of the words by explanatory notes. It is not simply a question of explaining that a person cannot hold what he has not received. It is assumed that the Creed is addressed only to believers, and we can only fall back on the argument of Dr. Mozley: 'It is an acknowledged principle in the interpretation of the damnatory language of Holy Scripture regarding unbelief, that it is to be understood with conditions, and

the same rule of interpretation applies to the Athanasian Creed.'[1]

I. i. (*a*) *Divine Personality is Triune*

3. *Now the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship the One God as a Trinity, and the Trinity as an Unity.*

The main statement given in this clause is one to which all can subscribe. The Catholic Faith is this—not that we define and dogmatise unduly, but that we worship one God revealed to us in a Trinity of Persons. True faith leads to worship. Tennyson's 'I cannot understand, I love' is true of every soul which trusts in God and makes the venture of faith in Christ and in His Spirit. I believe, not with Tertullian 'because it is impossible,' but with Anselm 'in order that I may understand,' understand how love has guarded my steps, giving the gift of the Spirit of regeneration in Baptism, of strengthening in Confirmation, the Spirit who has in the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ continually sustained, strengthened, and refreshed the life given in Holy Baptism. In Keble's words, 'All the Godhead joins to make us whole.' All this I know by experience, having made my venture of faith. So I say to any Unitarian friend who cannot accept the Apostles' Creed in which all this is implied, If you are sincere I do not doubt that your invincible ignorance will be forgiven, but I regret more than words can say your loss in the present, which must be your loss in the future also, of all the comfort and strength which this faith brings. You take your stand on the Unity of the Godhead and so do I. This Creed is a protest against any sort of mistaken belief that disparages it. We are forbidden by the Catholic Religion (clause 20) quite as sternly as by the Revelation given through Moses (Deut. 6[4]) to say there be three Gods.

4, 5, 6. *Neither confusing the Persons nor dividing the Substance. For there is a Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost; but the Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is one; their glory equal, their majesty co-eternal.*

[1] *Lectures and Theological Papers*, p. 194.

We are taught by the unanimous voice of Christian tradition to acknowledge eternal distinctions in the working of the Divine Persons which we are led to trace back to eternal distinctions in the Being of God. By 'Being' we do not mean 'Nature,' but we argue up from the analogy of human Personality to the Divine. In the being of each family three persons are conjoined, Father, Mother, and Child, showing the unity of a common nature but expressing it in action variously according to his or her will. This analogy is valuable though, like all other analogies, it is very incomplete. For in human life we measure strength of personality by separateness of will, whereas in God will and life are one.

We condemn the Sabellian teaching that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are but three names or aspects of God confusing the persons, so that the Father could be said to suffer in the Son. As we have seen, that form was popularised in the fifth century by Priscillian, as in our own day by Swedenborg's disciples. It is by no means an extinct heresy. It is attractive, because it makes less demand for humility of mind. It is compatible with very sincere devotion to the Person of our Lord, and most energetic work in preaching His Gospel for the salvation of sinners. It breaks down in practice, because it is in essence an attempt to rationalise the mystery of the Being of God, which leaves the heart unsatisfied. There is no room left by it for real trust in the Fatherhood of God, no confidence in the personal guidance of the Holy Ghost.

Dividing the substance. Here we condemn Arian teaching in all its forms. The radical mistake of Arian theology, 'an irreligious solicitude about God,' as S. Hilary called it, the desire to spiritualise the idea of Deity undefiled by contact with the material world, found expression in metaphors from which the earlier Arians would have shrunk. Thus, in one of the old Commentaries on this Creed, we find the respective glories of the three Persons in the Trinity compared to Gold, Silver, and Brass. This magnifying of the Father at the expense of the Son and the Spirit would be indeed a dividing of the one substance of the Godhead which

justifies us in ascribing equal glory to each Divine Person.

From the point of view of private devotion, it may not be out of place to suggest that the work of praise is much neglected, and that even a daily use of the *Gloria* would surely bring into many lives that element of joy in religion which is often so conspicuously lacking. It would tend also to restore that profound sense of the nearness of God in the daily working of His Providence that led such a saint as Bishop Ken to write 'Glory to God' at the head of his letters, and thus bring his faith into relation to ordinary daily business which it can transfigure, till the humblest kitchen becomes the Presence Chamber of God Himself no less than the most impressive Cathedral.

The thought of 'majesty' helps out the thought of awe in the Presence thus revealed. There is an unwritten saying of our Lord recorded by Clement of Alexandria: 'He that wonders shall reign and he that reigns shall rest.' We wonder not with the credulity of superstitious ignorance, but with the wonder of the true Scientist, who feels more and more that this world is the home of mystery.

(*b*) *Attributes of the Godhead arranged in subsidiary Antitheses.*

7 *Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the*
8 *Holy Ghost; the Father uncreated, the Son uncreated,*
9 *the Holy Ghost uncreated; the Father infinite, the Son*
10 *infinite, the Holy Ghost infinite; the Father eternal,*
11 *the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal; and yet they*
12 *are not three eternals but one eternal; as also they are not three uncreated, nor three infinites, but one uncreated,*
13 *and one infinite. So, likewise, the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, the Holy Ghost almighty, and yet they*
14 *are not three almighties, but one almighty.*

The main object of this section is to emphasise the fact that any attribute of the Godhead may be assigned to each of the three Persons. And these attributes

are grouped in subsidiary antitheses, subsidiary I mean to the main antithesis 'Trinity in Unity.'

The first of these 'uncreated' is an attribute which is taught in the first verse of the Bible: '*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth*' (Gen. 1[1]), and is emphasised throughout both the Old and the New Testament. In view of Arian mistakes it was important to claim it for the Son and the Holy Ghost, to show in the words of the Nicene Creed, 'begotten not made,' that the Son is not a created Being.

There is a passage in the treatise of Niceta of Remesiana on the Holy Spirit, which shows plainly enough what practical importance lay in clear assertion of the same truth about the Holy Ghost. Niceta complains that the Macedonians were always trying to impale orthodox Christians on the horns of a dilemma by asking questions: 'Is the Spirit born or unborn? If He is not born like the Only-begotten Son, or unborn like the unbegotten Father, then He must be a created Being.' Niceta easily shows the futility of such arguments, and maintains that He is uncreated and Divine.

We turn to the term 'infinite,' and note first that this is the best translation of the word *immensus*, literally unmeasured. It brings us to a most interesting train of thought, the necessity of reverence and awe in dealing with these heavenly mysteries. Men are so apt to forget that we have no celestial language in which to express eternal truths. It is the merit of the great teachers of the fourth and fifth centuries that they never forgot this in their criticism of unspiritual speculation in theology. Thus Niceta appeals: 'O man that dost not yet know thyself, dost thou dare to measure the Divine attributes?'[1]

It is not at first obvious why the attribute '*almighty*' is not joined with the others, but tacked on by '*So likewise.*' The other attributes refer to the glory of God before the world was. '*Almighty*' has distinct reference to His work in Creation. It combines the ideas of 'transcendence' and 'immanence.' If we press the former we are led to the impossible idea of 'a carpenter

[1] *De rat. fidei* 1.

God,' fashionable in the eighteenth century, a God, that is, who made the world and left it, as a carpenter makes and leaves a table. If we press the latter, we find ourselves in danger of landing in the error of Pantheism, which confuses the Maker with His creation. Rightly explained, 'almighty' guards from both errors.

(c) *In which Christian Truth acknowledges the Trinity*

15 *So the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost*
16 *God; and yet they are not three Gods, but one God.*
17 *So the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, the Holy Ghost*
18 *Lord; and yet they are not three Lords, but one Lord.*
19 *For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity*[1]
20 *to confess each of the Persons by Himself*[2] *to be both God and Lord, so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to speak of three Gods or three Lords.*

There is no antithesis suggested between the Christian verity (or truth) and the Catholic Religion, but we may fairly explain the Verity as being the whole Revelation of God made to man through the Holy Scriptures, while we understand by Catholic Religion the whole system of teaching accepted by the Church Universal as a true summary of 'the things most surely believed among us' (Luke 1^4). In the Church of England Catholic theology is based on the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the decrees of the great Councils.

The term 'almighty' introduces us to the titles which men have in all ages given to the Divine architect and governor of the universe, 'God' and 'Lord.' He is 'God' in the eternal majesty of His Being, 'who dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto' (1 Tim. 6^{16}). He is Lord because in many ways and words His will has been made known unto men and they obey.

An interesting illustration has been drawn at this point from the philosophy of Lotze: 'Everything is three and one. A thing is what it is in itself and to itself, its "soul," or self, according to Lotze; it is also

[1] *Or* by Christian Truth. [2] *Or* severally.

what it manifests of itself to other beings; and it is what its influence is upon other things (or rather what its influence is within other things; for action of things upon things is by their inner states). Here we have being as self, manifestation, and operation. The higher being advances, the more marked is this differentiation; and yet, from another point of view, the closer is the unity. There is no being without this unity of differences, so far as we know. And it is a fair inference, that it belongs to being as such, and is most perfect in the One Being of all, who has given an impress of Himself to His works.'[1]

I have a vivid recollection of a conversation with Bishop Westcott, in which he expressed his shrinking from the teaching of this phrase *by Himself*, which can easily be pressed too far. There is grave danger of a practical Tritheism in many minds, but not if they take heed to the warning here given, which shows that the author did not mean more than we are accustomed to say in our Catechism: 'First, I learn to believe in God the Father. . . . Secondly, in God the Son. . . . Thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost.' We distinguish in thought without wavering in faith. Our faith is in One God, one in life and will and work. Our Lord teaches '*The Father worketh hitherto and I work*' (John 5^{17}).

There is a most interesting passage in Dean Robinson's lectures on the Creed,[2] which may be quoted here:—

'Let us try, then, for a more positive description of what a person is. One who wills is a person; one who knows is a person; one who loves is a person. But if willing and knowing and loving are spoken of in connection with a person, we imply that there is something on which his will can act, something of which he can have knowledge, something which he can love. Thus we begin to feel that a person cannot be conceived of in isolation; that for his personality to realise itself at all there must be something besides himself.

'And yet further: will at its highest is manifested in its effect on another will; knowledge at its highest is knowledge of persons; love is scarcely more than a metaphor unless the object

[1] *C.Q.R.*, 1910, p. 127. Article by Rev. R. Vaughan, 'How we may think of the Trinity.'

[2] P. 39.

of love is a person. This last point is the clearest from our own experience. You cannot love a bird, or a dog, quite as you can love a human being. Perhaps you cannot love it at all, except in so far as you attribute personality to it. But in any case it is not on your level of personality; it is not adequate to receive and to return the whole gift of your love.

'Now to us the idea of a Personal God includes at least those elements of personality which we know so well by our experience —will, wisdom, love. Consider in particular the last of these, so strongly emphasised by S. John that he declares twice over, not merely that God loves, but that "God is love." In eternity, let us reverently ask, What does God love? or rather since love at its highest loves a person, and a person adequate to receive and return the love, In eternity whom does God love? Can we escape from saying, A Person eternal as Himself? for otherwise His love would not be eternal: a Person adequate to receive and return love at its highest: an eternal Person, therefore, not less than God. And here the Christian revelation meets us with the declaration that the Father loveth the Son, and the Son loveth the Father. "Love is not love," it was said long ago in this connection, "if there be no beloved." God is eternally Love: there is an eternal Beloved.'

The Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity is in harmony with this idea of Personality as the capacity for fellowship. The fellowship of the Holy Ghost crowns our conception of the fellowship of the Father and the Son. We acknowledge that the whole truth is beyond our comprehension, yet we are confident that our dim vision of it from afar illuminates our minds as no other conception of God. It explains much that before was unexplained, and it offers the only possible foundation for a Gospel of social progress.

(ii) *Divine Relationships in Scriptural Terms are unique, coeternal, coequal*

21 *The Father is of none; not made, nor created, nor*
22 *begotten. The Son is of the Father alone, not made,*
23 *nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son; not made, nor created, nor begotten,*
24 *but proceeding. There is therefore one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost,*
25 *not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity none is*
26 *before or after, none is greater or less; but all three*

Persons are coeternal one with another, and co-
equal.
27 *So that in all ways, as is aforesaid, both the Trinity*
is to be worshipped as an Unity, and the Unity as a
28 *Trinity. Let him therefore that would be saved*[1] *think*
thus of the Trinity.

We should shrink from any attempt to express such mysteries if we had not the support of Scriptural terms, so that we are not confined to mere negatives, such as unoriginate, uncreated, unbegotten. Our Lord's own words about the Father justify S. John's use and ours of the term 'only begotten.'[2] It is again from S. John's Gospel, though this time from the lips of the Master Himself, that we derive the term 'proceeding,' which, though it perhaps there (John 15[26]) refers only to the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, is the term which adequately expresses His eternal relationship to the Father and the Son.

'But if the question arise,' as it has been well put by Bishop Forbes, 'why the procession of the Son is termed generation, and that of the Holy Spirit not so, it may be answered, that there is a difference in the mode of their originations, as indicated to us. For generation is the origin of a living existence from a living principle, one with it in nature, and it requires that the origin of the begotten shall be from the begetter by an action which communicates similarity: but procession is generally any emanation of one person from another, and the exercise of the will is to love one's like, not to produce likeness; it follows that the procession of the Word will be generation, but not that of the Spirit, who is love and from the will. But these things are mysteries beyond the ken of mortal man.'[3]

'*None is before or after.*'—These express partially the difficult but important truth that we must separate from our thought of God's eternity all our thoughts of time. In Tennyson's words:—

[1] *Or* desireth to be saved.
[2] John i. 14.
[3] *The Nicene Creed*, p. 123, quoting S. Thos. Aquinas 1[ma] 27, a. 4.

'And all creation is one act at once,
The birth of light: but we that are not all,
As parts, can see but parts, now this, now that,
And live, perforce, from thought to thought, and make
One act a phantom of succession: thus
Our weakness somehow shapes the shadow, Time.'[1]

There is a very interesting passage in which S. Hilary of Poitiers describes his conversion from heathenism, first to the faith of Judaism and then to Christianity. He came to the conclusion that 'omnipotence and eternity are the possession of One only, for omnipotence is incapable of degrees of strength or weakness, and eternity of priority or succession. In God we must worship absolute eternity and absolute power.'

'While my mind was dwelling on these and on many like thoughts, I chanced upon the books which, according to the tradition of the Hebrew faith, were written by Moses and the prophets, and found in them words spoken by God the Creator testifying of Himself, "I AM THAT I AM," and again, HE THAT IS hath sent me unto you (Ex. 3^{14}). I confess that I was amazed to find in them an indication concerning God so exact that it expressed in the terms best adapted to human understanding an unattainable insight into the mystery of the Divine nature. For no property of God which the mind can grasp is more characteristic of Him than existence, since existence in the absolute sense cannot be predicated of that which shall come to an end, or of that which has had a beginning, and He who now joins continuity of being with the possession of perfect felicity could not in the past, nor can in the future, be non-existent; for whatsoever is Divine can neither be originated nor destroyed. Wherefore, since God's eternity is inseparable from Himself, it was worthy of Him to reveal this one thing, that HE IS as the assurance of His absolute eternity.'[2]

The coequality of the Divine Persons was a truth specially dear to Western theologians, who approached the subject from the point of view of the unity of God's Being in an *Immanent Trinity*. Their teaching was founded on our Lord's words: '*I and my Father are one*' (John 10^{30}). Bishop Westcott's comment is: 'It seems clear that the unity here spoken of cannot fall short of unity of essence. The thought springs from the equality of power (*my hand, the Father's hand*); but infinite

[1] *The Princess.* [2] *De Trin.* i. 5.

power is an essential attribute of God; and it is impossible to believe that two beings distinct in essence could be equal in power.'

Eastern theologians started from the point of view of the *Œconomic Trinity*, thinking of God revealing himself as Three in the Divine work of creation and redemption. They thus easily found a place for ideas of a subordination within the Godhead. They would lay stress on the thought of the one source or fountain of Deity. In Pearson's words: 'The Father has something of eminence, some kind of priority, because the Son has the Divine essence by communication and the Spirit also.' The *Quicumque* guards the main principle in the definite assertion that 'the Father is of none,' but without drawing the conclusion that the Son and the Spirit are therefore subordinate, and when in clause 33 it returns to the question, it only speaks of the Son as 'less than the Father,' in respect of His self-humiliation in assuming Manhood.

The words that follow about the worship of the Trinity as an Unity, express the practical outcome of our belief, which is ever the gateway to worship. Awe, not self-confidence, is the keynote of growth in knowledge of spiritual things. '*Let us fall low on our knees*' is the prelude to our confession of faith, and the deepening awe, which is the prelude to increase of faith, brings its reward in the strengthening of character through increase in hope and love.

The idiomatic, '*must thus think of the Trinity*,' has disappeared from the new translation, but in sixteenth-century English did not express the stern insistence which it conveys to modern ears.

II. *The Incarnation*

29 *Furthermore, it is necessary to eternal salvation that*
we also believe faithfully the Incarnation of our Lord
30 *Jesus Christ. The right Faith therefore is that we believe*
and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God
is at once both God and Man.

Under the influence of the Greek version,[1] Bishop Hilsey's 'believe faithfully' became 'believe rightly' (ὀρθῶς) in the Prayer Book of 1549. This was a great pity, since the new translation obscured the emphasis laid on loyalty to faith received. The affection of the heart is involved no less than the intelligence of the head. It may be argued that the change from S. Paul's address to his Philippian gaoler, '*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved*' (Acts 16 [31]), to the abstract idea of believing the Incarnation is an unwelcome change from the simplicity of the primitive Gospel. We can only answer that the Church is not to blame for the changes which became inevitable, when the questionings of false teachers led to erroneous denials of the Incarnation. Even in very early days S. Ignatius of Antioch was constrained to protest against the Docetic error which regarded our Lord's Body as a mere phantom. Thus it became necessary to guard the simple belief in His Person, as taught in the Baptismal Creed, by adding a statement as to His 'becoming flesh' (John 1 [14]).

Christ in Two Natures

31 *He is God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before*
the worlds, and He is Man of the Substance of His
32 *Mother, born in the world; perfect God, perfect Man,*
of reasoning soul and human flesh consisting; equal to
33 *the Father as touching His Godhead, less than the*
Father as touching His Manhood.

The word 'substance' is the term employed to express the 'being' of God, and later Latin theologians maintained the distinction which Tertullian defined between 'substance' and 'the nature of substance.' They shrank (as Mr. Bethune Baker puts it) from speaking of the two natures merely.[2] If they do not use the term 'substance,' they use some other term rather than 'nature.' Thus S. Hilary speaks 'of the form of God' and 'the form of

[1] See p. 102.

[2] *Introduction to Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 232, Methuen, 1903.

a servant,' S. Augustine of 'the Son of God' and 'the Son of Man.' Leo uses the term 'nature' freely, but adds 'and substance' to mark his full meaning. His words are worth quoting in full :—

'Since then the properties of both natures and substances were preserved and coexisted in One Person, humility was embraced by majesty, weakness by strength, mortality by eternity; and to pay the debt of our condition the inviolable nature was united to a passible nature; so that, as was necessary for our healing, there was one and the same "Mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ," who was capable of death in one nature and incapable of it in the other. In the complete and perfect nature, therefore, of very man, very God was born—complete in what belonged to Him, complete in what belonged to us. And by "what belonged to us," we mean what the Creator put in us from the beginning, and what He undertook to repair. For that which the Deceiver brought upon us and that which deceived man admitted found no trace in the Saviour. And it does not follow that because He shared in human weakness He therefore shared in our sins. He assumed the "form of a servant" without the stain of sin, enhancing what was human, not detracting from what was Divine; because that "self-emptying," by which He who is invisible rendered Himself visible, and He who alone is the Creator and "Lord of all" willed to be mortal, was a condescension of pity, not a loss of power. Hence He who, remaining "in the form of God," made man, was the Same who was made man in the "form of a servant." For each nature retains without loss its own properties; and as "the form of God" does not take away the "form of a servant," so the "form of a servant" does not detract from the "form of God."'[1]

This eloquent summary needs no explanation. It expresses the mystery of the Divine Life portrayed in the Gospels.

Before the worlds means before time began, and the ages by which this visible universe can be reckoned to exist.

Perfect Manhood is said to consist of 'reasoning soul and human flesh,' thereby asserting that Christ assumed the higher element in human nature, the mind, the spirit, the will. In the second century Christian thinkers were constrained to contend for the reality of the human flesh. Thus Ignatius writes: 'There is one Physician, fleshly and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God in man,

[1] *Tome of S. Leo*, c. 3.

true life in death, both of man and of God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord.'[1]

Irenæus, also speaking of the Lord's experiences of fatigue and grief and pain, says they were tokens of 'the flesh, assumed from earth, which He recapitulated in Himself, saving that which He Himself had formed.' But now the pendulum having swung back, it was the reality of the human soul which it was important to guard, including free will. 'Thus Gregory of Nyssa declared that if the human soul of the Lord did not possess free will (the power of choice and self-determination), His life could neither be a real example and a moral pattern for us, nor could it effect any gain for the human race.'[2]

Equal to the Father . . . less than the Father. These words suggest an interpretation of our Lord's words (John 14[28]): *The Father is greater than I,* which is in harmony with the teaching of the absolute equality of the Divine Persons in verse 26. In Bishop Westcott's words, 'the eminence of the Father lies in His relation to the Son as Incarnate and not yet glorified.' He goes on to show that this view is quite consistent with the view that the eminence of the Father lies in the fact that the Son has the divine Essence by communication. One view really implies the other. It is reasonable to 'ground the congruity of the mission' of the Son upon the immanent pre-eminence of the Father.

Irenæus, discussing Mark 13[32], says:—

'If any one inquire the reason wherefore the Father, communicating to the Son in all things, hath been declared by the Son to know alone the hour and the day, one could not find at present any [reason] more suitable or more becoming, or more free from danger, than this (for the Lord is the only true Master), [that it is] in order that we may learn through Him that the Father is over all things. *For the Father,* he says, *is greater than I.* And so the Father is announced by our Lord to have the pre-eminence in regard to knowledge, for this purpose, that we also . . . should leave perfect knowledge and such questions to God.'[3]

---

[1] Eph. 7.
[2] *Antirrhet.* 45, quoted by Bethune Baker, *op. cit.* p. 249.
[3] *Adv. Haer.* ii. 28, 8.

Here the reference is to the Incarnate Son in His Manhood.

S. Basil adopts the other interpretation :—

'Since the Son's origin is from the Father, in this respect the Father is greater, as cause and origin. Wherefore also the Lord said thus, *My Father is greater than I*, clearly inasmuch as He is Father. Yea, what else does the word Father signify unless the being cause and origin of that which is begotten of Him?'[1]

And in the West S. Hilary wrote :—

'The Father is greater than the Son, and clearly greater, to whom He gives to be as great as He Himself, and imparts the image of His own birthlessness by the mystery of birth, whom He begets of Himself after His own likeness.'[2]

S. Augustine generally refers the greatness of the Father to the Incarnation, but allows that the words can be understood of the Son as Son :—

'The words are written partly on account of the Incarnation . . . partly because the Son owes to the Father that He is; as He even owes to the Father that He is equal to the Father, while the Father owes to no one whatever He is.'[3]

It only remains to say that we are not committed by the *Quicumque* to any theory beyond the plain teaching of S. Paul concerning the self-emptying of the Son, who humbled Himself for our sakes (Phil. 2^{6-8}).

Bishop Weston brings forward a helpful illustration which may be quoted here.[4] He is arguing that—

'The self-consciousness of the Incarnate as God in manhood is so real that He cannot receive anything except in and through His manhood. He may be in another sphere the unlimited Logos, but as Incarnate He cannot receive or use or know what His manhood cannot mediate.

'It is as if a king's son were to will, for purposes of his father's policy, to leave his palace and to dwell a workman among workmen; to pass through all the troubles and vicissitudes of the life of a manual labourer, and to refuse to receive anything from others that he could not naturally receive and use as a working man. Those who recognise him, and in their hearts bow before him, are forbidden to acknowledge him or to help him in any way.

---

[1] *c. Eunom.* i. 25.
[2] *De Trin.* ix. 54.
[3] *De Fide et Symb*, c. ix.
[4] *The One Christ*, p. 164.

Imagine a time of distress, and the king's son numbered among the unemployed, and chosen to be one of their leaders. He goes with them into the king's presence; he is as they are in the king's sight; and the answer that he receives is that nothing can be done for any one of them. Outside the palace he shares the grief, the distress, and the hunger of the unemployed; and none may help him apart from the whole body of weary sufferers. He is, by a primary act of will, one of the unemployed. As the days pass the distress deepens; and finally a riot ensues. In the riot he is severely handled: he lies at death's door in the prison infirmary. He is recognised, but must be treated only as an unemployed workman, now a prisoner awaiting his trial. Yet all the while he is a king's son. However, he is resolved only to know himself as king's son in conditions of manual labour. The law of self-restraint that he imposed upon himself when in his father's palace must hold. He will not, must not, break it.'

The value of this illustration lies in the suggestion of a dual relationship in which the son can exist with his father at the same time. It is here that our imagination needs stimulating.

(*Christ*) *is One Person*

ii. 34 *Who although He be God and Man, yet He is*
35 *not two, but one Christ; One, however, not by*
change of Godhead into flesh, but by taking of Man-
hood into God; One altogether, not by confusion of
37 *Substance but by unity of Person. For as reasoning*
soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one
Christ.

We have still to face the old difficulties, we must again reject the old mistakes, partial explanations. The union of Godhead and Manhood is a mystery which we cannot fathom but dare not explain away. While we believe that the Manhood which our Lord took upon Him was complete in the possession of a rational soul, and included a human will which only through suffering was resigned to harmony with the Divine will, we are equally assured that such Manhood was impersonal.

In recent years the study of the phenomena of 'subconsciousness' has been thought by some to help us in our analysis of human nature on its Godward side. The

composer Schubert on waking from sleep found complete musical compositions in his mind, which he was able to write down, and they are among his best. Coleridge's fragment 'Kubla Khan' was composed in a dream, but he was interrupted before he could write it all out, and could never recover the rest. We realise, however, that the subconscious Coleridge was a greater poet than in his moments of consciousness, as the subconscious Schubert was a greater musician. As it has been well put: 'Supreme genius, such as that of Beethoven and Shakespeare, seems to consist in an ability to bring all the powers of the "subconscious" mind to bear on their conceptions at will.'[1]

While man moves with difficulty from one level of consciousness to another, our Lord could do it with ease. He handles with the sureness of perfect understanding forces of which we are only dimly aware. As Mr. Taylor has well said: 'It is exactly the difference between an investigator and a creator, between the use of a machine by its contriver and one who has first to find out what its purpose is, how it is to be used, and then why it does what it does.'[2]

Without in any way holding the theory that the Divinity in our Lord during His life on earth was subconscious, it appears legitimate to say that the double consciousness which exists in man makes it easier for us to understand the truth that His 'reasoning soul' was united with the divine eternal Word.

We have still to be on our guard against Eutychian ideas of the Godhead undergoing a change in becoming incarnate. But we are free to follow out S. Hilary's idea of the capacity of human nature for the exaltation involved in the union of manhood with God. We must not lay too much stress on the limitations of human personality.

'Each one of us, we are told, is like a mountain submerged in an ocean. Only the peak appears above the waters, the light of day does not reveal to us the great

[1] Rev. P. Taylor, *The Athanasian Creed in the Twentieth Century*, p. 86. T. and T. Clark.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 88.

expanding mass beneath.' We can understand the fitness of human nature as a dwelling-place for and a revelation of God. 'He could enter, so to speak, into the human mould without any necessity of being completely enclosed by it; He could fill it as the sunlight fills a human eye, and yet spreads all around; He could charge it with His power as a limited piece of apparatus is charged from an infinite sea of electricity.'[1]

The Redeemer, the Judge

iii. 38 *Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell,*
39 *rose again from the dead; ascended into heaven, sat down at the right hand of the Father, to come from*
40 *thence to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again in their bodies and*
41 *shall give account for their own deeds. And they that hath done good will go into life eternal, they that have done evil into eternal fire.*

The mention here of the doctrine of the Atonement comes in naturally, but it must not be supposed that bare mention implies that it took a subordinate place in the author's mind in proportion to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Since we are sinners, the message of Christ Crucified must come first, as it came first in S. Paul's preaching. But when we have been brought to repentance and '*peace through the blood of His Cross*' (Col. 1^{20}), all our reflections, our meditation on the theory of the forgiveness which we have enjoyed in experience, must centre in these doctrines which are summarised for us in the Creeds, the doctrines of the Being of God, and of Divine Personality. For indeed it is 'the infinite worth of the Son of God' which alone gives value to His Sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross.[2]

The doctrines of the descent into Hell, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, are stated here in the terms common to many forms of the Western (Apostles') Creed, and I must refer to the explanation which I have given

[1] Taylor, *op. cit.* p. 117 ff.
[2] Cf. Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, v. lii. 3.

elsewhere.[1] But the reference to the general Resurrection differs in form and requires a word of caution. 'Shall rise again in their bodies' may have meant, though we cannot prove that it meant, to the author, as it did to Rufinus, the resurrection of this flesh in its former material particles.

'Why, pray, have you so mean an opinion of God's power that you do not believe it possible for the scattered dust, of which each man's flesh was composed, to be re-collected and restored to its own original fabric? Do you refuse to admit the fact when you see mortal ingenuity search for veins of metal deeply buried in the ground, and the experienced eye discover gold where the inexperienced thinks there is nothing but earth? Why should we refuse to grant these things to Him who made man, when He whom He made can do so much?'[2] . . . 'It will come to pass that to each soul will be restored, not a confused or foreign body, but its own which it had when alive, in order that the flesh together with its own soul may for the conflicts of the present life either be crowned if undefiled, or punished if defiled.'[3]

The fact is that we understand better than Rufinus could, or the author of the *Quicumque*, in what a state of flux the material particles of our bodies are at all times, completely changed every seven years, so that it is easier for us to imagine how immaterial spirit can be enabled to take on a new spiritual body, and clothe itself as it were in an incorruptible vesture for its new life in the unseen world, which will be essentially the same body although its visible constituents have vanished.[4]

But this spiritualising of our thoughts about the resurrection of the righteous carries with it also a certain modification of our thought about the punishment of the wicked. We must take all our Lord's metaphors together as teaching us symbolically the same terrible truth that punishment must imply pain, from within if not from without, a pain of sense no less than a pain of loss, reaching its climax in remorse which can find no remedy. The parable of the wedding garment, in which Christ speaks of the unworthy guest as cast out into darkness, teaches us that for the impenitent there must

[1] Cf. *The Apostles' Creed*, chap. v.
[2] *Commentary on the Apostles' Creed*, c. 42.
[3] *Ib.* c. 43.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 35-54.

be conscious exclusion from the light and joy and peace of the faithful. The parable of the unmerciful servant speaks of a prison-house which shall be the righteous doom of the impenitent, while the parable of the rich man and Lazarus compares the pain of remorse to the torment of scorching heat. All the references to the rubbish fires of the Valley of Hinnom, where *their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*,[1] are symbolic of the necessary burning up of moral rubbish in the Gehenna of fire, which in accordance with the ordinary metaphors of Jewish thought the Lord foretold as the doom of the wicked. But to the Christian there is nothing in all these passages inconsistent with the belief that the punishments are self-acting, and not inspired by any idea of vengeance, or anything less than the necessary sternness of perfect love, judging as a Father must His rebellious sons, after leaving nothing undone which may win back the stubborn will.

If the idea of future punishment is thus explained in a spiritual manner, there will not be the same moral difficulty felt about the idea of its eternity, which has roused so many gentle souls to keen opposition to Church teaching. The Church only uses the words in section 41 of the Athanasian Creed as an impersonal statement of the future consequences of wilful sin persisted in. No known case in human history is regarded as hopeless if either at the entrance into the unseen world or through the discipline of remedial punishment the soul is brought into a condition from which, however steep the way may be upwards, there is the beginning of progress.

From our point of view the ruin of a character may seem absolute and the future consequences inevitable and eternal. It is from that point of view that we speak when we accept the words of the Creed. As Dr. Illingworth has well put it :—

'But even if we incline to the belief in everlasting punishment, on the ground of its long and wide prevalence in the Church, we must distinguish between punishment and torment. The terrible pictures of everlasting torment, which mediæval Christianity

[1] Mark ix. 48.

shares with various other religions, are a startling witness of man's judgment on himself—of the awful possibilities which he sees in unrepented sin; but they are pagan in origin, and have not a shred of justification in the pages of the New Testament. They belong to rougher ages than our own; when cruelty was so common a human attribute as not to seem incompatible with the character of God; and their rejection, in the present day, is due to that gradual elevation of our moral standard, which has been the constant work of the Christian Spirit in the world. But we can conceive of a punishment that shall be everlasting, without doing violence to our sense of divine justice. For we have an analogy for it within the limits of this life. Take the case of a man who has been a culpable spendthrift, in his youth, and so reduced himself to penury for the remainder of his life. His poverty is his punishment, and so long as he resents it he is in misery; but no sooner does he recognise its justice than he can bear it with cheerful acquiescence, as God's will. Yet the punishment remains; he has all the incapacities of poverty, and can never now do the good that he might have done with his wealth. This is a simple instance of what is daily occurring when we look behind the scenes of life. Men are being perpetually punished by the life-long consequences of their sins; but if they accept the punishment as punishment, it ceases to be pain; for they become in Dante's language, "content within the fire."

'Now one can conceive a similar process in the future life; that men may then be made to recognise that, by their earthly conduct, they have brought themselves for ever to a lower state than might have been, and are to that extent everlastingly punished, while yet they accept their condition as divinely just, and are at peace.'[1]

42. *This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man have faithfully and stedfastly believed he cannot be saved.*

Again, at the end of the Creed, stress is laid on loyalty to known truth; nothing is said about those outside the Church. The Apocryphal story of Gregory the Great,[2] who was so much moved by a story of Trajan's kindness and justice that he prayed for his salvation, and heard a voice telling him that his prayer was heard, but he must never again ask grace for one who died unbaptised, expresses the general opinion of the Church during the early Middle Ages. But we fall back

[1] *Reason and Revelation*, p. 230.
[2] It appears in the St. Gallen *Life*.

on the teaching of S. Paul (Rom. 2 [14]) on the judgment of Gentiles who 'do by nature the things of the law' as offering sure ground of hope in the just judgment of Christ. The importance already attached to 'good deeds' is quite enough to satisfy the demands of our conscience.

The limits of this series preclude further reference to modern controversies, and to the difficulty which many people feel as to the *prima facie* meaning of the warning clauses of the Creed. If we allow to other men the plea of invincible ignorance, we are true to the teaching of S. Paul that conscience must be supreme arbiter. And our sympathy with weak and wounded consciences in no degree relaxes our hold on the supreme truths which the Creed guards. Our humble prayer is that we may be led to know the truth, and that the truth may set us free from prejudice, from passion, and from pride, to serve our Lord in renewed loyalty, and candour, and love.

APPENDIX A

THE LATIN TEXT

THE following text is almost identical with the text printed by Mr. C. H. Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (April 1910), but I am not able to follow him in the inversion of order cl. 12, 'increati . . . immensi . . . immensus increatus,' on the sole authority of the Bobbio MS. at Milan; in the omission of *est* in cl. 16, 18 when it completes a rhythm; in the readings 'minor patre', 'inferos' for 'inferna,' and in the omission of 'et' in cl. 25.

I have marked the rhythms according to the system of accented prose known as the *Cursus Leoninus*, which had three ordinary forms of endings:—

cursus planus ´ ⏑⏑ ´ ~ (pl)

cursus tardus ´ ⏑⏑ ´ ⏑ ~ (t)

cursus velox ´ ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ ´ ~ (v)

There is also a metrical ending (No. 4), which at a later date passed into the *cursus*

´ ⏑⏑⏑ – ~

This will account for the rhythms of cl. 3 and cl. 20, but it leaves unexplained the (from this point of view) unrhythmical endings of cl. 27 and cl. 28.[1]

It is important to note further that, for the sake of uniformity, I have abandoned the numbering of the clauses, which in my *Introduction to the Creeds* I took from Waterland, and have adopted the numbering of the English Prayer Book followed by Mr. Turner, and Bishop Gibson with the Archbishop's Committee.

QUICUMQUE UULT

[1] Quicumque uult saluus esse ante omnia opus est ut teneat *cathólicam fídem* [pl], [2] quam nisi quis integram inuiolatamque seruauerit, absque dubio in *aetérnum períbit* [pl].

[1] For information on the history of the *Cursus* see my *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 249.

I

i (*a*) [3]Fides autem catholica haec est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in Unitāte ŭĕnĕrēmŭr; [4]neque confundentes personas, neque *substántiam separántes*: [v] alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia *Spíritus Sáncti* [pl]; sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est diuinitas, aequalis gloria, *coaetérna maiéstas.* [pl]

(*b*) [7]Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et *Spíritus Sánctus* [pl]: [8]increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus *Spíritus Sánctus* [pl]; [9]inmensus Pater, inmensus Filius, inmensus *Spíritus Sánctus* [pl]; [10]aeternus Pater, aeternus Filius, aeternus *Spíritus Sánctus* [pl]; [11]et tamen non tres aeterni sed *únus aetérnus* [pl]; sicut non tres increati nec tres inmensi sed unus increatus et *únus inménsus* [pl]. Similiter omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens *Spíritus Sánctus* [pl]; [14]et tamen non tres omnipotentes, sed *únus omnípotens* [t].

(*c*) [15]Ita Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus *Spíritus Sánctus* [pl]; [16]et tamen non tres Dii, sed *únus est Déus* [pl]. [17]Ita Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus *Spíritus Sánctus* [pl]; [18]et tamen non tres Domini sed *únus est Dóminus.* [t] [19]Quia sicut singillatim unumquamque personam et Deum et Dominum confiteri christiana *veritáte compéllimur* [v], [20]ita tres Deos aut Dominos dicere catholica religiōnĕ prŏhĭbēmur.

ii [21]Pater a nullo est factus nec *creátus nec génitus* [t]: [22]Filius a Patre solo est, non factus nec *creátus, sed génitus* [t]: [23]Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec *génitus, sed procédens* [v]. [24]Unus ergo Pater non tres Patres, unus Filius non tres Filii, unus Spiritus Sanctus non tres *Spíritus Sáncti* [pl]. [25]Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil maius aut minus, [26]sed totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt *et coaequáles* [pl]: [27]ita ut per omnia, sicut iam supra dictum est, et Trinitas in Unitate et Unitas in Trinitate ueneranda sit.

[28]Qui uult ergo saluus ita de Trinitate sentiat.

II

[29]Sed necessarium est ad aeternam salutem ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Iesu Christi *fidéliter crédat* [pl].

[30]Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur quia Dominus noster Iesus Christus Dei Filius et Deus *púriter et hómo est*:

i. [31]Deus est ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitus, et homo est ex substantia matris in *sáeculo nátus* [pl]: [32]perfectus Deus, perfectus homo ex anima rationabili et humana *cárne subsístens* [pl]; [33]Æqualis Patri secundum diuinitatem, minor Patri *secúndum humanitátem* [v].

ii. [34]Qui licet Deus sit et homo, non duo tamen sed *únus est Christus* [pl]; [35]unus autem, non conuersione diuinitatis in carne,

sed adsumptione *humanitátis in Déo* [pl]; [36] unus omnino non confessione substantiae, sed *unitáte persónae* [pl]. [37] Nam sicut anima rationabilis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et homo *únus est Christus* [pl]:

iii. [38] Qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferna, *surréxit a mortuis* [t], [39] ascendit ad caelos, sedit ad *déxteram Pátris* [pl], inde venturus iudicare *uíuos et mortuos* [t]. [40] Ad cuius adventum omnes homines resurgere habent in corporibus suis, et reddituri sunt de factis *própriis ratiónem* [v]; [41] et qui bona egerunt ibunt in uitam aeternam, qui mala in *ignem aetérnum* [pl].

[42] Haec est fides catholica quam nisi quis fideliter firmiterque crediderit, saluus *esse non póterit* [t].

GREEK VERSIONS

The Greek versions of the *Quicumque* are not important since they are plainly translations from the Latin text, and none of the MSS. go back earlier than the fifteenth century. But they are not without interest to any who would study the limited use of the *Quicumque* in the Eastern Church. They have been fully described in Prebendary Ommanney's *Dissertation*.

Montfaucon published four such versions in his *Diatribe de Symbolo Quicumque*:—

i. *Cod. Vatic. Palat.* 364, . . . *saec.* xiv.
Cod. Paris, B. N. Gr. 1286, . . *saec.* xy. xvi.

ii. *Cod. Paris, B. N. Gr.* 1327, . . *saec.* xvi.
Cod. Vindob. cxc, ... *saec.* xv.

iii. *Cod. Bodl., Canonici Gr.* 116, . . *saec.* xvi.
Cod. Florent., Plut. xi. 12, . . *saec.* xv.
Published by Aldus at Venice in the *Hours of the Blessed Virgin*, 1497.

iv. Published by Ussher from an Horology of Greek hymns, also in Labbe's *Councils*, etc.

Caspari [1] also edited two versions:—

i. *Cod.* DLXXV. in S. Mark's Library, Venice, ... *saec.* xv.
[Ommanney quotes other MSS.]

ii. *Cod. Ambros.* β 39, Sup. No. 12, . *saec.* xvi.

Of these the first is adapted from the third of Montfaucon's versions, and the second is founded on Montfaucon's first.

The version printed in the Appendix to the Greek Horology is a compilation from the first and third of Montfaucon's versions. It was probably admitted to the Greek Horology in 1777.[2]

[1] *Quellen*, iii. 263-7.
[2] Ommanney, *Dissertation*, p. 304.

The extent to which the translation of the *Quicumque*, which is given in the First Prayer Book of 1549, followed the Greek version is not easy to determine, as in some cases the variations from the Latin text of the Sarum Breviary are due to the following of an older Latin text. But there can be no doubt that *incomprehensible* (ver. 9) was a translation of ἀκατάληπτος rather than *immensus*; *believe rightly* (ver. 29) is a translation of ὀρθῶς πιστεύσῃ rather than *fideliter credat*; *except a man believe faithfully* (ver. 42) follows the Greek ἐὰν μή τις πιστῶς πιστεύσῃ rather than the Latin *nisi quis fideliter firmiterque crediderit.*

The translators probably used Aldus' edition of the *Hours of the Blessed Virgin*, published in 1497 (=Montfaucon's third version).

APPENDIX B

THE EARLIEST MSS.

Some years ago M. Léopold Delisle, the well-known Librarian of the Bibliothèque Nationale, called attention to a MS. in the Library of the Marist Fathers at Lyons, which was presented by Bishop Leidrat of Lyons to the Altar of S. Stephen in that city, with the following autograph inscription: *Leidrat licet indignus tamen episcopus istum librum tradidi ad altare sancti Stephani.*[1] Leidrat held the See of Lyons from A.D. 798-814, when he resigned. The MS. must have been written before 814, but not much earlier, since it contains verses by Alcuin. Here then is a MS. the date of which is beyond dispute, which proves that the *Quicumque*, in the form familiar to us, was well known to Leidrat, one of the ablest theologians whom Charles the Great gathered round him in the great Revival of Learning which made his reign famous.

The MS. contains an interesting collection of Creeds, including the first Nicene Creed, the Faiths of S. Ambrose, S. Gregory the Great, S. Gregory of Neocaesarea, S. Jerome=the Creed of Pelagius.[2] M. Delisle suggested that it was prepared for Leidrat's journey to Spain in 798, when he was combating the heresy of Adoptianism, to which allusion is made in more than one of the early commentaries on the *Quicumque*. But investigation proves that the phrases of the *Quicumque* needed sharpening against the revived Nestorianism of the Adoptianists. This appears in the quotations made by Alcuin and others from the Creed which, in the light of Leidrat's MS., are no longer ambiguous. They knew the Creed and used its phrases freely.

It is of more importance to note that the same collection of Creeds in the same order, together with most of the extracts which follow in Leidrat's MS., quotations from Cassiodorus,

---

[1] His attention was drawn to it by M. l'Abbé J. B. Martin, through whose kindness I obtained the facsimiles now published by the Bradshaw Society, vol. xxxvi. p. 18. The same dedication is found in three other MSS.

[2] See my *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 133.

Damasus, Jerome, Isidore, and Augustine, brought together as an Introduction to the Psalter, actually form the Introduction to the famous Golden Psalter at Vienna, Cod. 1861, which was written by command of a King Charles for a Pope Hadrian. There can be no doubt now that it was intended by Charles the Great for Pope Hadrian I., after whose death, in A.D. 795, the MS. seems to have been given to Queen Hildegard. Dr. Traube connected with it a group of which the best specimen is the famous Trèves Ada MS. But, alas, he died before writing a dissertation on it.

Thus Leidrat's MS. by itself crushes the two-document theory that the *Quicumque* was only put together after A.D. 813.

Cod. Petriburg. Q. I. 15

This MS. is one of the best Corbie MSS. which found their way to the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg in the collection of Peter Dubrowsky, who was an attaché of the Russian Embassy at Paris at the end of the eighteenth century. Mabillon found it among the treasures of the Benedictine House of St. Germain-des-Prés, to which the Benedictines of Corbie brought their treasures in 1638, and published a facsimile of the first words of the *Quicumque* in his book *De re diplomatica*. It was supposed to be lost, but on my showing a photograph to Dr. Traube he at once identified it, and worked out the history of the handwriting. It is not written in the old Corbie hand, and appears to have come from the Irish Monastery of Péronne, which lay not far from Corbie. Its date is c. A.D. 750. It contains the writings of Isidore, the *Quicumque*, and some verses by monks of Péronne.

Cod. Monacensis lat. 6298 (Fris. 98)

This MS. comes from the Cathedral at Freising, and contains a collection of sermons which was probably made by Cæsarius of Arles. It begins with a Preface from his pen, immediately followed by the *Quicumque*. Its date is certainly eighth century, and it has one most interesting variant in which it agrees with the Profession of Denebert[1] against all other known MSS. The evidence of these eighth century MSS., with which may be named a Gallican Psalter of the year 795 (Paris, B.N. 13, 159), a collection of Canons of the year 796 (Paris, B.N. 1, 451), and a fragment (Paris, B.N. 4858), which contains clauses 1-11, brings us back to the earliest MS.

Cod. Ambrosianus, O. 212 *sup. saec.* vii., viii.

This MS. came to the Ambrosian Library at Milan from the Monastery of Bobbio. It is written in an Irish hand, which may be compared with the script of the famous Antiphonary of

[1] See p. 12.

Bangor. In the opinion of the late Dr. Ceriani, sometime Librarian, both MSS. were written about the same time, *i.e.* about the end of the seventh century. Dr. Traube was content to say seventh or eighth century. In any case it serves as a link to connect eighth century MSS. with seventh century quotations. The MS. contains the *Book of Ecclesiastical Dogmas* written by Gennadius, a private Profession of Faith by Bacchiarius, the *Quicumque* without any title, a sermon on the Ascension in a slightly later eighth century hand, and the Creed of Damasus under the title 'The Faith of Jerome.'

Dr. Swainson had hard work to explain away to himself the evidence of this MS., and took refuge in certain variants from the ordinary text which he regarded as showing unsettlement of the text after the two portions had been joined together. Thus in verse 23, after the word 'proceeding,' the words are added: 'He is co-eternal with the Father and the Son.' They occur, however, both in the treatise of Gennadius and twice in the Faith of Bacchiarius, which precede the *Quicumque* in this MS. So it would be the easiest thing in the world for a copyist to add them. Explanations are also forthcoming for the other variants which are equally unimportant, and raise no solid suspicion as to the original text of the Creed.

As a matter of fact, we are not dependent on these MSS. alone for the information required. The whole text of the Creed is contained also in early Commentaries, few of which were known to Dr. Waterland.

Early Commentaries

An independent argument to prove the existence of the *Quicumque* text as we have it from the seventh or eighth century can be built up on the evidence of these early Commentaries.

The Orleans Commentary

This Commentary was published by the Librarian, M. Cuissard, from a MS. 94 of the Town Library, which contains part of Theodulf's treatise against Adoptianism and an exposition of the Mass, which has been attributed to him. It is very doubtful whether M. Cuissard is right in ascribing the Commentary to Theodulf, who was one of the most learned prelates of the Court of Charles the Great. Its laboured explanations, and its loose use of theological terms, are unworthy of him. But while its theological value is small, it is of historical importance in our present inquiry, inasmuch as it is a MS. of the ninth century. The author quotes other Commentaries, and this puts their date back—Fortunatus, Troyes, Stavelot, Paris. The MS. comes from Fleury and was probably written there. It throws light on the interest taken in the subject in the monastery of which Theodulf was at one time Abbot, and in which he introduced the use of

the *Quicumque* at Prime. A list of the Abbots at Fleury credits him with the authorship of an *Explanation of the View of S. Athanasius*, which is the title used in his book *On the Holy Spirit*, but not in this Commentary.

The Stavelot Commentary

The Stavelot Commentary probably dates from the ninth century also. The earliest MS. is in the British Museum (B.M. Add. MSS. 18,043), of the tenth century, from Stavelot Abbey in the Forest of Ardennes. In the Middle Ages it became widely popular, and was edited by Bishop Bruno of Würzburg. Since Stavelot was attached to Liège from the ninth century, it may have been one of the Commentaries referred to by a Synod held in the Diocese *c.* 840-855: 'For we decree that the Faith of S. Athanasius the Bishop, in this work, is to be observed, and the Creed of the Apostles with the traditions and expositions of the holy Fathers on these discourses.' This Commentary again has been conjectured to be the missing Commentary of Theodulf, but there is nothing to connect any of the MSS. with Fleury or the text with Theodulf. The Commentary contains good matter, and became, with the Oratorian and Fortunatus Commentaries, the foundation of several Mediæval Commentaries. One of these, under the name of Richard Rolle of Hampole, was widely used in England in the fourteenth century.

The Paris Commentary

The Paris Commentary was found by Prebendary Ommanney in a MS. of the tenth century (B.N. Paris, *Cod. lat.* 1012) from the Abbey of S. Martial at Limoges. There is no definite evidence as to its date. It contains quotations from Gregory the Great and Gennadius.

The Bouhier Commentary

The Bouhier Commentary is found in some four MSS., the earliest of which dates from the tenth century (Troyes, 1979), and belonged to the Bouhier family, whose name Ommanney attached to it. It is mainly founded on the Oratorian Commentary, and I cannot assign to it an earlier date than the ninth century.

The Oratorian Commentary

The Oratorian Commentary is by far the most learned of the known Commentaries. At present there are only two MSS. known. The earliest (*Cod. Vat. Reg.* 231), now at the Vatican of the ninth century, contains works of Cassiodorus, Prosper, Alcuin, Isidore, with expositions of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed. The other is at Troyes (MS. 804), of the tenth century, and contains works of Theodulf, Augustine on the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed, followed by two other expositions of

that Creed, and another of the *Quicumque*, to which I shall refer again as the Troyes Commentary. The Vatican MS. alone contains a remarkable preface, which, in a condensed form, reappears in all MSS. of the Bouhier Commentary. The writer, apparently addressing a Synod, states that he has carried out their instructions to provide an exposition of this work on the Faith 'which is up and down recited in our churches, and continually made the subject of meditation by our priests.' He complains of the ignorance prevailing among the clergy, of the difficulty which they find in getting books for their sacred offices—a Psalter, or a Lectionary, or a Missal. 'Since some have no desire to read or learn, it is the will of the Synod that at least they should be compelled to meditate on this exposition of the Faith' which he has illustrated from the Fathers. Ignorance of God in a priest should be accounted sacrilege like blasphemy in a layman. He goes on to speak of the tradition that this work had been composed by the blessed Athanasius, Bishop of the Alexandrian Church, 'for I have always seen it entitled thus, even in old MSS.' He had come to the conclusion that it was composed to meet the Arian heresy. This would be an easy deduction from the tradition of authorship, which has had an unfortunate influence on most writers who have discussed the internal evidence of the Creed. At this point I would only point out how important is the testimony of this ninth century writer, both as to the old MSS. which he has seen, and the use which he proposes to make of the *Quicumque*. In his exposition he quotes Augustine, Prosper, Leo, Cyril of Alexandria,[1] Fulgentius, Pelagius I., Vigilius of Thapsus, the Creed of Pelagius, and the Definition of the Sixth General Council of 681 A.D.

From this last quotation Ommanney concluded that the Commentary was written in the seventh century, while some fear of Monothelitism, the heresy which asserted that our Lord had only One Will, still prevailed. But the words of the Council are quoted rather as a statement of positive truth than as a weapon against such error. On the other hand, there is great stress laid on the unity of the Lord's Person, as if in fear of a revived Nestorianism. This seems to me to point to the time when Adoptianism was threatening the western church at the end of the eighth century, and supports Swainson's suggestion that this may be the lost Commentary of Theodulf. The whole tone of the preface is worthy of Theodulf, and describes the situation which he found in his diocese at the beginning of the Carlovingian revival of learning. Both the MSS. may be connected with Fleury.[2]

---

[1] In the Latin translation of Dionysius Exiguus.

[2] Cf. my *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 166.

The Troyes Commentary

The Troyes Commentary was found by Ommanney in the Troyes MS. (*Cod.* 804) of the tenth century, in which he found a new text of the Oratorian Commentary. It is based in part on the Fortunatus Commentary, and passes over without mention certain verses of the Creed. The author was evidently in dread of a revived Nestorianism, and speaks strongly against several opinions which were held by Felix of Urgel, the Adoptianist. Felix spoke of our Lord in His human nature as Adopted Son, and raised suspicion that he had in his mind the thought of a double personality. He also held that our Lord assumed human nature in the state to which Adam's fall reduced it, not indeed as tainted by original sin, but as subject to mortality and other consequences of sin. This view was strongly opposed by the author of the Troyes Commentary in his note on verse 30, and he goes on to insist on the singularity of the Lord's Person, and that He rose in the same flesh in which He died, all of which arguments point to the date 780 A.D. to 820 A.D., when Adoptianism was a growing heresy.

The Fortunatus Commentary

This is undoubtedly the earliest Commentary, but the MSS. do not carry us back beyond the earlier years of the ninth century. Only two MSS. were known to Dr. Waterland, but there are now over twenty on record, and probably many others. This points to a wide circulation, and we may hope some day to unravel the mystery of its origin. We have also a second edition of the Commentary, which was apparently made in the ninth century. The earliest MS. is at S. Gallen (*Cod.* 27), in the margin of a Psalter of the ninth century, which constrains us to put back the first edition to the eighth century at least.

The internal evidence is not decisive as to the date. Apollinarianism is the latest heresy mentioned by name, but there is a mild warning against Nestorianism: 'Lest on account of the taking up of human flesh there should be said to be a Quaternity. Be it far from the heart or feelings of the faithful either to say or think this.' It does not seem wise under present circumstances to say more than that it was written before 700 A.D., though it gives the impression of being a sixth century rather than a seventh century document.

A more important question must be raised in relation to the form of text quoted in it. Does it quote from a shorter form which has been expanded into our revised text? The clauses omitted are 2, 12, 14, 21-23, 26, 28, 29. Having regard to the writer's method of explanation, we can with some confidence maintain that there was no word in any of the omitted clauses

which really needed explanation. The most serious omission, 21-23, can be explained by showing that the later portion of this section had been quoted in the note on clause 5, and the important words 'begetting,' 'begotten,' 'proceeding,' had already been explained. But the evidence is too technical to be quoted here.[1]

We have given above a brief survey of the more important MSS., in which we can trace its history back to the seventh century. Side by side with them we set the early Commentaries, which carry us back by an independent route to the same date, but no further.

[1] See my *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 171.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BREWER, H., *Das sogenannte Athanasianische Glaubensbekenntnis: ein Werk des heiligen Ambrosius.* Paderborn, 1909.

BURN, A. E., *The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries.* Cambridge, 1896.

—— *An Introduction to the Creeds.* Methuen, 1899.

GIBSON, E. C. S., Bp. of Gloucester, *The Three Creeds.* Longmans, 1906.

LUMBY, J. R., *The History of the Creeds.* Cambridge, 1873.

KÜNSTLE, K., *Antipriscilliana.* Freiburg im Breisgau, 1905.

MACLEANE, D., *The Athanasian Creed.* London, 1914.

OMMANNEY, G. D. W., *A Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed.* Oxford, 1897.

SWAINSON, C. A., *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds.* London, 1875.

TURNER, C. H., *The History and Use of Creeds and Anathemas.* S.P.C.K., 1908.

WATERLAND, Dr. D., *A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed.* New edition. Oxford, 1870.

INDEX