

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

Oxford Church Text Books

The Apostles' Creed

BY

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

VICAR OF HALIFAX, AND PREBENDARY OF LICHFIELD

EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD

AUTHOR OF 'THE ATHANASIAN CREED' AND 'THE NICENE CREED'
(OXFORD CHURCH TEXT BOOKS)

THIRD EDITION

RIVINGTONS

34 *KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN*

LONDON

1912

TO
MY MOTHER

CONTENTS

PART I.—THE HISTORY

CHAP.	PAGE
I. The Earliest History of the Creed, . . .	1
II. Early Creed-forms and Theories about their Origin,	23
III. Our Apostles' Creed,	39

PART II.—THE TEACHING

IV. The Doctrine of God,	54
V. The Incarnation,	66
VI. The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit,	85
VII. A Short Historical Commentary,	106
BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR REFERENCE,	117
INDEX,	118

THE APOSTLES' CREED

PART I. THE HISTORY

CHAPTER I

THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED

It is difficult to write a short history of the Apostles' Creed because, in its various stages of development, the Creed is bound up with the whole history of the Church from Apostolic times. To use one ancient interpretation of its Latin name, *symbolum*, it has been the banner carried at the head of the victorious army of Christ. As regimental banners display emblazoned the names of the great battles in which the regiment has won distinction, so do the creeds of particular Churches sum up in phrases added to the original form the history of dire conflicts in which Truth has painfully battled with Error. It is one thing to give the skeleton record of a series of campaigns with the dates and the names of commanders on both sides, and quite another to narrate the story of endurance and bravery which was shown on the toilsome march, and through night battles, and in the suffering of hardships, no less than in the clash of battle and the hour of victory. Just so we may in the compass of a few pages put together a record of skeleton creed-forms, with approximate dates and a few appropriate reflections. But this would be to leave the heart of the subject untouched. We desire to revivify the memories of the great crises when champions of Truth have been betrayed into inconsistencies, feebleness, and

folly, and nevertheless Truth has conquered. In a short history we must be content with mention of a few battles, which were decisive. This will suffice if the reader is led on to the study of the great issues involved in larger works, both on the creeds and on Church history in general.

Again, it is bewildering to a beginner to find out how many in number and how various in shape the early creed-forms are. So many new forms also have been found quite recently that it seems as if a large volume were needed to contain them, even without note or comment. Surely it is impossible to do justice to their manifold variety in a short work.

Further study, however, reveals the fact that they all follow one main line of development, that they can be easily classified, and that for beginners it is only necessary to know the chief types. The main line of development consists in the progressive interpretation of the Baptismal Formula 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' The three chief classes are Baptismal Creeds, Conciliar Creeds, and Private or Individual Theological Professions. Our Apostles' Creed belongs to the first class, our Nicene Creed to both the first and the second, our (so-called) Athanasian Creed to the third. We are only at present concerned with the Apostles' Creed, so a very few words of explanation must suffice to show how the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds are related to it.

When the Nicene Council met in A.D. 325 Eusebius, the learned Bishop of Cæsarea, presented to it a form of faith which no doubt contained many phrases of the Baptismal Creed of Cæsarea, since he quoted it as such. But it really represented a theological essay, if I may use the term, designed by Eusebius to settle current disputes, both in the description given of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the abrupt termination of the form at the words 'And in the Holy Ghost.' There was no

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 3

controversy pending on the teaching of the third division of the Baptismal Creed. Eusebius therefore dropped the usual mention of the Church and the forgiveness of sins. The form in which it was proposed was not the form in which it was passed by the Council. It was emended and enlarged notably by the addition of the words 'of one substance' (*homoousios*) and 'of the substance of the Father,' round which controversy raged for a long time. A series of anathemas was also added condemning the main propositions of Arian theology.

Thus the original Nicene Creed was the first of a distinct class of Conciliar Creeds, which add to the simple statements of the ancient Historic Faith theological interpretations of a more or less intricate and speculative character. Many conservative theologians, of whom Eusebius himself was one, objected strongly to the use of any term such as *homoousios* (of one substance) because it was not found in Holy Scripture. But as time went on the wisdom of the Council was justified. A simple-minded bishop like Cyril of Jerusalem, whose first interest was in pastoral work, not in the region of speculative theology, came to see that such terms, though not Scriptural, were necessary to guard the sense of Scripture. So he revised the Creed of Jerusalem by the insertion of a section cut out of the Creed of the Nicene Council. His revision was received with approval by the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381. At the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 it was quoted side by side with the original Nicene Creed as the profession of the Council of Constantinople. They were referred to as the Creeds of 'the 318 holy fathers' and 'the 150 fathers' respectively. In their later history they were often confused, and their texts were altered by copyists to make them correspond more closely. But it was the revised Creed of Cyril which came into use as the Baptismal Creed of Constantinople and so of the whole

4 THE APOSTLES' CREED

Eastern Church, was then introduced into the Liturgy, and with two additions¹ has come down to us as our Nicene Creed.

To make the case quite clear I will print the two forms side by side. The change in the pronouns from *We* to *I* does not represent a difference between Eastern and Western creeds, as is often asserted, but simply the difference between Conciliar and Baptismal Creeds.

Council of Constantinople,
A.D. 381.

Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325.

Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

We believe

We believe

I. 1. In one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible.

I. 1. In one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

II. 2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both those in heaven and those on earth,

II. 2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, [*God of God*], Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made;

3. Who for us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate, was made Man,

3. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate of the

¹ Printed in [].

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 5

Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made Man,

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 4. Suffered, | 4. And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, |
| 5. And rose the third day, | 5. And rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures, |
| 6. Ascended into heaven, | 6. And ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, |
| 7. Is coming to judge quick and dead. | 7. And is coming again with glory to judge quick and dead, whose kingdom shall have no end. |
- III. 8. And in the Holy Ghost. III. 8. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father [*and the Son*], who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets,
9. In one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.
10. We acknowledge one baptism for remission of sins.
11. We look for the resurrection of the dead,
12. And the life of the world to come.

It remains to say a word about Private Professions of Faith, which stray more or less from the beaten path of the ordinary Baptismal Creeds in order to emphasise what seem to the author to be important, or it may be neglected, aspects of Christian Truth. One of the earliest is the following from the pen of Gregory the Wonder-worker, a pupil of Origen :

Gregory Thaumaturgus.

‘One God, Father of the living Word, (who is) wisdom subsisting, and of power, and of His eternal image, perfect begetter of (one who is) perfect, Father of (the) Only begotten Son, one Lord, sole from sole, God from God, Image and likeness of the Godhead, energising Word, Wisdom encircling the constitution of the Universe, and efficient power of the whole creation, very Son of (the) very Father, invisible of invisible, and incorruptible of incorruptible, and immortal of immortal, and eternal of eternal. And one Holy Spirit having his existence from God, and appearing through the Son, the Image of the Son, perfect (image) of perfect (Son); Life—the first cause of all that live; Holiness—the provider of hallowing, in whom is made manifest God the Father who is over all and in all, and God the Son who is through all; a complete Trinity, in glory and eternity and reign not divided nor estranged. There is therefore in the Trinity nothing created or serving, and nothing imported in the sense that it did not exist to start with, but at a later time made its way in; for never was there wanting Son to Father nor Spirit to Son, but there was always the same Trinity unchangeable and unalterable.’

Another is the famous letter of Pope Leo to Flavian which, as a masterly summary of the case against the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, had great influence

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 7

on the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, and on the balanced Definition of Faith which they published.

The Athanasian Creed is a similar Private Profession of Faith which was written some time in the fifth century¹ by a writer of the school of Lerins. It was an Instruction used for the benefit of a congregation or congregations in the south of France which in course of time came to be used as a canticle, and at its first introduction into Western service-books had precisely the same authority as the *Te Deum*. We are not concerned with its history except so far as it follows the line of the Apostles' Creed, quoting current Gallican teaching on the Descent into Hell, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. But it seems important, in view of modern controversies, to note how it should be classified. It is a Private Profession which was accepted from the tenth century throughout the Western Church as a useful paraphrase of their Baptismal Creed, just as they used the Baptismal Creed of the Eastern Church to enrich their Liturgy, without substituting either for the solemn act of Faith required from every Christian at his baptism and on his deathbed.

In the Prayer Book of the Church of England the Apostles' Creed is used with slight variations in the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer and in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick. It may be well to mark the variations which these forms present when compared with our Baptismal Creed, because they show to an observant eye how deeply rooted in the past history of the Church are those liturgical phrases which rise so readily to our lips, and should be more often pondered over in our hearts.

For example, the words 'after death' in our Baptismal

¹ In the opinion of Dom Morin the author was probably Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles.

Creed come to us from Gaul, whether directly or indirectly we do not know. They stood in the Creed of the Bangor Antiphony in the seventh century, and may have come to us by some such Celtic channel. But this creed itself shows signs of Gallican origin, and the expression is found in other Gallican creeds, *e.g.* in the creed of the Church of Limoges,¹ and in an explanation of the Creed which has been traced to the pen of Magnus of Sens.² It came into our Interrogative Creed through the Sarum ritual.

These words are not anti-heretical or controversial. In English they form a cadence of real beauty which should fall on a thoughtful ear with a measured sound arresting attention. They bid us reflect on the passing of so many generations who have made this great act of faith before us with lips now silent in death. They unseal emotion when we are led on to think of the great mystery of life which in the unseen world is now to them revealed, which we hope to share with them in the Paradise of all Christ's saints.

A

BAPTISMAL CREED.

(Used also in the Office for the
Visitation of the Sick.)

Dost thou helieve

I. 1. in God the Father
almighty, maker of
heaven and earth?

II. 2. And in Jesus Christ, His
only-begotten Son, our
Lord?

B

MORNING AND EVENING
PRAYER.

I helieve

I. 1. in God the Father al-
mighty, maker of
heaven and earth :

II. 2. And in Jesus Christ His
only Son our Lord,

¹ Martene, i. 1, Art. xviii. Ord. 18.

² Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, p. 80.

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 9

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>3. <i>And that</i> He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,</p> | <p>3. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,</p> |
| <p>4. <i>That He</i> suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried ;</p> | <p>4. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried,</p> |
| <p>5. <i>That He went down</i> into hell and <i>also</i> did rise again the third day,</p> | <p>5. He descended into hell ; the third day He rose again from the dead,</p> |
| <p>6. <i>That He</i> ascended into heaven</p> | <p>6. He ascended into heaven,</p> |
| <p>7. And sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty ;</p> | <p>7. And sitteth at the right hand of God the Father almighty ;</p> |
| <p>8. <i>And from thence shall come again at the end of the world,</i> to judge the quick and the dead ?</p> | <p>8. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.</p> |
| <p>9. And dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost ;</p> | <p>9. I believe in the Holy Ghost ;</p> |
| <p>10. The holy Catholic Church ; the communion of saints ;</p> | <p>10. The holy Catholic Church ; the communion of saints ;</p> |
| <p>11. <i>The remission</i> of sins ;</p> | <p>11. The forgiveness of sins ;</p> |
| <p>12. The resurrection of the <i>flesh</i> ;
And everlasting life <i>after death</i> ?</p> | <p>12. The resurrection of the body,
And the life everlasting.</p> |
| <p><i>Ans.</i> All this I stedfastly believe.</p> | |

In its present form (A) our Apostles' Creed has had a continuous history of some twelve hundred years. In the use of the Gallican Church, with omission of the words

'*maker of heaven and earth,*' it can be traced back for two hundred and eighty years further. But in the fifth century there were many other forms extant which, together with our form, seem to have been derived from a common archetype or parent. Of these the Old Roman Creed which comes to light in the fourth century was certainly the archetype of all Western forms. But the critics are not agreed that the Roman type was also the parent of Eastern forms, which some of them trace back to a common ancestor in Antioch or Asia Minor. These statements will become more intelligible as we proceed to deal—first, with the earliest history of Christian thought on the subject of belief, and then with selected types.

§ 1. THE EVIDENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

There is abundant evidence in the New Testament that the Apostles were agreed on an outline of teaching (Rom. vi. 17). The summaries of sermons of S. Peter and S. Paul in the Acts provide close parallels to the teaching of the Creed on the doctrine of God, the life and work of Christ, and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But there is no suggestion of any fixed form of words in which the teaching might be summarised and committed to memory. S. Paul preaching to a cultured congregation at Athens seems free to alter the form of his discourse spontaneously, and uses a strain of thought quite different from that which he had used to the barbarian villagers at Lystra. Yet in both cases he began with the doctrine of the one true God, the Creator, in opposition to belief in numberless heathen deities. Only upon that foundation could he build safely the doctrine of the Son of God, in opposition to the hero-worship which had such a fascination for the pagan mind.

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 11

When the Apostles preached to Jews they had a common foundation of faith in the God of their fathers, and their message was at once of Jesus as the Messiah, crucified and risen from the dead, of repentance, of baptism for the remission of sins, of faith in His name as the motive power of moral conduct, of confession of that faith as the condition of spiritual health. *For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation* (Rom. x. 10).

The only trace of a form of creed is the simple confession of Jesus as the Lord, or the Son of God. In the words, *No man can say that Jesus is the Lord save in the Holy Ghost* (1 Cor. xii. 3), S. Paul traces faith to its source. Again he writes: *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved* (Rom. x. 9). He quotes the prophet Joel (ii. 32) as predicting *this word of faith*, and teaches that the Lord Jesus is one with the Lord Jehovah on whose name Joel bade his hearers call.

An attempt has been made to prove that the evidence of S. Paul's Epistles to Timothy points to a longer form. S. Paul reminds Timothy (1 Tim. vi. 13) of the confession before many witnesses which he had made, presumably at his baptism. He calls it *the beautiful confession* to which Christ Jesus has borne witness before Pontius Pilate, and charges him before God, who quickeneth all things, to keep the commandment. The simplest explanation of the confession which the Lord witnessed is this, that He avowed that He was a King (John xviii. 36). It does not seem possible to extract more from the words than the exhortation that Timothy should make a similar confession of Christ as King and Lord. Mention of Pilate was included in S. Paul's teaching, but not necessarily in his creed. The pattern of sound (Gr. healthful)

words which he bids Timothy hold (2 Tim. i. 13) *in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus*, seems to refer to the general content of the gospel which he preached. *Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel* (2 Tim. ii. 8). He bids him pass on the teaching heard from him *among many witnesses* to faithful men whom he in his turn is to put in remembrance. *I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the quick and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word* (2 Tim. iv. 1, 2).

Some writers, piecing together these texts, have tried to reconstruct a primitive Apostles' Creed which they connect with the missionary Church of Antioch, by whom S. Paul was sent forth on his journeys. Dr. Zahn argues: 'If this is not all deceptive appearance, it must be taken as proved that the confession which Timothy made at his baptism before many witnesses referred first to God the Author of all life; secondly, to Jesus Christ; and that it described Him as "descended from David's seed," who stood "before Pontius Pilate," "was raised from the dead," who will some day appear again "to judge the quick and the dead."' ¹

It is admitted that nothing can be said about a third article of the Creed, though there is a reference to the Holy Ghost in the context of 2 Tim. i. 14. This is the weak point in the argument to prove that the Apostles had such a form, which became the parent of both Eastern and Western forms, and was reconstructed either in Rome or Asia Minor, chiefly by omission of any mention of the Davidic descent of Christ. We have to consider the possibility that the Apostolic Creed was a simple confession of Jesus as the Lord.

Important testimony is forthcoming from an unexpected

¹ *Apostles' Creed* (Eng. Trans.), p. 86.

quarter, the eunuch's confession in Acts viii. 37: 'I believe that Jesus is the Son of God.' It is true that it is found only in what is known as the Western text (Codex Bezae), and has been thrust into the margin of the Revised Version. But some think that this text represents S. Luke's original draft. And in any case it was known to Irenæus in this form, and may represent the form of Baptismal Confession in the Church of Asia Minor from which Irenæus drew his tradition.

The suggestion is confirmed by the evidence of the Johannine Epistles: *Whosoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God* (1 John iv. 15). The aorist tense used in the Greek text points to a single definite act, the confession from which the divine indwelling is dated.

In another passage the context is important, as showing the drift of thought. Jesus has been proved to be the Christ historically by water and blood, His baptism and His crucifixion. He now works in the Church, not only in the water of baptism, but also by cleansing in His blood. Thus S. John leads up to the thought of the Baptismal Confession: *This is the victory that overcame the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?* (1 John v. 5).

Similar evidence may be gathered from the Epistle to the Hebrews: *Having therefore a great High Priest, who is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession* (Heb. iv. 14).

I regard these texts as proving conclusively that the earliest creed of the Church was this simple statement: 'I believe that Jesus is the Lord (*or* the Son of God).' Belief in the Person of Christ leads on to belief in the words of Christ. The later creed has been made by expansion of this form in combination with the Baptismal

Formula : *In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost* (Matt. xxviii. 19).

Some writers maintain that the original form of the Baptismal Formula also was Christological and not Trinitarian, *in the name of Jesus* (or *the Lord Jesus*). They appeal to the following passages : Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, x. 48, xix. 5 ; Rom. vi. 3 ; Gal. iii. 27. On the other hand, all these references to baptism in (or into) the name of the Lord Jesus may refer, not to the Baptismal Formula, but either to the confession made by the baptized, or to the new relationship into which they were brought on becoming 'members of Christ.'

The disciples of John the Baptist whom S. Paul met at Ephesus (Acts xix. 3) told him that they had been baptized *into the baptism of John*. This does not mean that John used the formula : 'I baptize into the name of John,' for we gather from S. Paul's reply that John said, 'for repentance.' But the disciples of John seem to have confessed themselves such, just as Corinthian partisans (1 Cor. i. 12-18) labelled themselves disciples of Cephas, or Apollos, or Christ, or Paul. Why, then, should not the words that follow, '*they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus,*' be taken to refer to their personal confession of faith. Indeed the pains which S. Paul took to instruct them about the Holy Spirit seem to imply that Trinitarian teaching was actually given them.¹

Before leaving the New Testament we must note that there are other set types of teaching, which have not come under consideration, and may possibly have belonged to the earliest catechetical teaching. Thus we find teaching cast in the form of a chronicle (Mark xvi.

¹ For fuller treatment of this subject, cf. my *Introduction*, p. 20 ff. ; and for a full defence of the authenticity of Matthew xxviii. 19, *vide* Riggenbach, *Der Trinitarische Taufbefehl*, Gütersloh, 1903.

9 ff.), or in the form of a chronicle with short proofs (1 Cor. xv. 3-7). In 1 Peter iii. 18 the scheme is moulded on the antithesis *according to the flesh—according to the spirit*, and the Apostle has instruction of candidates for baptism in his mind. Having spoken of Christ as suffering for sins, he contrasts His death in the flesh with His quickening in the spirit, and his mention of the salvation of Noah's family in the ark as a type of baptism leads up to the mention of *the question and answer* (R. V. interrogation) *of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ: who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven* (1 Peter iii. 21, 22).

We also come across fragments of primitive Christian hymns, such as 1 Tim. iii. 16 :

*He who was manifested in the flesh,
justified in the spirit,
seen of angels,
preached among the nations,
believed on in the world,
received up in glory.*

But such fragments stand in no relation to the subsequent development of creed-forms and need not detain us.

§ 2. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

The so-called Apostolic Fathers are the generation of Christian teachers who were pupils and immediate successors of the Apostles.

Clement, Bishop of Rome, wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians in which are contained important statements of faith in the Trinity, but no obvious parallel to a creed-form. 'Have we not,' he writes, 'one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit of grace, which was poured out upon us?' (Cor. xlvi. 6). And again: 'As God lives,

and the Lord Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit, the faith and hope of the elect' (Cor. lviii. 2). He claims for the Son and the Spirit, just as S. Paul had claimed in the benediction of his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. xiii. 13), a personal life distinguished from that of the Father, and yet Divine.

The parallels in the Epistles of Ignatius the Martyr Bishop of Antioch are much more definite. They form a connecting-link between the teaching of S. Paul's letters to Timothy and the early, perhaps earliest Creed, which we shall presently discuss as the Old Roman Creed.

To the Ephesians, c. 18: 'For our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived in the womb by Mary according to a dispensation, of the seed of David but also of the Holy Ghost; and He was born and was baptized that by His passion He might cleanse water.'

To the Trallians, c. 9: 'Be ye deaf, therefore, when any man speaketh to you apart from Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David, who was the Son of Mary, who was truly born and ate and drank, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven and those on earth and those under the earth; who, moreover, was truly raised from the dead, His Father having raised Him, who in the like fashion will so raise us also who believe on Him—His Father, I say, will raise us—in Christ Jesus, apart from whom we have not true life.'

To the Smyrnæans, c. 1: 'I have perceived that ye are established in faith immovable, being, as it were, nailed on the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, in flesh and in spirit, and firmly grounded in love in the blood of Christ, fully persuaded as touching our Lord that He is truly of the race of David according to the flesh, but Son of God by the Divine will and power, truly born of a virgin and baptized by John that *all righteousness might*

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 17

be fulfilled by Him, truly nailed up in the flesh for our sakes under Pontius Pilate and Herod the Tetrarch (of which fruit are we—that is, of His most blessed passion); that *He might set up an ensign* unto all the ages through His resurrection, for His saints and faithful people, whether among Jews or among Gentiles, in one body of His Church.'

In the Epistle (to the Philippians) of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, the friend and pupil of Ignatius, there is very little to be gleaned. He lays stress (c. 2) on the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead in words taken from 1 Peter, and (c. 7) urges confession of Jesus Christ come in the flesh, and the witness of the Cross, echoing 1 John iv. 2-4.

Equally disappointing is the *Didache*, a Jewish manual edited by a Christian writer, which, however, quotes (c. 7) the Baptismal Formula, and side by side with it (c. 9) the phrase 'those baptized into the name of the Lord,' where the reference seems clearly to be not to a formula of baptism but to a form of confession, or to the new relationship to the Lord into which the baptized are brought.

Our conclusion is that the Apostles' Creed did not exist in Apostolic times, though the substance of its teaching was primitive. The Ignatian epistles prove that instruction was given in Antioch on many points characteristic of the teaching of the developed creed, the miraculous birth, the crucifixion, the resurrection. We also find mention of *the Catholic Church*, in the primitive sense of the word *catholic*=*universal*, as of the forgiveness of sins and of the hope of resurrection, but the teaching on these points is not connected with faith in the Holy Ghost nor joined in any way with the Christological teaching so as to suggest the existence of a developed creed-form.

§ 3. THE APOLOGISTS.

We turn next to the Apologists of the second century : (1) Justin Martyr, (2) Aristides, (3) Irenæus. This is the most difficult stage of our inquiry. It is so easy to strain the evidence and by arbitrary critical processes compile a creed of Ephesus from Justin Martyr or a creed of Gaul from Irenæus. I believe myself, with Dr. Kattenbusch, that both Justin Martyr and Irenæus were acquainted with the old Roman Creed. But it seems fairest to quote the most important passages as they stand.

(1) *Justin Martyr.*

Justin Martyr's evidence may be quoted under two heads: (a) Expansions of the Baptismal Formula; (b) Specimens of Christological teaching.

(a) *Apol.* i. 61: 'For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water.'

Ib. ad fin.: 'And in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Ghost . . . he who is illuminated is washed.'

(b) Specimens of Christological teaching. These may be arranged with reference to (i) general teaching on the Incarnation; (ii) the fulfilment of prophecy; (iii-iv) the history of the Lord Jesus; (v) a prayer of exorcism; (vi) an old Testament type.

(i) *Apol.* i. 21: 'We say also that the Word, who is the first-born of God, was produced without sexual union, and that He, Jesus Christ, our teacher, was crucified and died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven.'

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 19

(ii) *Ib.* 31: 'In these books, then, of the prophets we found Jesus our Christ foretold as coming, born of a virgin, growing up to man's estate, and healing every disease and every sickness, and raising the dead, and being hated, and unrecognised, and crucified, and dying, and rising again, and ascending into heaven, and being, and being called the Son of God.'

(iii) *Ib.* 42: 'But our Jesus Christ, being crucified and dead, rose again, and having ascended to heaven, reigned.'

(iv) *Ib.* 46: 'Through the power of the Word, according to the will of God the Father and Lord of all, He was born of a virgin as a man, and was named Jesus, and was crucified and died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven.'

(v) *Dial.* 85: 'For every demon, when exorcised in the name of this very Son of God—who is the First-born of every creature, who became man by the Virgin, who suffered and was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your nation, who died, who rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven—is overcome and subdued.'

(vi) *Ib.* 132: 'It conduces to your hereby knowing Jesus, whom we also know to have been Christ the Son of God, who was crucified, and rose again, and ascended to heaven, and will come again to judge all men, even up to Adam himself.'

The variety of context in which these phrases occur renders it unlikely that Justin's personal creed contained more than 'Jesus is the Christ the Son of God.' In his *Dialogue* (64) the Jew Trypho is represented as connecting the thought of confession with prayer to Christ: 'We do not need confession of Him nor worship.' In the same *Dialogue* (35) Justin shows that the preaching of Jesus crucified leads up to confession of Him as Lord and Christ: 'confessing that they themselves are Chris-

tians and to confess that the crucified Jesus is both Lord and Christ.' Again he writes (*Dial.* 47) of guarding such a confession 'in the Christ of God.'

At the same time full consideration should be given to the coincidences of language by which Dr. Kattenbusch seeks to prove Justin's acquaintance with the Old Roman Creed. In a quotation of Matt. xvi. 21 = Mark viii. 31 = Luke ix. 22 Justin (*Dial.* 51, 76, 100) uses the word *crucified* in place of the 'be killed' of the *Textus receptus*. This is followed by 'rose the third day,' where Mark has 'and after three days rise again,' Matthew and Luke have 'and on the third day be raised.' Justin also speaks confidently of 'the resurrection of the flesh' as a part of orthodox Christian belief' (*Dial.* 80). It is difficult to convey the force of such arguments from Greek phrases to English readers. But even when Justin's acquaintance with the Old Roman Creed is accepted it does not follow that it had yet come into use in Asia Minor.

On the other hand Dr. Zahn thinks that Justin was quoting his own creed of Ephesus and that it included the word 'dead' between 'crucified' and 'buried.' He calls attention to the reply of the Presbyters of Smyrna, a city near of Ephesus, who c. A.D. 180, in opposition to the heresy of Noetus, confessed 'Suffered, dead, risen again the third day.' But the word 'dead' is very rare in creeds till a much later time, so that this is no proof that Justin and the Smyrnæans were quoting from an Eastern creed parallel to that of Rome.

(2) *Aristides.*

The testimony of the Apologist Aristides of the date A.D. 140-148 is extant in three fragments of the Greek original and of Syriac and Armenian versions. The following passage suggests that Aristides like Justin

EARLIEST HISTORY OF THE CREED 21

confessed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, while at the same time he taught plainly enough His pre-existence and His birth of a Virgin: 'The Christians then are race-reckoned from the Lord Jesus Christ. He, the Son of God Most High, is confessed in the Holy Spirit to have come down from heaven for the salvation of men; and was born of a holy virgin . . . took flesh and was manifested to men.'

(3) *Irenæus.*

Irenæus, the great Bishop of Lyons, was a native of Asia Minor, who in his youth, before his migration to Gaul, had been a pupil of Polycarp. He was sent on an important mission to Rome, where he lectured against heresies. The times were critical. The rise of the Gnostic heresy, which was a movement among Gentile Christians, threatened to subvert the Christian faith from its foundations. It was an attempt to solve the problem of the origin of evil on pagan lines by attributing all the sin of the world to an intermediate deity, or Demiurge, who was imagined to oppose the supreme Good God. The Demiurge was identified with the God of the Jews. Christ as the Only-begotten Son was described as an emanation from Heavenly Powers, themselves emanations from the Supreme, who came into the world to deliver mankind from the oppression of the Demiurge.

The following passages prove that Irenæus taught on the lines of the developed creed, though the fact that the Holy Ghost is not mentioned in his Rule of Faith, after detailed teaching on the Incarnation, appears to make it improbable that his personal creed was more than the short Christological confession: 'I believe that Jesus is the Son of God.' At the same time there are many

phrases which point to acquaintance with the Old Roman Creed. The following is the most important passage, *c. Haer*, i. 10 :

‘The Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the Apostles and their disciples this faith : [She believes] in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and the sea and all things that are in them ; and in one Christ Jesus the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation ; and in the Holy Spirit who proclaimed through the prophets the dispensations of God and the advents, and the birth from a Virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension into heaven in the flesh of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, and His [future] manifestation from heaven in the glory of the Father to gather all things in one, and to raise up anew all flesh of the whole human race in order that, to Christ Jesus our Lord and God and Saviour and King, according to the will of the invisible Father “every knee should bow of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess to Him,” and that He should execute just judgment towards all.’

CHAPTER II

EARLY CREED-FORMS AND THEORIES ABOUT THEIR ORIGIN

At the present stage of investigation into the history of the Apostles' Creed it is important to keep an open mind, free to consider the bearings of any new evidence which may be forthcoming. But the uncertainty which is attached to the theories about their origin does not belong to the early creed-forms themselves, and for practical purposes one theory is as good as another. It is agreed, for example, that the Old Roman Creed goes back to the first years of the second century. Whether we can trace a sister or parent creed of Antioch thirty years further back or not, or even if the parent of both is to be found in Asia Minor, the common tradition which they hand down represents a summary of Apostolic teaching in the generation following the Apostles, preserved from a date preceding the formation of the New Testament Canon. The Creed and the New Testament are supplementary. We may prove the truth of the witness of the Church as expressed in the Creed out of the Bible records, but even if the records had perished the witness of the Creed would have remained permanent, irrefragable.

1. THE OLD ROMAN CREED.

The history of the Old Roman Creed is best studied backwards. During the ages of persecution when the Church became of necessity a secret society, hiding

jealously its books and its holy mysteries, the Creed was used as a 'password' by which a Christian could make himself known in a community to which he was a stranger. And the custom grew up which lasted on even to the fifth century, when Christianity had for many years been a permitted religion, of warning candidates for baptism that they should never write down the articles of their belief but treasure them written in their heart. This fact explains the difficulty of tracing back creed-forms in early times when Christian writers shrank from open quotation of that which they treasured as a mystery, according to one meaning of the old Latin *sacramentum*, a sacrament.

Thus in the fourth century the Old Roman Creed comes to light in the writings of Marcellus of Ancyra and of Rufinus of Aquileia. In the year A.D. 340 Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, was exiled from his diocese by Arian intrigues, and came to stay with Bishop Julius of Rome. Before his return home in the following year he left with his host a profession of his faith, which might be used by his friends in his defence, and has been preserved by the historian Epiphanius.¹ This was the Old Roman Creed which Marcellus accepted and made his own,² using the Greek text which in all probability comes down from the days when the earliest Roman Church was a Greek-speaking community to which S. Paul naturally wrote his epistle in Greek. Of course the Roman Christians must always have been bilingual, and the Old Latin text is probably as ancient as the Greek.

¹ *Haer.* lxxii.

² It was Archbishop Ussher who first pointed this out. There are two slight variations in the text quoted by Marcellus, the omission of the word 'Father' in Art. 1, and the addition of the words 'eternal life' in Art. 12, which are probably mistakes of copyists of the treatise of Epiphanius.

Sixty years later (A.D. 400) Rufinus, a priest of Aquileia, wrote a commentary on the creed of his native city, comparing it with the Old Roman Creed. He was a man who had travelled much and was well read. He believed that the Roman Creed was the actual Apostles' Creed which the Twelve had composed in solemn conclave before they left Jerusalem. He explained that while other Churches added clauses to meet different heresies the Roman Church had remained free from heresy, and had kept up the custom that those who are going to be baptized should rehearse the Creed publicly, that is in the audience of the people, 'the consequence of which is that the ears of those who are already believers will not admit the addition of a single word.'¹ We need not accept the legend of Apostolic authorship, of which earlier writers, men of more acumen than Rufinus, do not seem to have heard. It was afterwards transferred to the later creed-form which has become our Received Text of the Creed, and in many old MSS. the different clauses are distributed among the Apostles sometimes in one order of the names and sometimes in another! Though it was true that the Roman Church was comparatively free from the attacks of heresy in Arian times, this was not the case in the second century when, though Rufinus did not know it, Rome as the capital of the Empire was the meeting-ground of every conceivable heresy and superstition, pagan as well as Christian. Rufinus is quite correct, however, in his statement about the solemn ceremony of the Repetition of the Creed by Candidates for Baptism. Though not peculiar to Rome it was specially observed there. There is an interesting passage in Augustine's *Confessions*² in which he describes the sensation made when Victorinus, who had

¹ *Comm.* c. 3.

² Quoted below, p. 113.

been a famous teacher of Neo-Platonism, rose to make his profession of faith.

THE OLD ROMAN CREED.

- I. 1. I believe in God (the)¹ Father almighty ;
- II. 2. And in Christ Jesus His only Son our Lord,
 3. Who was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary,
 4. crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried,
 5. the third day He rose from the dead,
 6. He ascended into heaven,
 7. sitteth at the right hand of the Father,
 8. thence He shall come to judge living and dead.
- III. 9. And in the Holy Ghost,
 10. (the) holy Church,
 11. (the) remission of sins,
 12. (the) resurrection of the flesh.

We can trace back this Old Roman Creed in the writings of Felix, Bishop A.D. 269-274, and of Dionysius, Bishop c. A.D. 259. There is also an interesting quotation in the writing of Novatian, a priest of the Roman Church, *On the Trinity* :

‘The Rule of Truth demands that first of all we should believe in God the Father and Lord Almighty ; to believe also in the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord God, but Son of God . . . of Mary . . . about to rise from the dead . . . about to sit at the right hand of the Father judge of all ; to believe also in the Holy Spirit . . . who guards the Church in holiness of truth . . . who brings forth our bodies for resurrection of immortality.’

¹ I have quoted the definite article in brackets where it is not found in the Greek text of Marcellus. The Latin language having no article, it is a question how the Latin text should be translated.

At the end of the second century Tertullian, a Carthaginian lawyer, who had been ordained priest in Rome, and afterwards lapsed into the heresy known as Montanism, expresses the agreement of the African Church with the Church of Rome in matters of faith. His heresy, which was mainly an unbalanced opinion on the measure of inspiration accorded by the Holy Spirit to Montanus and other Christian prophets, does not render his statements on the Creed suspicious. He calls the creed the watchword which the African Church shares with the Roman, also the Rule of Faith, and the oath of allegiance (*Sacramentum*) imposed on the Christian soldier at the font. In the following passage he appears to give to sacrament the meaning of an outward sign of an inward grace. The Creed is the sign; faith enlarged by knowledge of the whole scheme of redemption is the grace which clothes the soul. The Baptismal Formula supplies the framework, and the Birth, Passion, and Resurrection of the Lord are included in it.

De Bapt. 13: 'Grant that, in days gone by, there was salvation by means of bare faith, before the passion and resurrection of the Lord. But now that faith has been enlarged, and is become a faith which believes in his nativity, passion, and resurrection, there has been an amplification added to the sacrament, [namely], the sealing act of baptism; the clothing, in some sense, of the faith which before was bare, and which cannot exist now without its proper law. For the law of baptizing has been imposed, and the formula prescribed: "Go," saith He, "teach the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."'

This corresponds to another passage, in which Tertullian speaks of threefold immersion, while reciting rather more than the Lord appointed in the Gospel. Taken together with the following two parallels, these statements leave little or no doubt in one's mind as to the form of creed which Tertullian used.

De uirg. uel. 1: 'The rule of faith indeed is one altogether . . . of believing in one God almighty, maker of the world, and in His Son Jesus Christ, born of Mary the Virgin, crucified under Pontius Pilate; the third day raised from the dead, received in the heavens, sitting now at the right hand of the Father, about to come to judge quick and dead, through the resurrection also of the flesh.'

De Præscr. 36: 'What the (Roman) Church has made a common token with the African Churches: has recognised one God, creator of the universe, and Christ Jesus, of the Virgin Mary, Son of God the creator, and the resurrection of the flesh.'

From Tertullian we learn much about the famous Gnostic Marcion. What made opposition to Marcion most difficult was the fact that he still held to the Roman Creed interpreted in his own way. Tertullian felt this with regard to Valentinus,¹ and it embittered his opposition to Marcion. He writes that Marcion had not so much innovated upon the rule of faith by the separation of the law and the gospel, as he had taken trouble for its adulteration, and that 'after the Apostles' times truth suffered adultery concerning the Rule of God.'²

In one passage of Marcion's revised New Testament he writes about the two covenants, combining Gal. iv. 24 with Eph. i. 21: 'The one from Mount Sinai, which is the synagogue of the Jews after the law, begotten into bondage; the other, which is exalted above all might, majesty, and power, and over every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; which (covenant) is the mother of us all, which begets us in the holy Church, which we have acknowledged (or to which we have vowed allegiance).'

Dr. Zahn³ points out that Marcion does not say, or rather does not allow the Apostle to say, 'which we

¹ *Ad Valent.*, 1.

² *Adv. Marc.*, i. 21.

³ *The Apostles' Creed* (Eng. trans.), p. 66 f.

acknowledge,' but he looks back to the confession and the oath taken once for all at baptism with reference to the holy Church. The same word had been used by Ignatius of the oath taken on the confession of the Christian faith. It follows that the words 'holy Church' were contained in the Roman Creed before Marcion's breach with the Church in A.D. 145.

Thus we trace the Old Roman Creed up to the earliest years of the second century, and ask the question whether Rufinus was right after all in saying that it had remained unchanged? The evidence of Tertullian, and of Irenæus also, seems to point to the addition of the word 'one' in the first Article, which is found in all Eastern forms of the Creed. If the word once stood there, can we explain its omission from the time of Novatian?

From Tertullian we learn that certain leaders of thought in the Roman Church had been strongly influenced by a strain of teaching which confused the Persons of the Godhead. Zephyrinus is reported to have said: 'I believe in one God, Jesus Christ.' His successor, Callistus, attempted to make a compromise, distinguishing Christ the Divine from Jesus the human. He was at once denounced by the teacher Sabellius, from whom the heresy derived the name Sabellianism. Sabellius asserted that the Trinity represented successive aspects of the one Godhead, God having been manifested first as Father, then as Son, then as Holy Spirit. Under these circumstances it would not be surprising if the word 'one' were omitted from the first Article of the Creed to counteract such teaching. In the history of Eusebius¹ the heretics of this period are said to have accused the Roman Church of recoinng the truth like

¹ *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 28, 3, 13.

forgers. Dr. Zahn suggests that this is a reference to the alteration of the Creed.

The internal evidence of the Creed points to the early years of the century, ± 100 A.D., as the date of its composition. The simplicity and terseness of the style point to the sub-Apostolic age. There is no mention of God's work in creation which was generally included in outlines of Christian doctrine after the rise of Gnosticism. Its authorship remains unknown, but it seems to have become a rule of faith without dispute. 'From Tertullian's description we are led to call it simply "the Faith," a short and intelligible summary of the teaching which Christianity offered. Its terse and rhythmical sentences were not unworthy of the great apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, who had laboured and suffered in the imperial city. We may even conjecture that they helped not a little to mould the noble traditions of faith and learning which through centuries to come enhanced the reputation of the holy Roman Church. It may fitly be called an Apostolic Creed, because it contains the substance of apostolic teaching, and is the work of a mind separated only by one generation from the apostles.'¹

2. THE OLD CREED OF JERUSALEM.

We turn next to the Old Creed of Jerusalem which we find imbedded in the catechetical lectures of Cyril, who was Bishop of Jerusalem in the fourth century. Cyril quotes two forms. The first, which is very short, was used apparently at the moment of Baptism. He reminds the newly baptized how they renounced Satan and all his works, turning to the West as the land of darkness. Then turning to the East, as the land of

¹ *Vide my Introduction, p. 65.*

light, they said: 'I believe in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, and in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' We might almost imagine that this form takes us back to the days when S. Peter preached his first sermon in Jerusalem. The longer form, like a geological map of the different strata on the earth's surface, records the history of its gradual formation. The titles 'Only-begotten' and 'Paraclete,' given to the Son and the Holy Spirit, point to the teaching of S. John; the word 'catholic' to the times of Ignatius; the words 'whose kingdom shall have no end' look like a recent addition to counteract the teaching of Marcellus of Ancyra.¹ But the relation of the longer form to the shorter is shown by the order of Articles 11 and 10, in which the words 'one baptism for the remission of sins' precede the words 'and in one holy Catholic Church,' the rest of this division of the Creed having been built up, so to speak, round the earlier form.

THE OLD CREED OF JERUSALEM (c. A.D. 345).

Cyril, *Cat.* vi.-xviii.

- I. 1. We believe in one God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.
- II. 2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God the only begotten, begotten of the Father, true God, before all the ages, through whom all things were made;
3. incarnate and living as man among men;

¹ Marcellus in his later years pressed unduly the words of S. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 28: 'Then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.' He taught that the Son would return to God and become the immanent Logos or Word of God, the silent thinking principle which is in God, losing all distinction as the Son. Thus, like Sabellius, Marcellus 'confused the Persons.'

4. crucified and buried,
 5. And rose again the third day,
 6. And ascended into heaven,
 7. And sat on the right hand of the Father,
 8. And shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead,
whose kingdom shall have no end.
- III. 9. And in one Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who spake by the Prophets,
10. And in one baptism of repentance for remission of sins,
 11. And in one holy Catholic Church,
 12. And in resurrection of the flesh,
And in life eternal.

The point which I have singled out, the order of clauses 10 and 11, in which 'remission of sins' precedes 'holy Catholic Church,' leaves no doubt in my mind that we have to do with a case of development on independent lines. If this longer form had been dependent on the Roman Creed, mention of Pilate would have been included. The fact that it appears in the Revised Creed of Jerusalem (*i.e.* our Nicene Creed) does not prove that it belonged to the earlier form. Cyril, if we may credit him with the authorship, was in that respect conforming to the Western type, as in changing 'resurrection of the flesh' into 'resurrection of the dead' he followed current Eastern mode of thought.

Such questions lead to abstruse lines of argument in which the ordinary reader cannot be expected to take much interest. The specialists have by no means said the last word on the subject. The two conflicting theories may be briefly described as follows.

Dr. Kattenbusch, with whom Dr. Harnack is in general agreement, takes as his working hypothesis the proposition that the Old Roman Creed lies at the base of

all like-constructed creeds. His critics agree that this is true of all Western forms, but maintain that there is evidence as to the existence of an Eastern type of creed of equal antiquity, but distinguished from the Roman Creed by such phrases as 'one (God),' 'Maker of heaven and earth,' 'suffered,' 'shall come again in glory.' Dr. Kattenbusch traces all the Eastern creeds of the fourth century to one archetype in the Creed of Antioch which, according to his view, is dependent on the Roman Creed. He conjectures that the Roman Creed was introduced at Antioch after the deposition of the heretic Paul of Samosata (*c. A. D. 272*), that it was altered to meet the dogmatic necessities of the time, that it then became the parent of the creeds of Palestine and Asia Minor and Egypt in the following century. In the case of Egypt, for example, there is evidence of the existence of a shorter form based on the Baptismal Formula like the short form quoted by Cyril,¹ which seems to prove the wide extension of such usage in Eastern Churches.

On the other hand, Dr. Kunze and Dr. Loofs in Germany, Dr. Sanday in England, head an opposition to this theory. Dr. Kunze² reconstructs the Antiochian Creed of the third century as follows :

CREED OF ANTIOCH.

- I. 1. I believe in one and an only true God, Father Almighty, maker of all things, visible and invisible.
- II. 2. And in our Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, the only-begotten and first-born of all creation, begotten of Him before

¹ The Egyptian Church Order has a form which has been translated from the Coptic as follows:—'I believe in the true God alone, the Father, the Almighty; and His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour; and in His Holy Spirit, the all-lifegiving.

² *Theol. Litteraturblatt.*, xxiii. 19, 221.

all the ages, through whom also the ages were established, and all things came into existence ;

3. Who, for our sakes, came down, and was born of Mary the Virgin,
4. And crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried,
5. And the third day rose according to the scriptures,
6. And ascended into heaven.
- 7.
8. And is coming again to judge quick and dead.
9. [The beginning of the third article has not been recorded.]
- 10.
11. Remission of sins,
12. Resurrection of the dead, life everlasting.

Again Dr. Loofs¹ selects the following phrases as typical of creeds which go back to a date preceding the Nicene Council. The creeds which he selects are: the Creed which Eusebius presented to the Nicene Council; the revised Creed of Cyril of Jerusalem; the Creed of Antioch quoted by Cassian, a Gallican writer of the latter part of the fourth century; the Creed of the Apostolic Constitutions, a Syrian compilation written in Antioch c. A.D. 375; the Creed of Lucian the Martyr, generally called the second Creed of Antioch; the Creed of Arius, which he presented to Constantine in A.D. 330. Arranging these in tabular form we notice the grouping.

- A Eusebius (Cæsarea).
- B Cyril (Jerusalem).
- C Antioch (Cassian).
- D Apostolic Constitutions (Antioch).
- E Lucian the Martyr (Antioch).
- F Arius.

¹ *Symbolik*, i. 19.

1. One (God), A, B, C, D, E, F.
Maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible (or a like phrase), A, B, C, D, E.
2. Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, the only-begotten (or a like phrase), A, B, C, D, E, F.
3. Crucified under Pontius Pilate, B, C, D. (A, E, F omit because they are theological creeds. Dr. Loofs thinks that it does not follow that the words were omitted by the Baptismal Creeds on which they were based.)
5. Rose the third day, A, B, D, E. (F omits 'the third day,' being a theological creed; the translation of C is uncertain.)
6. Went up, A, B, D, E, F.
+and . . . and . . . and, A, B, C, D, E, F.
8. And is coming, B, C, D, E, F; and is about to come, A; +again, A, C, D, E, F (B?); +in glory, A, B; with glory, D, E.
10. +catholic, B, D, F (A, C, E?).
12. +life eternal, B, C; +life of the age to come, D, F.

I think that this is a fair way of putting the case on this side without encumbering my pages with a number of creed-forms. The real battle-ground of the future between the opposing theories lies in the testimony of Irenæus. He has most of the characteristic expressions of the Eastern creeds. He inserts 'one' in clauses 1 and 2. He has the phrase 'maker of heaven and earth,' adding 'and the sea and all things that are in them.' He has 'suffered' and 'crucified' with 'under Pontius Pilate' after instead of before it. Probably also he had 'in glory' in clause 8. The only characteristic of the oldest form of the Western Creed in Irenæus is Christ Jesus (for Jesus Christ). Dr. Sanday thinks that this may belong to the primitive Creed, but that Irenæus brought to Gaul from his home in Smyrna an Eastern

type which had already diverged from the primitive form.¹ He does not discuss the possibility that Irenæus brought the Roman Creed from Rome, or the possibility that the phrases which remind us of the Eastern type really belong not to his creed but to the customary forms of catechetical teaching on the person of Christ. These forms tended to crystallise everywhere, and we find S. Paul quoting from such a form in 1 Cor. xv. 3-7.

The practical question, however, for the ordinary reader is not affected by his doubts concerning either or both of these theories. The plain fact remains that the old Roman Creed was taught in Rome, and that the same facts were taught in Palestine (Antioch), Asia Minor, and Egypt, whether they were gathered up in a parallel creed-form or not.

We have now traced the history of the Old Roman Creed from the beginning of the second century to the end of the fourth, and have observed how very slight are the variations which appear to have taken place in its form. Side by side, however, with the almost immutable Creed of Rome there existed in other Western Churches many daughter forms, so to speak, which were enlarged, or in some cases enriched, by additional clauses. Thus the Creed of Aquileia, the native city of Rufinus, had in the first clause the epithets *invisible* and *impassible*. Again, in clause 4 the words *descended into hell* were added to *buried*. This is still the earliest known Baptismal Creed in which the words occur, though they are found in a recently discovered creed of S. Jerome² and in manifestoes issued by three Arian Synods of the years 359 and 360. Rufinus himself regarded the words as an extension of the idea *buried*. They may have been added to emphasise the truth that the Lord really died in opposition to Docetic denials, which would imply that

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. 3.

² See p. 43.

His Body was a mere phantom. But it is more probably that they were intended to teach what reverent Christian imagination has always held, that the Lord by sharing sanctified the condition of departed souls.

Rufinus also explains that the addition of the word *this*, in the clause *resurrection of this flesh*, teaches the identity of the future with the present body. This was the ordinary popular view, and has been endorsed by the authority of Bishop Pearson. But it is misleading if a materialistic meaning is attached to the words, and we may be thankful that the emphatic *this* has been dropped from our Creed.¹

The Creed of Milan, at the end of the fourth century, only differed from the Roman by the substitution of *suffered* for *crucified*. It interests us as the Baptismal Creed of S. Augustine. And it is also worthy of note that he found no difficulty, when he went across to Africa, in accepting the slightly different form which he found in use there.

The Creed of Africa, which he quotes in one of his sermons,² has the words *creator of the Universe, King of the ages, immortal and invisible* in clause 1. And at the end the spiritual benefits of *the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh and eternal life* are represented as received *through the holy Church*. As early as A.D. 255 S. Cyprian quoted from his Interrogative Creed: 'Dost thou believe in eternal life and remission of sins through the holy Church?' Here it is obvious that the transposition of clause 10 has some relation to the rigorist view of African theology represented by S. Cyprian, who taught that baptism by heretics was invalid, that through the Church alone true Baptism can be administered. But as Archbishop Benson put it in a fine phrase, 'Life corrected the error of thought.' With the rejection of this

¹ See p. 102.

² *Sermons*, p. 215.

narrow view of S. Cyprian the Church at large clung to the original order of the clauses in the third division of the Creed.

The characteristic differences in the Creed of Spain at this period, the end of the fourth century, are only known to us through a quotation in the writings of the heretic Priscillian, who 'confounded the Persons' of the Holy Trinity. Apart, however, from the heretical variations in his creed there is proof that it included the word *suffered* and the words *God* and *almighty* in the clause '*sitteth at the right hand of God the Father almighty.*'

Turning from Spain to Gaul we find that the creeds of Gallican writers from the beginning of the fifth century show an increasing approximation to the type of our Received Text. But these must be reserved for another chapter.

CHAPTER III

OUR APOSTLES' CREED

OUR Apostles' Creed is plainly derived, like all other Western creeds, from the original Old Roman type. But there is great diversity of opinion on the questions how and when and where it first made its appearance. I am not taking into account at this point the minute differences which distinguish the form used in our Baptismal Service from the form used at Morning and Evening Prayer. I refer to the common type which they share, characterised by the additions *maker of heaven and earth, conceived, suffered, dead, He descended into hell, God (the Father) almighty, catholic, the communion of saints, and the life everlasting*.¹

We have already met with some of these additions. Thus we have found *suffered* in the Creed of Milan. The Church of Milan had great influence in the development of liturgical forms in the West, and it was possibly through this channel that the phrase passed into the Creeds of Spain and Gaul. On the other hand the writings of Irenæus may have been the common source. We have found *descended into hell* in the creed of Aquileia, the words *God* and *almighty* added to *sitteth at the right hand of the Father* in Spain, *life everlasting* from an early date in the African Creed. We have yet to

¹ Also by the order *Jesus Christ* (for *Christ Jesus*), *thence for whence, I believe* for *And* (in the Holy Ghost).

discover at what period they were combined, and the remaining phrases added.

Perhaps the most interesting method of explaining the history of these clauses will be to quote the earliest creeds in which each of them is found, with a short description of the historical background in every case. We may then proceed to the more difficult question, which does not yet admit of a final answer. Where are we to look first for the finished product? Just as astronomers have calculated where they should look for a new planet, having detected its presence because they observed traces of its influence on other heavenly bodies whose motions, apparently irregular, were only thus to be accounted for; so the historian of the creeds can observe the influence of the new form of creed spreading in Gaul, Italy, and Germany from about A.D. 700, and proceeds to select from two or three possible centres of thought that which seems to be the most probable home of the creed. But when I speak in this way of 'possible centres' and a 'probable home' I do not wish to convey the impression that this department of theological study deals only with hypotheses, more or less rash, and has no real evidence to produce in support of its theories. On the contrary, we may confidently assert that every new form which has been discovered during the last ten years and traced to a definite locality, or the dwelling-place of some historical personage, helps us to proceed scientifically from the known to the unknown, and to narrow down still further the limits of problems that remain unsolved.

NICETA OF REMESIANA.

The discovery of the attractive personality of Niceta, who was Bishop of Remesiana, in what is now known as Servia, is one of the most romantic of literary adven-

tures. Some years ago Dom. G. Morin, O.S.B., in a brilliant article in the *Benedictine Review* showed that various treatises published under the names of Nicetas of Aquileia and Nicetius of Trèves should be restored to him as their true author. He proved that the earlier Niceta was an energetic missionary among Roman colonists, and among the half-savage tribes of the district. He was also a man of considerable culture, a tried friend of the saintly Paulinus of Nola, who greatly admired his poetic gifts. Dom. Morin further suggested that the preservation in certain MSS. of Irish *provenance* of a tradition that the hymn *Te Deum laudamus* was written by a Nicetius (or in one MS. Neceta) pointed to Niceta as the probable author.¹ Without entering into detail, I may quote from his sermon on the Creed, which is the fifth book of his *Instructions for Neophytes* :

- I. 1. I believe in God the Father almighty, *maker of heaven and earth,*
- II. 2. And in His Son Jesus Christ (our Lord ?),
 3. Born of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary,
 4. *Suffered* under Pontius Pilate, crucified, *dead.*
 5. The third day He rose again *alive* from the dead,
 6. He ascended into heaven,
 7. Sitteth at the right hand of the Father,
 8. From *thence* He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
- III. 9. And in the Holy Ghost,
 10. the holy Church *catholic, the communion of saints,*

¹ I have discussed these questions fully in my *Niceta of Remesiana* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1905), which is the first edition of his collected works.

11. the remission of sins,
12. the resurrection of the flesh, *and the life everlasting.*

Probably this creed-form was in use throughout the district, and the additions *maker of heaven and earth* and *suffered* are also found in a contemporary creed preserved in some Arian fragments which are vaguely designated as belonging to the Danube lands, that is to say, to Pannonia and Moesia, which were contiguous to Dacia. Probably these creeds of the Balkan peninsula derived the addition from the East, lying as they did on the border-line between the Eastern and Western Empires, and on the great highroad between Constantinople and Milan. For it was Milan more than Rome which was the capital of the West at this time. All Eastern creeds had some reference to the work of God in Creation. Thus the famous dated Creed of Sirmium, drawn up in 351 by Bishop Mark of Arethusa, begins thus :

‘We believe in one Only and True God, the Father Almighty, Creator and Framer of all things.’

I quote this Creed of Sirmium chiefly for the sake of a subsequent passage.

‘We know that He, the Only-begotten Son of God, at the Father’s bidding came from the heavens for the abolishment of sin, and was born of the Virgin Mary, and conversed with the disciples, and fulfilled all the Economy according to the Father’s will, was crucified and died and descended into those parts beneath the earth, and regulated the things there, whom the gatekeepers of hell saw (Job xxxviii. 17, lxx.) and shuddered; and He rose from the dead the third day.’

It does not matter for our present purpose whether this Creed was based on the Creed of the district Pannonia, or on the Syrian Creed which Mark brought with

him from Palestine. It shows how, quite apart from the special subject of controversy between the Arians and the Catholics, the ordinary catechetical teaching of the Church went on, and the *Descent into Hell* was taught, where men had begun to think about it, even before Rufinus quoted it from the Aquileian Creed.

We find mention of the Descent into Hell in the catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, but it did not find a place in the Jerusalem Creed nor in that of Niceta, who quoted from Cyril.

A very interesting new form, which has quite recently been discovered by Dom. Morin, may with great probability be traced to the pen of S. Jerome. It is very probably the Faith which he mentions in one of his letters¹ as sent to Bishop Cyril of Jerusalem.

THE FAITH OF S. JEROME.

I believe in one God the Father almighty, maker of things visible and invisible. I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, born of God, God of God, Light of light, almighty of almighty, true God of true God, born before the ages, not made, by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth. Who for our salvation descended from heaven, was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered by suffering under Pontius Pilate, under Herod the king, crucified, buried, descended into hell, trod down the sting of death, rose again the third day, appeared to the apostles. After this He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, thence shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, God not unbegotten nor begotten, not created nor made, but coeternal with the Father and the Son. I believe (that there is) remission of sins in the holy catholic church, communion of saints, resurrection of the flesh unto eternal life. Amen.

¹ *Ep.* 17, n. 4.

This is one of the most important of the discoveries which have been made in the last few years. It directly connects the creeds of West and East. We reflect that Jerome was born in Pannonia, that he had travelled through Asia Minor on his way to Palestine. He introduces phrases of the Jerusalem Creed into his Baptismal Creed much in the same way as Cyril had himself introduced phrases of the First Nicene Creed into the Jerusalem Creed. S. Jerome may have picked up the clause *communion of saints* in Cappadocia. Dom. Morin thinks that it comes down from the days when Firmilian upheld so strongly the doctrine that in the true Church alone could valid Baptism be administered or salvation be secured.¹ We will discuss this interpretation of the words later on.² Our present concern is purely historical. In these Creeds of Niceta and Jerome alone we have found all the phrases which are missing links with the ultimate Western Creed.

We must now turn to a series of Gallican creeds of the fifth century, which shows them coming into more general use.

Faustus, Bishop of Riez, sometime abbot of the important monastery of Lerins, a strong centre of spiritual as well as intellectual influence, quotes in acknowledged writings the following: 'I believe also in the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary'; and '(I believe also) in the Holy Ghost, the holy church, communion of saints, remission of sins, resurrection of the flesh, life everlasting.'

There is a collection of sermons passing under the name of Eusebius Gallus which are generally attributed

¹ *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses*, ix., 1904, 22 ff.

² p. 94.

to Faustus, but their evidence does not carry us further except in the addition of the word *catholic*. And there is less need to rely on evidence that is in any way doubtful, because we can now say confidently that the Creed of Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles (503-543), combined all the additions which we have in mind except *maker of heaven and earth* and *God Almighty* in article 7. Cæsarius was a great popular preacher, a man who was also an eminent theologian. He presided over the Council of Orange which ended the semi-Pelagian controversy.

We may compare with the Creed of Cæsarius another, extracted from a letter of Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon, in which he refers respectfully to Cæsarius. But it is less complete in that it omits *dead* and *descended into hell*. Much the same evidence is offered by a creed of Eligius of Noyon (+ 659), which likewise omits these phrases, and in the third division, which is not quoted by Cyprian, omits also *communion of saints*.

Amid some diversity it is safe to say that the form in use in the south of France approximated to our Received Text though without the words *maker of heaven and earth*. Indeed it is the date when these words were inserted which is the crux of the whole question. But at the same time we are much nearer to the truth than Bishop Westcott was able to go when he wrote in his *Historic Faith* of the clause *communion of saints*, 'Our Western forefathers added, as late perhaps as the eighth century, a fresh clause to the Creed.'¹

We have seen that the clause *communion of saints* was becoming common in the south of France, and that other additions characteristic of the final form were (so to speak) available from the fourth century. Moreover, if we may conjecture that the additions common to the Creeds of

¹ p. 123.

Jerome and Niceta belonged to Jerome's native Creed of Pannonia, we find them in use on the great highroad between East and West, along which, as Dr. Sanday says, there was 'a strong set of the current . . . from behind the Balkans through Aquileia to Milan. And from Milan it was an easy step to Lerinum.'¹

This suggestion easily accounts for the introduction into the south of France, through the school of Lerins, of the majority of the additions which we have noted in the Creeds of Faustus and Cæsarius.

It is impossible to avoid a reference at this point to a difficult problem of Liturgiology, the question of the origin of the so-called Gallican Liturgy. Duchesne holds that the Gallican Liturgy, represented by the Ambrosian rite of Milan, Gallican service-books, and the Mozarabic or Spanish rite, is a Cappadocian Liturgy which was introduced into Milan by Auxentius, the Arian predecessor of Ambrose. He proves that the influence of the See of Milan was supreme in North Italy and in Gaul, and thus explains the triumph of the Gallican rite over the Roman.

On the other hand many writers, notably Dom. Cagin, maintain that the Gallican rite, however altered, is based on the oldest Roman Liturgy, that it takes us back to the days when the Church in Rome spoke Greek and possessed a Liturgy parallel in type to the oldest Eastern Liturgy. The original Greek Liturgy seems to have held its own until the middle of the fourth century, but for some time a Latin Liturgy had existed side by side with it. The Roman Canon seems to be the result of a compromise between the two.² The so-called Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian Sacramentaries re-

¹ Sanday, *Journal of Theological Studies*, iii. 14.

² W. H. Frere, *New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 440.

present three stages in the history of the Roman Liturgy, from the sixth to the eighth century. This must be kept in mind when we deal with creed-forms in Sacramentaries which contain mixtures of Gallican and Roman rites.

Probably the latter theory is by far the most satisfactory, and it fits in with the fact that the Balkan peninsula with Pannonia had been colonised from Rome, and probably Christianised also, so that when the current of influence set westward in the fourth century it brought back again, as it were with interest, a loan of sacred knowledge which had been formerly sent from Rome.

The usual practice of historians in discussion of our Apostles' Creed is to start from Priminus, the celebrated Benedictine missionary, as the first historical character with whom we can connect the form. But before A.D. 700 there were other creed-forms in use in Gaul, which included the words *maker of heaven and earth*, though with other variations which distinguished them from the form which we seek. During the seventh century Roman missionaries were constantly traversing Gaul on their way to Britain. They were responsible for the frequent mixture of Gallican and Roman rites in the old service-books.

At the same time we must remember another kind of influence which was potent during the seventh century, the influence of Celtic missionaries, who streamed across the continent until they came into touch with the remnants of the old Latin Christianity of the Danube. This is a most important fact which has been entirely left out of account in dealing with this question. Yet I am inclined to see in it the missing link which has hitherto been lacking in the evidence.

'The old diocese of Chur was on the highroad from

the Upper Drave to the Rhine. S. Columban and his companion S. Gall were welcomed on the Lake of Constance by the Christian priest of Arbon. The pilgrimage of Fortunatus¹ is evidence of the life of the Church in Noricum and Rhaetia in 565. It is not likely that it had been wholly stamped out in the forty years before the arrival of S. Columban. The priest of Arbon was not the only priest in the district. His father would be a contemporary of Fortunatus. Bregenz was the western end of the great road by the Vorarlberg to Innsbruck, the Brenner, and the Upper Drave valley. It was in touch with the old Christian centres of Augsburg and Chur.

‘S. Columban remained only a short time at Bregenz. . . . The call seemed to have come to him over the Brenner, to strengthen the Church along the highway of the East, on the confines of the ancient province of Illyricum. He left S. Gall on the Lake of Constance,² and himself settled at Bobbio.

‘S. Columban worked in all for twenty-five years, more or less, in touch with the relics of the old Christianity of the Burgundian and Rhaetian peoples. His Celtic spirit of independence cut him off from the court clergy of Gaul and from the Catholicism of Rome. But his sympathetic nature, native to the Irish race, made him quick to appreciate the work and the traditions of the struggling Christianity which he met with on the Lake of Constance and in the valleys of the Alps. It is probable that this Celtic sympathy led him to enrich the formularies of his own Church from the rites and traditions of the Latin Church of the Danube still surviving in Burgundy and Rhaetia. Bobbio became the great Celtic centre of learning in North Italy, while the monasteries of S.

¹ From North Italy to Tours.

² To found the famous monastery of S. Gallen.

Gallen and of Reichenau became the Celtic schools north of the Alps. They with the mother-house Luxeuil became the nursery of the so-called Gallican tradition, a tradition which was probably as much Illyrican as it was Gallican or Celtic.¹

Now the chief documents which we have to discuss as containing forms almost identical with the Received Text until its final dated appearance in a treatise of the Abbot Priminus of Reichenau, are found in documents connected with one or other of these monasteries founded by Columban and his friends. In the case of sermons on the Creed it often happens that the form commented on, the form that is of the author, differs from the form inserted at the beginning, which shows very often signs of development. But amid the constant ebb and flow, so to speak, of the waves we can discern the constant rising of the tide.

In this connection it is very important to compare the sermons inserted in the so-called Gallican Sacramentary and Gallican Missal. The Gallican Sacramentary,² more properly called the Missal of Bobbio, is a seventh-century MS., containing the old Roman type of Liturgy which was brought by S. Columban to Bobbio. It is the type which had been sent from Rome to Britain in the fifth century, and preserved in the Celtic Church, though Columban added to it. It contains a sermon used at the Delivery of the Creed in a context which is plainly to be connected with Roman rites, because it follows the Opening of the Ears, or delivery of the first words of the four Gospels. The creed-form inserted at the beginning (A) represents the form used at Bobbio before 700, while the form commented on (E) represents the creed of the original author. Of these A is almost exactly the

¹ Rev. T. Barns, *Some Creed Problems*.

² This MS. is at Paris, *Bibl. Nat. Cod. lat.* 13246.

Received Text, but E still lacks *maker of heaven and earth and communion of saints*.

On the other hand, the Gallican Missal,¹ written c. A.D. 700, is a volume containing fragments of two Sacramentaries. The history of the first is unknown. It contains a sermon also delivered in connection with the ceremony of *Opening the Ea's*, therefore presumably from a Roman source, which contains an interpolated creed with all the additions of the Received Text, while the creed of the author to be recovered from his commentary lacks *maker of heaven and earth, descended into hell, and communion of saints*.

The other Sacramentary comes to us from Auxerre, and the sermon on the Creed is connected with prayers from a Gallican source. The inserted creed is like our Received Text without the words *descended into hell*. The same sermon is found in other MSS., one of which is a collection of sermons, mainly by Cæsarius of Arles, which comes from Freising, and was written in the eighth century. As I have already pointed out that the forms at the beginning of such sermons may be taken to represent the creed-forms in the place when and where the MS. was copied, so we are able to compare two forms, the one copied in the diocese of Auxerre c. A.D. 700, and the other in the diocese of Freising seventy years later. It is not certain that these particular copyists interpolated the creed-forms familiar to them, but their tendency would be to assimilate any form to the forms used in their day.

Both forms are substantially like our Received Text, but whereas the Auxerre form omits *descended into hell*, and adds (after 'ascended') *as victor* (into heaven), a variation which is found both in Gaul and North Italy, it appears to be less in the direct line of approach to the

¹ Now at the Vatican, *Cod. Vat. Palat. lat.*, 493.

Received Text than the other. The creed from Freising brings us back again to the Creed of Priminus. He was probably an Irish monk who came through Neustria into Germany, where he founded the Abbey of Reichenau, and other monasteries in Bavaria and Alsace. Now Priminus was a friend of the great missionary Boniface, who visited him at Hornbach before starting on his last journey, and it was Boniface who founded the Bishopric of Freising. We can trace the use of the Received Text along the line of the journeys both of Boniface and Priminus, and there is no doubt that they extended its use. When we ask how they received it, there can be little doubt that they received it from the Roman Church, with which Boniface was in constant communication. Pope Gregory II. sent him instructions to use what seems to have been an official Roman Order of Baptism, which would doubtless include a Roman form of Creed. Priminus, who was far from being an original writer, made great use of a treatise written by Martin of Bracara in the sixth century, but in the section dealing with the Creed substitutes a Roman form of Renunciation, and a reference to the Roman rite of Unction which followed Baptism, which leads us to suppose that the form of Creed substituted for Martin's form was also Roman.

In the present defective state of our information I cannot prove that the Received Text was a Roman Revision,¹ but I think that it is becoming clear that it was disseminated from Rome after A.D. 700. It was comparatively of little importance to prove whence it was brought to Rome, whether from Gaul or Bobbio.² Our information

¹ My suggestion to this effect in my *Introduction* was only tentative, though I think that it explains all the facts.

² The Psalter of Gregory in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, *Cod. N. 468*, is probably a copy of a Psalter sent by Pope Gregory III., A.D. 731-741, that is, in the time of Priminus.

concerning the Roman Creed of the sixth and seventh centuries is very meagre. While Pelagius I. uses the old form, Gregory the Great in a private confession of faith brings in the word *conceived*, which shows a leaning to an enlargement of the familiar phrases. Harnack supposes that the use of the Constantinopolitan Creed (=our Nicene Creed) in the Gelasian Sacramentary proves that the Roman Church had substituted the Nicene Creed for the older baptismal Creed. Caspari thought that this was done to meet the pressure of Gothic Arianism under Odoacer, c. 476-493. The fact remains, however, that Pelagius and Gregory I. quote the older form, and that the missionaries to Britain whom Gregory sent, and their successors, brought the Roman form and not the Nicene.

Another explanation of the use of the Nicene Creed is, that during the time of Byzantine influence the Baptismal Creed of Constantinople was offered to Greek-speaking catechumens, as the equivalent of the Roman Creed, the Greek text of which had long before been forgotten. A Baptismal Order from Vienne, which is derived from the same source as the Gelasian Sacramentary, directs that the God-parents should be asked: 'Is Greek understood?' The answer 'No' follows, and then 'I believe in God,' not 'in one God,' that is the Roman Creed. 'Time passed, and there were no more Greek-speaking catechumens. It became necessary to explain the existence of two parallel forms, and in some Orders of Baptism we find the absurd explanation that one was used for girls and the other for boys.

It is to be hoped that further evidence will soon be found which will throw light on the use of both forms in Rome in the seventh century. A collection, apparently made in the ninth century, has lately been found by Dom.

Morin.¹ It contains the Roman Order of Baptism in which the Received Text occurs, but there is also a sermon expounding the older Roman form, and there is a reference to the custom of reciting the Nicene Creed over catechumens when they recited their creed on Thursday in Holy Week. In this case it was not really used as a Baptismal Creed proper, but, together with Greek lessons and Greek hymns, to emphasise the idea of the unity of the Church, which among different nations and in different languages worships one God. We may say with some confidence that the use of the older Roman form never ceased till it was superseded by the Revised Text, not regarded as a new form, but only as improved.

At the end of the eighth century Charles the Great issued a series of questions to the Bishops of his Empire, of whom he inquired as to the forms of Creed in current use. Some of the replies have been preserved, and among them one from Amalarius of Trèves is very important, because it shows that he not only used the Received Text, but also definitely states that he used the Roman Order of Baptism.

Twenty-four years later the acts of a provincial synod at Mainz, summoned by the Emperor, have preserved the statement of his wish for uniformity according to the Roman Order, and direct that those who cannot learn the Creed in Latin may learn it in their own tongue. From that date we can trace Old German translations.

It seems clear, then, that the form which we now use, whether moulded into its present shape in Luxeuil, or Bobbio, or in Rome itself, had been adopted in Rome before A.D. 700, and was sent out through Boniface and other Benedictine missionaries, as afterwards under the directions of Charles the Great, all over the West.

¹ In *Cod. Sessorianus*, 52 saec. xi. xii.

PART II. THE TEACHING

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

I believe.

It has been pointed out (p. 4) that the use of the singular pronoun is not a characteristic of Western Creeds as distinguished from Eastern, but of all Baptistal Creeds. Indeed from New Testament times the solemn act of confession of faith has been regarded as distinctively a personal act. And the emphasis which has been laid in Christian circles of thought on the teaching of personal responsibility has contributed in no small degree to the development of the conception of Personality, both Human and Divine. We are coming to see, as Mr. Illingworth puts it, that 'Personality is the gateway of all knowledge.' We should be grateful to Christian philosophers for the profound influence which they have exercised in this direction. And in this respect there is no need to turn to elaborate systems of abstract thought expressed in technical terms beyond the mental grasp of ordinary people. There is a philosophy of common-sense which is expressed in the ordinary growth of human language, and in the ordinary progress of a child's mind from the dawn of self-consciousness.

A certain German philosopher used to teach each of

his children to keep the anniversary not of birth, but of the day when the child first said 'I.' It is the same profound conception which inspires many Christians with the desire to keep the anniversary of their confirmation as the day on which they publicly accepted the privileges of their position as 'members of Christ,' and pledged themselves to be 'Christ's soldiers.'

Without any special philosophical training it is within the power of an ordinary educated person to read the history of Christian thought so carefully summarised by Mr. Illingworth in his Bampton Lectures on 'Personality, Human and Divine.'¹ It was under the influence of Christian ideas that men attained to the fuller self-consciousness which is the highest prerogative of the human race to-day. In some directions Greek thinkers had reached the limits of analysis. But in the Christian character, reproduced in thousands of disciples of Christ, living under every variety of circumstances and conditions, a new type of personality appeared in the world and sought to explain itself. The full importance of this new development is not seen till we reach the fourth century. At the end of that epoch of the history of the world which witnessed the decline of the Roman Empire, S. Augustine prepared the way for a new advance of thought by his profound meditations on the mystery of his own being. The *Confessions* of S. Augustine was an epoch-making book, for it turned men's minds from metaphysics to psychology, from speculation about final causes in the world around us to observation of the great conflict between flesh and spirit which is going on within us, and to reflection on the powers of thought, feeling, and will which are the distinctive faculties of each human being. And of these faculties 'to will' is the greatest, because it is the nearest approach to a final cause of

¹ Published by Macmillan, cheap edition, 6d.

which we have any knowledge. To say 'I think therefore I am' with one philosopher does not raise a man above the level of a calculating machine, unless he is conscious that he desires to have noble thoughts and wills so to desire. On the other hand, to say 'I feel therefore I am' would open the way for the philosophy of pleasure-seeking, which in every age is 'Procuress to the lords of hell.'

Corresponding to this complex being of man is the complex character of faith, which is man's noblest activity. 'Faith,' in the words of Bishop Westcott, 'is thought illuminated by emotion and concentrated by will.' It is pre-eminently a personal act, in which reason, feeling, and purpose are elements. Faith which is unreasoning is degraded into superstition. Faith which is unfeeling is the aspiration of a fanatic whose creed cannot stir loving hearts. Faith without willing is the assent of a condemned criminal to the sentence of doom, the assent which our intellect is forced to yield to the laws of the natural world. We are in no sense better men or women because we believe that fire burns, unless the inquisitor who uses fire as torture is better because better informed than we.

Because faith, then, in its highest sense is the act of the whole man able to feel, think, and will, faith must influence conduct. This is no unmeaning conceit of Christian thought when we say that creed influences conduct. Emerson writes, 'A man's conduct is the picture-book of his creed.' This is equally true whether his creed be that of a believer or a sceptic.

I believe in God.

The use of the preposition *in* is important. There is a difference between our saying 'I believe God,' that there is a God, that what God has revealed of His will

and purpose is true, and our saying 'I believe in God,' I put my whole trust in Him, I am ready to fear and love Him with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my mind, and with all my strength. It was Rufinus who first emphatically called attention to the meaning of the preposition and to the fulness of the trustfulness which it implies. He points out how it is repeated for each of the Divine Persons. I believe in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, giving to each the glory due unto His Name with thankfulness for His share in the work of my Redemption. Then I go on to say, understanding the repetition of 'I believe,' 'the holy Catholic Church,' not '*in* the holy Catholic Church,' that there is a holy Church. As Rufinus puts it: 'It is not said, "*In* the holy Church," nor "*In* the forgiveness of sins," nor "*In* the resurrection of the flesh.'" For if the preposition *in* had been added, it would have had the same force as in the preceding articles. But now in those clauses in which the faith concerning the Godhead is declared, we say "*In* God the Father," and "*In* Jesus Christ His Son," and "*In* the Holy Ghost," but in the rest, where we speak not of the Godhead but of creatures and mysteries, the preposition *in* is not added. We do not say "We believe *in* the holy Church," but "We believe the holy Church," not as God, but as the Church gathered together to God: and we believe that there is "forgiveness of sins"; we do not say "We believe *in* the forgiveness of sins"; and we believe that there will be a "resurrection of the flesh"; we do not say "We believe *in* the resurrection of the flesh." By this monosyllabic preposition, therefore, the Creator is distinguished from the creatures, and things divine are separated from things human.'¹

¹ *Commentary*, c. 36. In some Latin creeds we find the names of the Divine Persons put in the Ablative case to mark this

He that cometh to God must believe that He is. The arguments for the existence of God meet with varying degrees of acceptance. It has been well said that they are 'sufficient not resistless, convincing not compelling.'

There is the cosmological argument, or in other words the argument for a First Cause. How did this world come into being? We do not like savages attribute natural phenomena to the immediate action of personal beings like ourselves, spirits of the air and the woods and the deep. But the widest observation of the working of natural laws leads to the belief that 'we recognise in the universe without us certain qualities of infinitude, reality, causation, independence, and the like, which have no counterpart except in the region of our own personality, and can only, therefore, be interpreted as attributes of a person.'

There is the argument from design which, though modified by recent scientific discoveries, has been rather strengthened than weakened. The higher up we go in the scale of being the more wonderful is the evidence of design. Things are, so to speak, prepared for one another. It has been well said of the eye: 'A microscope invented in a city of the blind could hardly surprise us more. It is a correct vaticination of the laws of refraction in a realm that has never even heard of light.'

There is the ontological argument, or suggestion that the existence of God is proved by our thought of Him, which was the chief contribution of Anselm to the thought of the Middle Ages. As Illingworth points

distinction. But it is not safe to take too much notice of cases in early MSS., because in the early Middle Ages copyists were very vague as to the difference between the Accusative and the Ablative.

out, this line of thought underlay Plato's theory of Ideas, and the teaching of Augustine.¹

Above all is the argument from conscience, or the moral argument. We are conscious of freedom and we are conscious of a sense of duty. And this sense of moral obligation is felt just as strongly by those races which we are accustomed to call uncivilised. Mr. Illingworth illustrates this from the world-wide institution of Taboo, as including the twofold notion of religious reverence and religious abhorrence. Thus universally 'man is conscious of an imperative obligation upon his conduct. It is not a physical necessity, disguised in any shape or form, for he is also conscious of being free either to accept or to decline it. It cannot originate within him, for he has no power to unmake it; and it accomplishes purposes which its agent does not at the time foresee—results to himself and others which he can recognise afterwards as rational, but which his own individual reason could never have designed. It cannot be the voice of other men, though human law may give it partial utterance; for it speaks to his motives, which no law can fathom, and calls him to attainments which no law can reach. Yet, with all its independence of human authorship, it has the notes of personality about it. It commands our will with an authority which we can only attribute to a conscious will. It constrains us to modes of action which are not of our own seeking, yet which issue in results that only reason could have planned. It educates our character with a nicety of influence irresistibly suggestive of paternal care. The philosophers who have probed it, the saints and heroes who have obeyed and loved it, the sinners who have defied it, are agreed in this. And the inevitable inference must be that it is the voice of a Personal God.'²

¹ *Personality*, p. 53.

² *Ib.*, p. 56.

When we come to the study of the idea of God in the Old Testament as compared with that of other religions we find that the difference is one of kind rather than degree. S. Athanasius rightly claimed that the Law and the Prophets were for all the world 'a sacred school of the knowledge of God and the ordering of the soul.'¹ Step by step the Jews were led to the conviction of the unity of God, which was the last word of heathen philosophy, but it was never in their minds a mere metaphysical doctrine, it was always associated with belief in God's holiness, so that morality kept pace with religion. 'Hence the Jew was not called upon as the Greek to choose between his religion and his conscience.'²

The Christian religion claimed to be the fulfilment of the hope of Israel. Christ is not only a prophet but more than a prophet, the only Revealer of the Father: *No man knoweth the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son will reveal him.* And the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is not, as is so often supposed, a mistaken and, to say the least, superfluous addition to the doctrine of Jewish Monotheism, but the logical analysis of the words of Christ, all the authority of which is based on the Christian conception of the perfectness of His character. *Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ*, above all in the fact that under the stimulus of His personal influence men really lived a new life, and brought into the world a new type of character, which under all possible varieties of time and place is consciously moulded after His likeness. And the grace and beauty of the Christian character commend to the world the truth of His teaching about God as His Father and our Father, and about the Holy Spirit as our Guide.

¹ *De Incarn.*, c. 112.

² Aubrey Moore, *Lux Mundi*, ed. 15, p. 54.

Almighty.

The original Greek word means rather 'all-sovereign' than 'all-powerful.' The common explanation 'able to do anything' is quite inadequate. Ancient expositions of the Creed often enlarge on the point that God cannot die, cannot deceive. In Him is Life, and Truth is the very law of His Being. And He rules in the world of His creation in order that He may carry out the beneficent purposes which in far-seeing love He plans for men despite the interruption which, through misuse of their freewill, they interpose. He has not set the world to go like a watch that has been wound up, which needs no further attention so long as the mainspring retains power of movement. The doctrine of God which was popular in the eighteenth century, not only among Deists but also among orthodox divines, erred by laying too much stress on the idea of Divine transcendence, the majesty of the Creator, ineffably exalted above His work in such a sense as to be removed from contact with, or care for, His creatures. A great reaction was inevitable. 'The one absolutely impossible conception of God, in the present day, is that which represents Him as an occasional Visitor. Science had pushed the deist's God farther and farther away, and at the moment when it seemed as if He would be thrust out altogether, Darwinism appeared, and, under the guise of a foe, did the work of a friend. It has conferred upon philosophy and religion an inestimable benefit, by showing us that we must choose between two alternatives. Either God is everywhere present in nature, or He is nowhere. He cannot be here and not there.'¹ We must frankly accept the truth of Divine immanence so clearly expressed in our Lord's teaching about His Father's interest in and

¹ Aubrey Moore, *art. cit.*, p. 73.

care for flowers and birds. This truth was held in common by representative teachers both of East and West. S. Athanasius writes: 'The Word of God is not contained by anything, but Himself contains all things. . . . He was in everything and was outside all beings, and was at rest in the Father alone.'¹ S. Augustine writes: 'The same God is wholly everywhere, contained by no space, bound by no bonds, divisible into no parts, mutable in no part of His being, filling heaven and earth by the presence of His power. Though nothing can exist without Him, yet nothing is what He is.'²

This teaching about Divine Immanence does not contradict the equally important truth of Divine transcendence. In ourselves, in the relations of our human spirits to the material world around us, we are conscious of the same dual capacity. In our faculty of self-consciousness the spirit transcends the body, and still more in the sphere of morals the spirit, being conscious of freedom of choice, can become the master of lower desires. Also in every opportunity of scientific discovery and artistic creation is the spirit of man seen to transcend matter. But spirit is also immanent in matter, working through the brain and nervous system, 'so that we recognise a man's character in the expression of his eye, the tone of his voice, the touch of his hand; his unconscious and distinctive postures and gestures and gait.'³ Moreover, spirit is immanent also in man's works, so that 'when we look at the pictures of Raffaele, or listen to the music of Beethoven, or read the poetry of Dante, or the philosophy of Plato, the spirit of the great masters is affecting us really as if we saw them face to face: it is immanent in the painted canvas and the printed page.'⁴

Building upon these conceptions we are entitled to

¹ *De Incarn.*, c. 17.

² *De Civ. Dei*, vii. c. xxx.

³ Illingworth's *Divine Immanence*, p. 67.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 68.

urge that the Trinitarian Conception of God harmonises with the analogy of our personal experience. 'For according to this doctrine, the Second Person of the Trinity is the essential, adequate, eternal manifestation of the First, "the express image of His person," "in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily," while "by Him all things were made." Here, then, we have our two degrees of immanence; the complete immanence of the Father in the Son, of which our own relation to our body is an inadequate type; and, as a result of this, His immanence in creation, analogous to our presence in our works; with the obvious difference, of course, that we finite beings who die and pass away, can only be impersonally present in our works; whereas He must be conceived as ever present to sustain and animate the universe, which thus becomes a living manifestation of Himself; no mere machine, or book, or picture, but a perpetually sounding voice.'¹

Maker of heaven and earth.

In the original creed the word *almighty* took for granted the thought that God was the creator of the world. Neither Jewish nor Gentile convert could doubt it. But when Marcion and other Gnostic heretics attempted to capture Christianity in the interest of a philosophy which distinguished the Good God of the highest heaven from the Demiurge, or Creator of this world with its pain, and misery, and imperfection, it became necessary in the judgment of many Churches to add these words.

The Gnostics felt quite as keenly as Pessimists of modern times the difficulty of believing that a God of love was responsible for the world as it is. They went

¹ Illingworth's *Divine Immanence*, p. 73.

on to ask, How could the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and love, have inspired the Old Testament in which the Jews were ordered to exterminate their enemies? Marcion's solution of the problem was that Christ and Christianity had nothing to do with any part of the Old Testament, and little to do with the New. He founded on the Pauline Epistles and a revised Gospel of Luke a theory of a Saviour who came suddenly into the world, unheralded and unwelcome, to reveal the unknown God of love. One great difficulty in dealing with Marcion was the fact that he knew and used the Old Roman Creed, interpreting the word *Father* of His Good God. It became necessary to insert teaching as Tertullian does, such as 'Founder of the world'¹ or 'Creator of the universe.'² In the later African Creeds this was enlarged into 'Creator of the universe, King of the ages, immortal and invisible.'³ Since opposition to the Marcionites continued steadily till the fourth century it is easy to understand why we find the words in slightly varying forms in the Creeds of Cæsarea, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Aquileia. We can restore it in the Creed of Niceta of Remesiana, and we have noted it in the creed which S. Jerome seems to have brought from his home in Pannonia. The uncertainty which attaches to the historical formation of our Apostles' Creed as a finished product in no way affects the spirit of our interpretation of these words. We can read into them all the fervour with which the poet Wordsworth writes in his *Lines on Tintern Abbey* :

'I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts ; a sense sublime

¹ *De virg uel.*, c. 1.

² *De praeser.*, c. 13.

³ *Aug. Serm.*, p. 215; cf. Fulgentius, c. *Fab. Ar. Frag.* xxxvi.

Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man :
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things. Therefore am I still
A lover of the meadows and the woods,
And mountains ; and of all that we behold
From this green earth ; of all the mighty world
Of eye and ear—both what they half create,
And what perceive ; well pleased to recognize
In nature and the language of the sense,
The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
Of all my moral being.'

by the Council, retain their original place in the revised Creed, having stood in the Old Jerusalem Creed as in the Creed of Eusebius. The expression is not in Scripture, but conveys the sense of such words of the Lord as John xvii. 5, *the glory which I had with Thee before the world was . . .*, 24, *Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*

Of one substance with the Father.—As I have explained above, p. 10, the phrase is intended to express the essential unity of the Son with the Father, and it seems best to keep the translation ‘substance,’ familiar to us in our version, although in its popular sense it suggests something material. Philosophers used the term ‘essence’ (*ousia*) ‘to denote both the “idea,” which logically precedes the thing, and also the material thing considered by itself. Thus with the Stoics it was equivalent to matter (*hule*) or body (*soma*). The Gnostics introduced its use into theology (Iren. i. 5), where it held its idealistic sense. *Homo-ousios* would thus mean “of essential unity.” All species of the same genus would be “*homo-ousia*” with each other. But as God is unique in Nature and Essence, One who is *homo-ousios* with Him must be Very God also.’¹

The following quotation from S. Athanasius ‘On the Councils’ may suffice as a specimen of his method of argument :

‘But if since the Son is from the Father, all that is the Father’s is the Son’s, as in an image and expression, let it be considered dispassionately, whether an essence foreign from the Father’s essence admit of such attributes; and whether such a one be other in nature and alien in essence, and not coessential with the Father. For we must take reverent heed, lest transferring what is proper to the Father to what is unlike Him in essence, and expressing the Father’s godhead by what is unlike in kind and alien in essence, we introduce another essence foreign to Him, yet capable of the properties of the first essence, and lest we be silenced by God Himself, saying, “My glory I will not give to another,” and be discovered worshipping this alien God, and be accounted such as were the Jews of that day, who said “Wherefore dost Thou, being a man, make Thyself God?” referring, the while, to another source the things of the Spirit, and blas-

¹ Bindley, *Op. cit.*, p. 34 n.

phemously saying, "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub" (Is. xlii. 8; John x. 33; Luke xi. 15). But if this is shocking, plainly the Son is not unlike in essence, but coessential with the Father; for if what the Father has is by nature the Son's, and the Son Himself is from the Father, and because of this oneness of godhead and of nature He and the Father are one, and he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father, reasonably is He called by the fathers "Co-essential"; for to what is other in essence, it belongs not to possess such prerogatives.¹

We have considered above (p. 17) the unfounded theory that the term *Homo-ousios* was accepted at Constantinople in the sense of *Homoi-ousios*, not in the sense of the old orthodoxy of the Nicene Council, but with a new meaning given to it by the Antiochenes and the Cappadocians.

By whom all things were made.—There is abundant Scriptural authority (1 Cor. viii. 6, John i. 3, Col. i. 16), for teaching that the Son co-operated with the Father in the creation of the world. S. Athanasius also quotes Heb. xi. 3 in this connection: '*By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the Word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear.* For God is good, or rather is essentially the source of goodness: nor could one that is good be niggardly of anything: whence, grudging existence to none, He has made all things out of nothing by His own Word, Jesus Christ our Lord.'

S. Cyril of Alexandria quotes Ps. xxxiii. 6:

'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the Spirit of His mouth: Is not, I pray you, the Word, Who is from and in Him, personally distinguished from God the Father? B. He is indeed distinguished, for He subsists peculiarly, though He be consubstantial. A. Seeing therefore the Father brought all things into being and established the heavens, how is the Word the Creator of them? Tell me, who desire to learn this. B. Willingly. But this disquisition is acute and subtle. The one nature of Deity is known by us and by the holy angels, in the holy and consubstantial Trinity. And the Father is in His own Person most perfect, as is the Son and the Spirit: for the creative energy of one of those just now named, in whatever thing it is exercised, is the efficacy of that One; yet it permeates all the Deity, and is the work of the uncreated sub-

¹ *De Synodis*, c. 50.

stance, as if something in common, at the same time that singly it is appropriated to each Person, so that through the three Persons it should be peculiarly fitted to each, every one being complete in itself. The Father therefore worketh, but by the Son in the Spirit. And the Son worketh as the Power of the Father, being understood according to His own existence to be in Him and from Him. And the Spirit worketh, for He is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, the Maker of all things.¹

If we may conclude that it was S. Cyril of Jerusalem who grafted this section of the first Nicene Creed into his Creed of Jerusalem, it is to his Catechetical lectures that we must look for help in illustration of its meaning. But for the sake of clearness I will first repeat it side by side with the unrevised Creed of Jerusalem to be extracted from his Catechetical Lectures.

CREED OF JERUSALEM

And in one Lord Jesus Christ
the only-begotten Son of God
begotten of His Father,

very God before all worlds,

by whom all things were
made:

OUR NICENE CREED

And in one Lord Jesus Christ
the only-begotten Son of God
begotten of His Father before
all worlds, [*God of God*], Light
of Light, very God of very
God, begotten not made, be-
ing of one substance with the
Father by whom all things
were made:

Enough has been said² about S. Cyril's hesitation to accept the new terms in his early days. But it is most necessary to show clearly that this did not imply any hesitation to pay Divine honour to the Lord, to give Him the worship which, as S. Athanasius was never tired of insisting, is idolatry if addressed to a created Being.

'For the throne at God's right hand He received not, as some have thought, because of His patient endurance, being crowned as it were by God after His Passion; but throughout His being—a being by eternal generation,—He holds His royal dignity, and shares the Father's seat, being God and Wisdom and Power, as hath been said; reigning together with the Father, and creating all things for the Father, yet lacking nothing in the dignity of Godhead, and knowing Him that hath begotten Him, even as He is known of Him that hath begotten; and to speak briefly, remem-

¹ *Dial. vi., De Trin.*

² P. 21.

NICENE TEACHING ON THE INCARNATION 69

ber thou what is written in the Gospels, that *none knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any the Father save the Son.*¹

(3) *The Life and Work of the Redeemer*

JERUSALEM, A.D. 348	S. EPIPHANIUS, A.D. 374
<p>3. And was incarnate, And was made man,</p> <p>4. Was crucified, And was buried,</p> <p>5. And rose again the third day,</p> <p>6. And ascended into heaven,</p> <p>7. And sat at the right hand of the Father,</p> <p>8. And is coming in glory to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end.</p>	<p>3. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate, of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary and was made man,</p> <p>4. And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried,</p> <p>5. And He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures,</p> <p>6. And ascended into heaven,</p> <p>7. And <i>sitteth</i> at the right hand of the Father,</p> <p>8. And is coming again with glory to judge the quick and the dead whose kingdom shall have no end.</p>

Who for us men, etc.—These phrases ‘for us’ and ‘for our salvation’ express distinct ideas. The Gospel is a message to man as he is, a sinner needing Redemption. But the New Testament contains scattered hints that the glory of the Incarnation of the Son of God would have been revealed even if man had not sinned.² In any case we should have needed a Teacher and a Leader, as men created for Him and in His image. Because we have sinned He came ‘for our salvation,’ under circumstances saddened by suspicion and suffering and death. We may never forget all that it cost to redeem our souls. But we find food for thankful meditation in the thought of this restoration to our original destiny, this ‘Gospel of Creation,’ as Bishop Westcott³ calls it in a fine phrase. It is sometimes designated the Scotist theory of the

¹ Cat., iv. 7; Matt. xi. 27; John x. 15, xvii. 25.

² Col. i. 13 ff.; cf. Eph. iii. 9 ff., iv. 10.

³ *Epistles of S. John*, p. 273.

Incarnation, because Duns Scotus (+1308) was the most distinguished theologian of the Middle Ages who advocated it. It is suggested by earlier and more distinguished teachers of the Church. It kindled the glowing imagination of Irenæus, who passes from the thought of man as fallen to the thought of the absolute purpose of the Incarnation: 'If man had not conquered the adversary of man, the enemy would not have been justly conquered. And again, if God had not bestowed salvation, we should not have possessed it surely. And if man had not been united to God, he could not have partaken of incorruption. For it was necessary that the Mediator of God and men by His own essential relationship with both should bring both together into friendship and concord, and on the one hand present man to God, and on the other make God known to man.'¹ This thought was much in the mind of S. Hilary of Poitiers.

Came down.—This word expresses the self-emptying of the Divine Word, who laid aside His glory (Phil. ii. 7).

Was incarnate.—The Arians evaded the plain meaning of the words. The School of Lucian taught that the Word took flesh only without a human soul,¹ and this was brought out clearly by Eudoxius of Constantinople. So the Council of Nicæa added *dwelt amongst men as man*, in place of an expressive phrase of Eusebius 'lived as a citizen among men.' This was intended to express, in Dr. Bindley's words, 'the permanent union of God with human nature; but as it afterwards proved, it was not sufficiently technical to exclude heretical theories as to the mode of the union, whether by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh (Apollinarianism) or by union with a human person (Nestorianism).'³

In the revised Creed of S. Cyril mention is made of the mode of the Incarnation through the miraculous conception, which had always found a place in S. Cyril's lectures as in the Old Roman Creed.⁴

And was crucified for us.—Here again the death of

¹ *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 18. 7.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

² S. Epiphanius, *Ancor.*, 33.

⁴ *Cat.*, iv. 9.

our Lord, which in the Western Creed is brought before us as a historical fact, is in the Eastern Creed made the basis of a theological argument. But our theology analyzes our experience. History proves that from the day of Pentecost the power of Christianity as a missionary religion has been the preaching of Christ crucified. Beneath the Cross multitudes of sin-bound souls have found the burden of sin rolled away, while at the same time they were utterly unable to make any excuse for themselves. And the reality of their repentance has been shown in the response which they have made to the call for sacrifice of will, of pleasure, of ease, which finds its motive and support in Christ's sufferings. The Church has never formulated any theory of the Atonement, beyond this Scriptural phrase which was on the lips both of S. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 18) and S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 3). There is room in each succeeding age for large interpretations of its bearing on the needs of souls. Thus in our own time many of us have felt that Dr. Dale's book on the Atonement supplied something that was lacking in Dr. M'Leod Campbell's presentation of the doctrine. Dr. Dale himself foretold that further advance could not be made until the doctrine of Personality human and divine had been restated. His prophecy has been fulfilled in the well-known Bampton Lectures of Dr. Illingworth, upon which followed the great work of Dr. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*. Again we note advance. Dr. Moberly shows that Dr. Dale had stopped short of the teaching of S. Paul in Rom. viii., that we must never be content in our meditations on Calvary to omit the thought of Pentecost. He who conquered for us now conquers in us through His Spirit. It is the grace of His Spirit that makes us worthy of forgiveness from the first moment when we turn our faces to the light, and like the penitent thief responding to the mute appeal of the sinless Sufferer, are justified by faith which welcomes more grace to cleanse and sanctify and perfect every soul. This is a theme on which it is impossible to dwell within the limits of this book. But these sentences may suffice to show that Christian thought,

while progressing, is still guided by the old landmarks. We run our race still 'looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith' (Heb. xii. 2).

Under Pontius Pilate.—The addition of Pilate's name, probably from an Antiochian source, brought the revised Creed into line with the Old Roman, and was possibly an important link in the chain of resemblances upon which Pope Leo based his acceptance of the Constantinopolitan Creed at Chalcedon.

S. Augustine¹ suggested that Pilate's name fixed the date of the Crucifixion, a theory which found favour also with Rufinius.² It fits in with the references in Pliny's letter to Trajan and in the *History* of Tacitus. But the argument cannot carry the weight of a further theory that the archetype of all creeds which includes Pilate's name must have been written in Palestine, on the ground that the name of the Governor would only be of interest to the district which he governed.³

Dr. Bindley has an interesting note on the way in which events in Barbadoes are dated by the names of the Governors. The hurricane of 1898 is said to have happened in the time of Sir James Hay. But Pliny's letter shows that Christian tradition in Bithynia also associated Pilate's name with the record of the Lord's death. Indeed it seems so natural that it is strange that elaborate explanations should be sought for it, such as Dr. Zahn's theory that the name was inserted to prove that the story was historical, and not a myth devised to teach a certain moral.

And suffered and was buried.—Some heretics in S. Cyril's time still taught the Docetic theory that our Lord's sufferings were unreal. His warning is worth quoting :

'If any say that the Cross is an illusion, turn away from him. Abhor those who say that Christ was crucified to our fancy only; for if so, and if salvation is from the Cross, then is salvation a fancy also; but *if Christ be not risen we are yet in our sins*. If the Cross is fancy the Ascension is also fancy; and if the Ascension is fancy, then is the second coming also fancy, and everything is henceforth unsubstantial.'⁴

¹ *De Fid. et Symb.*, 11.

² *In Symb. ap.* 16.

³ Marian Morawsky, *Z. für k. Theol.*, 1895.

⁴ *Cat.*, xiii. 37.

The early Jerusalem Creed added *buried*, which naturally came into the revised Creed. S. Paul found occasion to emphasise the fact (1 Cor. xv. 3). S. Cyril added to it teaching on the Descent into Hell, which began to find mention in Creeds at this time, but did not put it in his revised Creed.

And He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.—In mention of the Scriptures we have another Pauline feature (1 Cor. xv. 4). We may suppose that S. Paul had in his mind such passages as Ps. xvi. 10, Hosca vi. 2. S. Cyril chose this passage 1 Cor. xv. 1-4 as his text for his Lecture on the Resurrection, and comments as follows :—

‘As an Apostle, therefore, has sent us back to the testimonies of the Scriptures, it is good that we should get full knowledge of the hope of our salvation ; and that we should learn first whether the divine Scriptures tell us the season of His Resurrection, whether it comes in summer or in autumn, or after winter ; and from what kind of place the Saviour has risen, and what has been announced in the admirable Prophets as the name of the place of the Resurrection, and whether the women, who sought and found Him not, afterwards rejoice at finding Him ; in order that when the Gospels are read, the narratives of these holy Scriptures may not be thought fables nor rhapsodies.’¹

There is an eloquent passage in S. Athanasius on the reasons for His Rising the third day, not sooner, to prove that He truly died ; not later, to guard the identity of His body, not to keep long in suspense those whom He had told about the Resurrection, ‘while those who had slain Him were still living on the earth and were on the spot and could witness to the death of the Lord’s body, the Son of God Himself, after an interval of three days, showed His body, once dead, immortal and incorruptible ; and it was made manifest to all that it was not from any natural weakness of the Word that dwelt in it that the body had died, but in order that in its death might be done away by the power of the Saviour.’²

This victory over death is demonstrated by the courage given to martyrs, “death being deprived of all his power”

¹ *Cat.*, xiv 2

² *De Incarn.*, § 26.

in each one of them that hold His faith and bear the sign of the Cross.

‘For now that the Saviour works so great things among men, and day by day is invisibly persuading so great a multitude from every side, both from them that dwell in Greece and in foreign lands, to come over to His faith, and all to obey His teaching, will any one still hold his mind in doubt whether a Resurrection has been accomplished by the Saviour, and whether Christ is alive, or rather is Himself the Life? Or is it like a dead man, to be pricking the consciences of men, so that they deny their hereditary laws and bow before the teaching of Christ?’¹

And ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father.—This going up answers to His coming down, and expresses the resumption of His Divine glory which He had laid aside. The change to *sitteth* from the past tense *sat down* of the old Jerusalem Creed corresponds to S. Cyril’s teaching.

‘Let us not curiously pry into what is properly meant by the throne; for it is incomprehensible: but neither let us endure those who falsely say, that it was after His Cross and Resurrection and Ascension into heaven, that the Son began to sit on the right hand of the Father. For the Son gained not His throne by advancement;² but throughout His being (and His being is by an eternal generation) He also sitteth together with the Father. And this throne the Prophet Esaias having beheld before the incarnate coming of the Saviour, says, *I saw the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lifted up,*³ and the rest. For the Father *no man hath seen at any time,*⁴ and He who then appeared to the prophet was the Son. The Psalmist also says, *Thy throne is prepared of old; Thou art from everlasting.*^{5,6}

And is coming again with glory to judge the quick and the dead.—The change from *in* to *with* is again supported by S. Cyril’s usage.

‘Our Lord Jesus Christ, then, comes from heaven; and He comes with glory at the end of this world, in the last day. For of this world there is to be an end, and this created world is to

¹ *De Incarn.*, § 30.

² Some Arians maintained, like Paul of Samosata, that our Lord was promoted to Divine honour in reward of His obedience as Son of Man.

³ Is. vi. 1.

⁴ John i. 18.

⁵ Ps. xciii. 2.

⁶ *Cat.*, xiv. 27.

be remade anew. For since corruption *and theft, and adultery, and every sort of sins have been poured forth over the earth, and blood has been mingled with blood*¹ in the world, therefore, that this wondrous dwelling-place may not remain filled with iniquity, this world passeth away, that the fairer world may be made manifest.'²

'Out of thine own conscience shalt thou be judged, thy *thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.* The terrible countenance of the Judge will force thee to speak the truth; or rather, even though thou speak not, it will convict thee. For thou shalt rise clothed with thine own sins, or else with thy righteous deeds.'³

'And shouldst thou ever hear any say that the Kingdom of Christ shall have an end, abhor the heresy; it is another head of the dragon, lately sprung up in Galatia. A certain one has dared to affirm, that after the end of the world Christ shall reign no longer; he has also dared to say, that the Word having come forth from the Father shall be again absorbed into the Father, and shall be no more; uttering such blasphemies to his own perdition. For he has not listened to the Lord, saying, *The Son abideth for ever.*⁴ He has not listened to Gabriel, saying, *And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end.*'⁵

The heresy to which S. Cyril refers is that of Marcellus of Ancyra in Galatia, who though prominent as a leader of the orthodox party at Nicæa fell afterwards into the snare of fanciful speculation, and was condemned universally. He pressed the words of S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 28), about the Son being subjected to the Father that *God may be all in all*, to the point of teaching that the relation of Sonship will pass away, and the Word of God become what Marcellus said He was before the Incarnation, immanent in the Father. There can be little doubt that Marcellus grew confused in his old age. S. Athanasius would never condemn him by name, and when he was questioned by an inquisitive friend would only smile quietly.⁶ This throws light also on S. Cyril's silence about his name, which may have been due to respect for his past services to the faith.

Although it is not possible within the proper limits of this chapter to trace the further development of Nicene

¹ Hos. iv. 2. ² *Cat.*, xv. 3. ³ *Ib.*, 25. ⁴ John viii. 35.

⁵ Lk. i. 33, *Cat.* xv. 27. ⁶ S. Epihanus, *Adv. Haer.*, lxxii. 4.

theology at any length, the discussion of the Creed at Chalcedon opens out a vista of new theological problems, which were dealt with as they arose, like the Arian speculation, but led likewise to thorny controversies. They were all summed up with remarkable conciseness in the final definition of the Council of Chalcedon, which represents the last word of the early Church on the great subject of the Person of Christ. It is most interesting to watch from far off how inevitably reaction followed, like the regular swing of a pendulum, when any one aspect of Christological teaching was pressed too far. Carried too far by his abhorrence of Arianism, Apollinaris, desiring to magnify the divine glory of Christ, supposed that the Divine Word took in Him the place of the human soul. When it was maintained that our Lord took perfect manhood into union with His Divine Nature, the Nestorians denied that the Babe on Mary's knee was rightly the object of worship, and taught that Jesus was a man who was taken into gradual union with the Eternal Word. And again the pendulum swung back. In their zeal for the honour due, as they felt, to the Mother of the Lord and to His Divinity, Eutychians used rash words about the taking up of the manhood into God as if it were absorbed, like a drop of vinegar in the mighty ocean. We may well shrink from speculation on such themes, but we dare not hesitate to give answers for the faith that is in us when our faith is challenged by new questions. And to aid our thinking the balanced words of the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon come down with perennial freshness:—

‘Following, therefore, the holy Fathers, we confess and all teach with one accord one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once perfect (complete) in Godhead and perfect (complete) in manhood, truly God and truly man, and, further, of a reasonable soul and body; of one essence with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one essence with us as regards His manhood, in all respects like us, apart from sin (Heb. iv. 15); as regards His Godhead begotten of the Father before the ages, but yet as regards His manhood—on account of us and our salvation—begotten in the last days of Mary the Virgin, bearer of God; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, proclaimed in two natures, without confusion,

NICENE TEACHING ON THE INCARNATION 77

without change, without division, without separation; the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed on account of the union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one Person and one hypostasis—not as though parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten God the Logos, Lord, Jesus Christ, even as the prophets from of old and the Lord Jesus Christ hath taught us concerning Him, and the Creed of the Fathers has handed down to us.’

Thus in a few words the Church not only repudiated the extremes of Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian teaching, but stated the relation between the two natures in the one Person.¹ Not as though words could explain the mystery, but because words can guard it from unreasonable or insufficient attempts to explain it away.

Thus the coping stone was added to the edifice of doctrinal teaching on the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. Subsequent developments of error, *e.g.* the heresy of the Adoptionists, a form of revived Nestorianism, have been and may be dealt with on the old lines. The limits of our subject do not allow us to proceed further. But this review of the whole advance from Nicæa to Chalcedon brings us back to the keynote of the whole argument, the justification of S. Athanasius for his loyalty to the Nicene term *Homo-ousios*.

If we go back to our Gospels, even to the irreducible minimum which agnostic critics can save for us as the bedrock of Christian tradition, we are face to face with a mystery of character unique in the history of the world. The mystery of Christ's Person leads us back to the mystery of His Birth. The Church from generation to generation repeats the confession ‘God from God,’ and does not darken counsel by words without knowledge when she adds ‘of one substance with the Father.’ As Dr. Illingworth has said very well:—

‘People sometimes speak vaguely about Christian dogma having been involved with Greek metaphysics; much as if it were something parallel to being involved with the Ptolemaic astronomy or any other ancient theory which the world has now outgrown. But, in fact, nothing of the kind is the case. The terms in

¹ Bethune-Baker, *Op. cit.*, p. 287.

question were simply adopted as those best calculated to express the specifically Christian idea that Jesus Christ is really God. They do not even carry with them any particular theory of what "essence" or "substance" may be; as is plain from the fact that those very men who insisted on the use of the term "co-essential" insisted equally . . . upon our utter inability to know what the essence of God is. The words, in short, as employed by the Christian Fathers, were stripped of any alien connotation, and simply utilised to denote a particular point of Christian belief; and they are therefore as applicable now as ever, if we retain the patristic Creed.¹

¹ J. R. Illingworth. *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, Macmillan, 1907, p. 122.

CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD THE HOLY GHOST

It is sometimes a matter of deep concern to beginners in the study of Christian doctrine when they for the first time realise how slowly the doctrine of the Holy Ghost was developed in comparison with the doctrine of the Person of Christ. It may seem to them to give some support to the suggestion of Unitarian teachers that the Holy Ghost was regarded by the Christians of the first age as an impersonal energy.

There is not, of course, much evidence to be produced. But such as there is may with good reason be called decisive. There is, proportionately, more of it in the New Testament than in the Apostolic Fathers of the next generation. The picture which S. Luke draws for us in the Acts of the Apostles is an outline sketch of men living from day to day in reliance on the guidance and comfort of the Holy Spirit. It was indeed as a fact of spiritual experience that they enjoyed His fellowship. But the great work of evangelisation, and oftentimes the stress of persecution, left but little leisure for meditation concerning the full glory of His Person and the dignity of His relationship to the Father and the Son. S. Paul's teaching, however, on the subject is clear, and shows development from the first. It is probably the fruit of the nine years which he spent at Tarsus before he was summoned by S. Barnabas to Antioch, when he seems to have been chiefly occupied in thinking out the conclusions to which faith in Christ led him.

The importance which the doctrine of the Holy Spirit assumes in the teaching of S. Paul has been strangely neglected. This teaching of S. Paul represents in part

no doubt his own reflections under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But we should be blind indeed if we failed to recognise that he is building all the time on a common basis of belief shared by the Christian Church, to which S. John's letters at a later date bear emphatic testimony. The ultimate source of it is the teaching of the Lord himself, given in a literary form to the Church of the next generation in S. John's Gospel.

The Fourth Gospel, in Dr. Swete's words, 'relates a series of conversations running through the course of our Lord's ministry, which reveal entirely new views of the Spirit's relation to the individual life, to the Church, and to God. . . . But the fullest and clearest revelation was reserved for the last discourse on the night before the Passion (John xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13).'¹ The Holy Spirit as an 'advocate' (*paracletos*) was to be Christ's substitute and representative, sent from the Father and the Son on His mission to the disciples and the Church. He was to carry on the teaching work of Christ, helping the disciples to remember Christ's words and to see in them new meanings. Thus He would glorify Christ as Christ glorified the Father, revealing His Lordship (John xvi. 14, 15, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3). And His witness would have power to convince men of the world concerning their sinfulness, divine righteousness, and divine judgments (John xvi. 8).

(1) *The Personality of the Holy Spirit*

We must look first for reasons to explain the slow growth of the doctrine of the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and causes which retarded it, especially in the second century. We have no interest in overlooking any of the evidence, either the very confused doctrine of the prophet Hermas in the second century, or the sad confession of S. Gregory of Nazianzus in the fourth century when he was appointed to the See of Constantinople: 'Some men,' he said, 'regard the Holy Spirit as an energy, some think that He is a creature, others that

¹ Art. *Holy Spirit*, in Hastings' D. B.

He is God, while others do not know which of these opinions to adopt out of reverence for the Scriptures.'

One important factor in the case is beyond question the influence of the Alexandrine Jew Philo, who systematically read Platonism into the Old Testament. His influence, in the words of Dr. Bigg, was 'partly helpful, partly detrimental. It was given to the Alexandrine Jew to divine the possibility and the mode of an eternal distinction in the Divine Unity, and in this respect the magnitude of our debt can hardly be overestimated. How large it is we may measure in part by the fact that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which has no place in his system, remained for a long time meagre, inarticulate and uncertain.'¹ Whether the term the Word (Logos) at the beginning of the Fourth Gospel was taken over from Philo's teaching, directly or indirectly, or was taken direct from poetical passages of the Old Testament, such as Psalm xxxiii. 6, '*By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made,*' does not come into question here. We are concerned not with the origin but with the development of the Logos doctrine, and in that development there is no doubt that Christian writers were encouraged by Philo's speculations to read the Old Testament in the light of Christ's teaching and to philosophise about it. And the pity of it was that one-sided speculation tended to obscure the teaching of the primitive Christian tradition on the Holy Spirit.

A word of warning is necessary here. In a writer such as Clement of Alexandria the doctrine of the Divine Son is very fully developed and the teaching on the Holy Spirit seems scanty. But we must remember that Clement promised a book on the Spirit, which has not come down to us, if it was ever written, and that we are therefore entitled to press to the full the importance of the famous passage in the *Miscellanies* when Clement shows a strong faith in the influence of the Spirit. He is adapting a metaphor from Plato, and pictures the whole hierarchy of created beings as a chain of iron rings, each sustaining and sustained, each saving and saved, held together by the magnetic force of the Holy Spirit.

¹ *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 25

To our shame, however, we must confess that in the second and third centuries, as in the present, the main cause of failure to believe rightly in the Person of the Holy Spirit was beyond doubt worldliness.

We see this clearly in the history of Montanism. The decline of Christian prophecy, which coincided with the strengthening on all sides of the authority of the official ministry, of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, coincided also with a great increase of temptations to worldliness. So far as it was a conservative reaction in favour of prophecy the Montanist movement bore witness to great truths which were endangered. But the claim of Montanus to be the merely passive instrument of the Spirit, and the fanatical zeal of his followers, aroused an opposition which was not all inspired by worldly motives. If Montanist teaching seems to us a parody of the Gospel, we must remember, as it has been well said, that a parody implies an original, and that the original in this case is the Fourth Gospel, weighed, pondered, misunderstood, but bringing to recognition neglected truths that might yet in the future bring succour to vital religion.

We see this fact illustrated in the experience of the Apologist Tertullian. The wilder vagaries of Montanism had no attraction for his cultured mind, to say nothing of his training as a lawyer in caution. No doubt it is true that he would have taught the great bulk of his teaching in any case, even if he had never heard of Montanus. Behind his harsh ruggedness we can discern an ardent nature on fire with the zeal, the fire of love of the Spirit, which was the inspiring motive of Montanism where it was in harmony with the best thought of the first age. Tertullian's magnificent description of Patience, the gift of the Holy Spirit which accompanies Him when He descends, suggested as seems most probable by the patience and courage of the martyr Perpetua, proves that by the best informed thought of his time the Holy Spirit was not conceived of as an impersonal gift, but as a Person.

(2) *The Doctrine in the Third and Fourth Centuries*

A striking exposition of the doctrine is found in Origen's great work *On first Principles*. He writes: 'The Apostles related that the Holy Spirit was associated in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son. But in His case it is not clearly distinguished whether He is to be regarded as generate or ingenerate, or also as a Son of God or not; for there are points which have to be enquired into out of sacred Scripture according to the best of our ability, and which demand careful investigation. And that this Spirit inspired each one of the saints, whether prophets or apostles; and that there was not one Spirit in the men of the old dispensation and another in those who were inspired at the advent of Christ, is most clearly taught throughout the churches.'¹ And in the following sentence he clearly teaches the coeternity of the Holy Spirit: 'The Holy Spirit would never be reckoned in the unity of the Trinity, *i.e.* along with the unchangeable Father and His Son, unless He had always been the Holy Spirit.'

But some of his expressions led to much misunderstanding, as when he is speaking of the *historical revelation* of God, and teaches as an inference from the Fourth Gospel 'that the Spirit owes His origin to the medium of the Son, and that therefore He is in the order of the divine life inferior to the Son.'² He is not here dealing with the *inner being* of the Godhead, on which he teaches: 'Nothing in the Trinity can be called greater or less.'³

The misadventures of Origen's speculations explain to us the acute fear which S. Cyril of Jerusalem expresses in his Catechetical lectures: 'We would say somewhat concerning the Holy Ghost; not to declare His substance with exactness, for that were impossible.'⁴

'Inquire not curiously into His nature or substance: for had it been written we would have spoken of it; what is not written, let us not venture on; it is sufficient

¹ *De Princ.*, Pref. p. 3.

² Bethune-Baker, *Op. cit.*, p. 203.

³ *De Princ.*, i. p. 34.

⁴ *Cat.*, xvi. 5.

for our salvation to know, that there is Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost.'¹

Yet S. Cyril leaves us in no doubt as to his belief in the distinct personality of the Spirit:—

'It is established, that though the titles of the Holy Ghost be different, He is one and the same; living and subsisting, and always present together with the Father and the Son; not uttered or breathed from the mouth and lips of the Father or the Son, nor dispersed into the air, but having a real substance, Himself speaking, and working, and dispensing, and sanctifying; even as the economy of salvation which is to usward from the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, is inseparable and harmonious and one, as we have also said before.'²

In the following passage he teaches that the Spirit is the source of all that is beautiful in moral and spiritual life:—

'Why did He call the grace of the Spirit water? Because by water all things subsist; because water brings forth grass and living things; because the water of the showers comes down from heaven; because it comes down one in form, but works in many forms. For one fountain watereth the whole of Paradise, and one and the same rain comes down upon all the world, yet it becomes white in the lily, and red in the rose, and purple in violets and hyacinth, and different and varied in each several kind: so it is one in the palm-tree, and another in the vine, and all in all things; and yet is one in nature, not diverse from itself; for the rain does not change itself, and come down first as one thing, then as another, but adapting itself to the constitution of each thing which receives it, it becomes to each what is suitable. Thus also the Holy Ghost, being one, and of one nature, and indivisible, divides to each His grace, *according as He will*:³ and as the dry tree, after partaking of water, puts forth shoots, so also the soul in sin, when it has been through repentance made worthy of the Holy Ghost, brings forth clusters of righteousness. And though He is One in nature, yet many are the virtues which by the will of God and in the Name of Christ He works. For He employs the tongue of one man for wisdom; the soul of another He enlightens by prophecy; to another He gives power to drive away devils; to another He gives to interpret the divine Scriptures. He strengthens one man's self command; He teaches another the way to give alms; another He teaches to fast and discipline himself; another He teaches to despise the things of the body; another He trains for martyrdom: diverse in different

¹ *Cat.*, xvi. 24.

² *Ibid.*, xvii. 5.

³ 1 Cor. xii. 11.

men, yet not diverse from Himself, as it is written, *But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit without.*¹ . . .²

To the quotation from S. Athanasius given above I may add the following from his letter to Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, at a time when the Arian attack had extended to denial of the Divinity of the Spirit: 'The Spirit is the Son's own image, and He is said to proceed from the Father because He shines forth, and is sent and given by the *Logos*, who is from the Father. He is the Son's very own and not foreign to God.'³

It seems as though when the full glory of the truth, revealed and as yet only partially understood, dawned upon these great teachers, their style gained an added glow and warmth, as in the following passage from S. Basil:—

'Who on bearing the titles of the Spirit, does not experience an elevation of soul and rise in thought to the supreme nature? For He is called the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father, the Upright Spirit, the Princely Spirit. Holy Spirit is his peculiar and distinguishing appellation, and this is a name pre-eminently adapted to what is incorporeal, purely immaterial, and indivisible. Accordingly our Lord, when teaching the woman who thought of a local worship of God that the incorporeal was incomprehensible, says, God is a Spirit. It is, then, impossible when we hear of a Spirit to picture to the imagination a circumscribed nature, or one which is subject to turning and changing, or which is at all like the creature; but rising to the sublimest thoughts, we are compelled to think of an intellectual essence, infinite in power, illimitable in magnitude, immeasurable by periods or ages; who ungrudgingly imparts His excellence; unto whom all things needing sanctification turn, for whom all things living long according to their excellence, being, as it were, watered by His breath, and assisted to attain their own proper and natural end; perfective of all else, Himself lacking nothing; who lives not because He is endowed with life, but because He is the giver of life; who does not grow by additions, but is at once full, self-sustaining and everywhere present; the source of sanctification, light invisible, who, as it were, illuminates every faculty of reason in its search for truth; unapproachable by nature, accessible by reason of His goodness; filling all things by His power, but communicable only to the worthy; not shared by all in the same degree, but distributing His energy according to the proportion of faith; simple in essence, manifold in powers;

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 7-11.

² *Cat.*, xvi. 12.

³ i. 21.

wholly present with each individual, and wholly everywhere; impassibly divided, and shared without division, like a sunbeam, whose gracious influence is as much his who enjoys it as though he were alone in the world, but which also blends with the air, and shines over land and sea. Thus, too, the Spirit is present with every one who receives Him, as if there were only one receiver, but bestows sufficient and complete grace on all; whom all things that partake of Him enjoy, according to the capacity of their nature, not to the extent of His power.¹

The following passages, from S. Hilary of Poitiers, may be added to show how, *c. A.D. 361*, he upheld, though with caution, the central truth:—

‘Thy Holy Spirit, as the Apostle says, searches and knows Thy deep things, and as intercessor for me speaks to Thee words I could not utter . . . nothing, except what belongs to Thee penetrates into Thee; nor can the agency of a power foreign and strange to Thee measure the depth of Thy boundless majesty. . . . Paul . . . thought that the description was sufficient when He called Him Thy Spirit. With these men, peculiarly Thine elect, I will think in these matters . . . I will not trespass beyond that which human intellect can know about Thy Holy Spirit, but simply declare that He is Thy Spirit.’²

A crisis was reached with the deposition of Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, who denied the Divinity of the Spirit. The Council of Constantinople, in accepting the revised Creed of Jerusalem, gave prominence to the truth that the Spirit should be worshipped and glorified with the Father and the Son. The controversy smouldered on. A graphic picture of it is given in the Catechetical lectures of Niceta of Remesiana, who accuses the Macedonians of raising interminable questions: ‘Of what sort is the Holy Ghost? Whence and how great is He? Has He been born? or has He been made?’ They were not content with the plain words of the Lord ‘He proceedeth from the Father.’ They persisted in misapplying the text ‘All things were made by Him’ (John i. 3) as if it included the Spirit. Niceta argued from their admission that S. John was inspired by the Spirit to write the words, therefore the Spirit could not be included among created beings. He quoted other texts to prove that the

¹ *On the Holy Spirit*, c. 22.

² *De Trin.*, xii. 55, 56.

Spirit is Lord, that He guides into all truth, sanctifies, absolves, regenerates. His attributes include foreknowledge, goodness and omnipresence. He who is confessed with the Father and the Son at baptism should be worshipped with them, not separately as different gods are worshipped by the heathen, but in the Unity of the Trinity.¹

(4) *The Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost*

When the Divinity of the Holy Ghost had thus been openly challenged by the Arians and championed by Church leaders, the way was opened for a new development of teaching. A new aspect of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost came into view, which stimulated thought and provoked controversy. As so often happens, this controversy has turned more upon accidentals than essentials, upon the way in which one view was brought into prominence rather than the impossibility of combining it with its opposite in one common formula. It was felt that precisely as the Church had learnt through painful experience to emphasise the Scriptural word 'only begotten' in relation to the Son, so to indicate the relationship of the Holy Spirit they must teach that He is 'not made nor created nor begotten but proceeding.'

Niceta is content to repeat the Scriptural words 'Proceedeth from the Father'; but the question was certain to come up—What is His relationship in this regard to the Son? The quotation which I have given above (p. 85) from S. Athanasius in which He is called 'the Son's own image' shows that the idea of His proceeding from the Father through the Son is not far off. It is one of the lines of thought in which S. Athanasius reveals his sympathy with the modes of thought current in the West.

The difference which afterwards arose between East and West on this subject was due to the fact that they approached the subject from opposite points of view. The Greek Fathers started from the thought of the Eternal Distinctions (*Hypostaseis*) and reconciled them as best they could with the idea of Divine Unity. They

¹ Cf. my *Niceta of Remesiana*, p. lxiv.

thought of the doctrine of the Trinity as an explanation of the creation, manifested in the work of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. On the other hand, Western teachers began with the idea of the Trinity as 'a necessity of the Divine Life—to use a technical term, as immanent, an abiding reality.' They began from the thought of the coinherence of the Divine Persons, as the Lord taught; 'Thou, Father, art in me and I in thee' (John xvii. 21). This led them to the thought that the Spirit must be regarded as proceeding in a sense from the Son, because He is '*the Spirit of Jesus*' (Acts xvi. 7). When the words 'And the Son' had been added to 'Proceedeth from the Father' Eastern theologians thought that this would introduce the idea of two fountains (so to speak) of Deity. But this was far from the imagination of the early writers who led men to the edge of the later controversy. Perhaps even now the wound may be healed by use of the more exact phrase 'Proceedeth from the Father through the Son,' which safeguards teaching on each side.

S. Hilary of Poitiers, the great ally of S. Athanasius in the West, is bold to speak of the Father and Son as authors of the Spirit who has His being from the Father and through the Son. In his book *On the Trinity*, he writes:—

'For my own part I think it wrong to discuss the question of His existence. He does exist inasmuch as He is given, received, retained. He is joined with Father and Son in our confession of faith, and cannot be excluded from a true confession of Father and Son. . . . If any man demand what meaning we attach to this conclusion, he as well as we have read the word of the Apostle: "Because ye are sons of God, God hath sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying Abba, Father," and "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God in whom ye have been sealed."'¹

Such was his answer to Arians and Macedonians. It is the next step in his thought that fixes our attention at the present moment. S. Hilary had no doubt that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son. 'And I question,' he goes on, 'whether it is the same thing to receive from the Son as to proceed from the Father.'² He was evidently inclined to answer

¹ *De Trin.*, ii. 29.

² *De Trin.*, viii. 19, 20.

yes, but was not prepared to insist on it. His book ends with a prayer in which he speaks of the Spirit as from the Father through the Only-Begotten.

We find the same idea in the writings of Victorinus Afer, the teacher of rhetoric whose conversion to Christianity made so great a stir in Rome a short time before the Conversion of S. Augustine.¹ 'The Spirit receives of the Father in receiving of the Son. He is the bond of union between the Father and the Son.'

For the full development of this teaching we must turn to S. Augustine, who did more than any one to mould later Western teaching. Thus in his work *On the Trinity* he distinguishes between *mission* and *procession*, and asserts a true procession of the Spirit from the Son, quoting S. John xx. 22: '*He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*' 'That bodily breathing was a demonstration by a suitable illustration that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son. We must admit that the Father and the Son are the Principle of the Spirit.' He boldly faces the objection that Christ speaks only of a procession from the Father: '*When the Paraclete is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall bear witness concerning me*' (John xv. 26). 'He says, "My doctrine is not mine." It was the Father's because He was of the Father. Yet it was His, because He and the Father are One. How much rather then must we understand that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him also when He saith thus—"proceeds from the Father," that He does not say "He does not proceed from Me."'² He is careful to explain that we must not think of the procession from the Son as following the procession from the Father. The Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father to the Son and proceed from the Son to sanctify the creation, but He proceeds at the same time from both.

As Dr. Swete well says, 'Augustine never asserts his view in the spirit of a controversialist. If he lays stress upon the procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son, if he enforces his opinion with a

¹ See Augustine's *Confessions*.

² *De Trin.*, iv. 29.

plainness and explicitness of language hitherto without a precedent, his purpose is neither to encourage speculation nor to provoke discussion, but rather to add completeness and stability to the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity. He is conscious of no conflict of opinion within the Church, his quarrel is only with the Arian and the Macedonian: the *Filioque* is part of his answer to those who denied the Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.¹

I have dealt sufficiently in Part I. with the history of the controversy which arose when the words *Filioque* were added to the Nicene Creed. But it remains to ask whether we can point to any advantage accruing from loyalty to the teaching of Western Christendom in this matter, or in other words, does such speculative teaching bear any fruit in the spiritual life?

On this point some light has recently been thrown by the late Canon Moberly. He says:—

‘The Spirit of the Incarnate is the Spirit of God. But it is not so much the Spirit of God, regarded in His eternal existence, or relation, in the Being of Deity: it is the Spirit of God in Humanity, the Spirit of God become the Spirit of Man in the Person of the Incarnate,—become thenceforward the true interpretation and secret of what true manhood really is,—it is this which is the distinctive revelation of the New Testament, the distinctive significance and life of the Church of Christ. This is the truth, immense in its significance for practical Christianity, which the so-called doctrine of the ‘Double Procession’ directly protects; and which the denial of that doctrine tends directly to impair. It may be that the removal of the ‘*Filioque*’ from the Nicene Creed, would not necessarily imply a denial of the doctrine: but there can at least be little doubt, historically speaking, that the ‘*Filioque*’ has served, to the doctrine, as a bulwark of great importance.’²

Similarly Dr. Milligan wrote,

‘As the Spirit of the exalted and glorified Lord, He is not the Third Person of the Trinity in His absolute and metaphysical existence, but that Person as He is mediated through the Son, who is human as well as Divine. It is on this particular aspect

¹ *Hist. of the Doct. of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, p. 132.

² *Atonement and Personality*, p. 195.

of His being that He diffuses Himself through the members of Christ's body, and abides in them.'¹

The opinions which Dr. Moberly and Dr. Milligan so ably set forth deserve fuller discussion than they have, so far as I know, yet received. Both defend the doctrine of the 'Double Procession' of the Holy Spirit as a matter of practical and not merely metaphysical importance. And yet all the spiritual results for which they contend seem to be secure if it is taught that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. From the point of view of a practical preacher I believe the statement reported from the lips of an experienced missionary to be profoundly true: 'Whenever due honour is paid to God the Holy Ghost in parochial missions results follow.' The great Western hymns, *Veni, Creator Spiritus* and *Veni, Sancte Spiritus*, to which the Eastern Church can show no parallel, have had their part in the great revivals of spiritual life for which in the Western Church we thank God. Let us pray that we may be enabled to advance along the same path, not unfaithful to truths which our forefathers were at pains to learn. All the same, let us be careful not to overstate the truth so as to give offence to those whom God is leading along another path, as we surely believe, to the same goal.

The possibility of agreement with the Eastern Church is shown by the results of a conference which was held at Bonn in 1875, between Easterns, Anglicans, and Old Catholics, when the following terms of union were agreed on.

We accept the teaching of S. John Damascene on the Holy Ghost, as it is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church:—

1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father as the beginning, the cause, the source of the Godhead.

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son, because there is in the Godhead but one beginning, one cause, through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.

¹ *Ascension of our Lord*, p. 189.

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son.

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son who is the Image of the Father, issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as His revealing power.

5. The Holy Ghost is the personal production out of the Father belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of God declaratory of the Word.

6. The Holy Ghost forms the link between the Father and the Son, and is linked to the Father by the Son.

It will be seen that these statements show that there is a very substantial agreement. And this agreement is still closer in the case of those Easterns who hold that it is lawful to believe that the 'procession' and 'shining forth' of the Spirit *through* the Son is from all eternity. We may hope that in time He who is the Spirit of unity and truth will reunite our scattered forces under the banner of our one Master.

Such is the story of the long controversy on this doctrine which has come under attention, first in the history of our Nicene Creed, and then in the course of exposition of its teaching. Sad to say, it is not through misrepresentation in the progress of heated debate, though that is bad enough, so much as through sheer neglect of the doctrine altogether, that the worst evils have come into being. There are many Christians of to-day who are much in the position of the disciples whom S. Paul found at Ephesus, constrained when they were challenged to answer: 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.'

As it was worldliness, more than anything else, that hindered the development of the doctrine in the first centuries, so is it worldliness to-day that hinders soul after soul from attaining to that peace and joy in the Holy Ghost which is the bliss of the kingdom of heaven.

CHAPTER VII

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS

OUR Nicene Creed does not differ to any important extent from the Apostles' Creed in its teaching on the Church and the Sacraments. But there are two additions which, like the reference to the doctrine of the Atonement in Art 5, bring in what one may call a pastoral touch, a hint of the beneficent work of the Church in the shepherding of souls. The first of these is the confession of the Unity of the Church, which is one in doctrine and fellowship. However far we may be from Reunion, it is well that in our holiest moments we should confess that it is the goal of our hopes and prayers.

The second is the coupling of the Sacrament of Baptism with its inward and spiritual grace 'I acknowledge one Baptism *for* the remission of sins.' Some one has said that there is a great deal of divinity (meaning theological teaching) in prepositions. This is true certainly in this case.

Again let us compare the forms :

JERUSALEM, A.D. 348

S. EPIPHANIUS, A.D. 374

- | | |
|---|---|
| 10. And in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, | 9. In one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. |
| 9. And in one holy Catholic Church, | 10. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. |
| 11. And in resurrection of the flesh, | 11. We look for the resurrection of the dead, |
| 12. And in life eternal. | 12. And the life of the world to come. |

Apart from the transposition of clauses 9 and 10, by

which S. Cyril brought the Creed into line with the customary order, there are several slight alterations which are significant.

We miss the words 'of repentance' with which the ancient short creed of Jerusalem had ended. But there was no intention to alter the emphasis in dogmatic teaching. S. Cyril's exhortations to repentance are most striking. Baptism, he says, is the end of the Old Testament and beginning of the New. For its author was John, and in the spirit of John the Baptist he declaims against hypocrisy.

'Yet He tries the soul. He casts not his pearls before swine; if thou play the hypocrite, though men baptize thee now, the Holy Spirit will not baptize thee. But if thou approach with faith, though men minister in what is seen, the Holy Ghost bestows that which is unseen. Thou art coming to a great trial, to a great muster, in that one hour, which if thou throw away, thy disaster is irretrievable; but if thou be counted worthy of the grace, thy soul will be enlightened, thou wilt receive a power which thou hadst not. . . . If thou believe, thou shalt not only receive remission of sins, but also do things which pass man's power. And mayest thou be worthy of the gift of prophecy also! For thou shalt receive grace also according to the measure of thy capacity and not of my words; for I may possibly speak of but small things, yet thou mayest receive greater; since faith is a large affair. All thy life long will thy guardian the Comforter abide with thee; He will care for thee, as for His own soldier; for thy goings out, and thy comings in, and thy plotting foes. And He will give thee gifts of grace of every kind, if thou grieve Him not by sin; for it is written, "*And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed unto the day of redemption.*"¹ What then, beloved, is it to preserve grace? Be ye ready to receive grace, and when ye have received it cast it not away.'²

In one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.—The Church is one, both by unity of outward organisation and also by unity of inward spiritual life. We are too ready to acquiesce in the miserable conditions which prevail in the present day, under which visible unity is broken. Separations between Churches set up barriers between faithful souls, and prevent that interchange of spiritual experience, that fellowship in righteousness and peace

¹ Eph. iv. 30.

² *Cat.*, xvii. 36, 37.

and joy in the Holy Ghost, which are the characteristics of social life in the Kingdom of God. No wonder that the conversion of the world is hindered, that spiritual hindrances abound. The world will never be convinced by what it cannot see. We must pray for, and expect in God's time, the reunion of Christendom on the largest scale. But this can only come through a great deepening and strengthening of the inner life of the Spirit. It will never come to those who are ready to sacrifice truth for peace. As the Archbishop of York¹ has said in a memorable phrase, what we want is 'not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth.' It is in the ability to take larger views of history, and above all in the insight which can discern spiritual things because it is spiritual, that we shall find new possibilities opened out through the vision of restored unity, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, who also '*maketh men to be of one mind in an house*' (Ps. lviii. 6, P.B.V.). In the meantime though the vision tarry we wait for it, and we do well to ponder the opinions of great teachers of the days when the Church though threatened was not divided. S. Ignatius of Antioch writes to the Ephesians: 'Do ye, each and all, form yourselves into a chorus, that being harmonious in concord, and taking the keynote of God, ye may in unity sing with one voice through Jesus Christ unto the Father, that He may both hear you and acknowledge you by your good deeds to be members of His Son. It is therefore profitable for you to be in blameless unity, that ye may also be partakers of God always.'²

S. Irenæus also writing at the close of the second century, when schisms were not unknown, though not so serious as in the modern world, writes:—

'A spiritual disciple who truly receives the Spirit of God . . . indeed judges all men, but is himself judged of no man . . . He will judge also those who cause divisions, who are destitute of the Son of God and look to their own profit, rather than to the unity of the Church, who for small reasons and for any reasons cut and divide, and, so far as is in their power, destroy the great and glorious body of Christ, who speak peace and make war, who verily strain out the gnat and swallow the camel; for from them

¹ Dr. Lang.

² Eph. 4.

can come no reformation so great as is the harm of schism. He will judge also all those who are outside the truth, that is, those who are outside the Church.¹

The pathetic appeal of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, to Novatian, a schismatic Bishop of Rome, is worthy of mention :—

‘If, as you say, you were led on unwillingly, you will prove it if you retire of your own will. For it would be well to suffer anything and everything in order to avoid dividing the Church of God. Martyrdom to avoid rending the Church would not be less glorious than martyrdom to escape idolatry. In my judgment it would be more glorious. For in the one case a man bears testimony to death for the sake of his own single soul; in the other case, the testimony is for the sake of the whole Church. Even now, if you persuade or constrain the brethren to come to concord, the recovery of your standing will be greater than your fall. The fall will not be reckoned; the recovery will be praised. But, if you have no power with the disobedient, take care to save your own soul.’²

From the thought of outward unity we turn to the thought of inward unity enjoyed through fellowship in the one life in Christ. This is the keynote of the great High Priestly prayer in which our Lord prayed, ‘As thou, O Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us’ (John xvii. 21). And St. Paul laboured continuously to enforce the same truth: ‘As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body being many are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13). Such unity of life begun in Baptism is continued in the Holy Eucharist: ‘We who are many are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread’ (1 Cor. x. 17). ‘This fellowship in the Gospel,’ which was for S. Paul the source of deepest joy, is the one abiding possession which reconciles us to the enduring of affliction, the patience needed by those who would tend old sores.

¹ *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 33. 1, 7, quoted by D. Stone, *The Christian Church*, p. 120.

² Quoted by Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 45.

But we are not alone in our joy or grief. To St John was revealed the prayer of martyred souls in the unseen World crying 'Lord, How long' (Rev. vi. 10), as well as the praise of those who, in joy unspeakable, see His Face (*ib.* xxii. 4).

'One family we dwell in Him,
One Church above, beneath,
Though now divided by the stream,
The narrow stream of death.'

In that blessed 'Communion of Saints,' which the Church here militant already shares with the Church resting, and so far as the conquest of temptation is concerned already triumphant, we have the foretaste of bliss and the secret source of courage unconquerable.

We pass on to think of the Church as *holy*. We are not concerned with the unfortunate omission of the word from our English version.¹ The conception is fundamental, and is alike concerned with our highest hopes and our deepest penitence. The Church is holy because the indwelling Spirit is Holy, because from the beginning all the members of the Church, who have had anything to do with the progress and the extension of the Church, have always set this before them as the ideal, to be consecrated, set apart to live 'in the world' yet 'not of the world,' in Christ, and therefore by His grace changed into the same image from glory to glory. We do not hide from ourselves one stain upon the fair fame of the historic Church, so often betrayed into conduct unworthy of Him whose Name we bear. We are sadly conscious of the blame attaching to each one of us in this regard, of past unworthiness and perhaps worse, whereby we have crucified to ourselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame (Heb. vi. 6). But this does not hinder us from claiming as our heritage the status of a 'holy nation, a people for God's own possession' (1 Pet. ii. 9).

S. Paul calls the Christian society 'a holy temple' (Eph. ii. 21) although in the same letter he plainly shows that he regards many of the Christians to whom he writes as

¹ P. 48.

in serious danger of falling into sins of falsehood, anger, and impurity (iv. 25, 26, v. 3). In other words, he is true to the ideal which our Lord, both in the Sermon on the Mount and in His parables, held constantly before the eyes of His disciples. Holiness is the ideal in His kingdom, but in this world evil will be mixed with the good until the Great Day. S. Paul goes on to speak of Christ's purpose to sanctify the Church 'having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish' (Eph. v. 26, 27).

The antithesis, which is often drawn between the visible and the invisible Church, ceases to be a source of perplexity when it is clearly perceived that we can say the above words truly of the Church in the two worlds of the seen and the unseen, and not only of the latter.

The epithet *Catholic* was first used to express the idea of the extension of the Christian society throughout the world. S. Ignatius used it free from all the qualifications which became necessary when heresies began to abound, and to the primary idea of universality were added the ideas of doctrine and unity. To the Smyrnæans he writes: 'Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal (catholic) Church.'¹ To S. Cyril of Jerusalem it meant much more:

'The Church is called Catholic because it extends throughout all the world from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and completely all the doctrines which ought to come to the knowledge of men concerning things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it brings into subjection to godliness the whole race of mankind, governors and governed, learned and ignorant; and because it treats and heals every class of sins that are committed in soul or body, and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named, both in deeds and in words and in every kind of spiritual gifts.'²

¹ *Cat.* 8. See Lightfoot's note *ad loc.* Mr. Stone, *The Christian Church*, p. 136, suggests that the context brings in the notion of orthodoxy. This was no doubt in the mind of S. Ignatius, but it is not clear that he narrowed the term.

² *Cat.*, xviii. 23.

S. Cyril goes on to warn his hearers when they visit strange cities to 'inquire not simply where the Lord's house is, . . . nor simply where the Church is, but where is the Catholic Church,' avoiding the meetings of heretics.

A similar interpretation is given by St. Augustine in a letter in which he replies to a Donatist :

'You think you say something sharp when you explain the name Catholic not from the communion of the whole world, but from the keeping of all the commandments of God and of all the Sacraments, as if we, even if perchance the Church is for this reason called Catholic because it truly holds the whole, of which truth certain fragments are found even in different heresies, rest for our proof of the Church in all nations on the testimony of this name, and not on the promises of God and on so many and so clear oracles of the truth itself.'¹

The term *Apostolic*, which has not come into the Western Creed with *Catholic*, has had a similar history. S. Ignatius salutes the Church of the Trallians 'in the divine plenitude after the Apostolic fashion.' In the description given of the martyrdom of Polycarp in the Letter of the Smyrnæans, Polycarp is described as 'the glorious martyr Polycarp, who was found an apostolic and prophetic teacher in our own time, a bishop of the holy (or Catholic) Church which is at Smyrna.' Here the term corresponds to the teaching of S. Paul in the passage in which he speaks of the Church as 'the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets' (Eph. ii. 20). This idea of the historical succession of apostolic men, who in generation after generation, continued the work of building up the Church, is very attractive. Tertullian defies heretics to trace back the origin of their Churches to Apostles, and the passage shows us the practical importance already attached to the principle of Apostolic succession, of orderly transmission of authority from one generation to another :

'If any dare to connect themselves with the Apostolic age that they may appear to have descended from the Apostles because

¹ Ep. xciii. 23, quoted by Mr. Stone, *Op. cit.*, p. 138.

they have been under the rule of the Apostles, we can say, Let them declare the origins of their Churches, let them unfold the succession of their bishops, so coming down from the beginning with continuous steps that the first bishop may have had as his consecrator and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of Apostolic men who remained in the communion of the Apostles.¹

It is this conception of an authority obedient to the law of its own existence, loyal to the past yet not out of harmony with the present, that is the strength of the system of Episcopacy. But it is with something more than confidence in Episcopal Orders and discipline that the Church claims the attribute Apostolic. It is with the sense of a Divine mission to mankind, trusted to carry on an occupation 'as definite as a soldier's' in the perpetual conflict against evil and misery and ignorance, that the Church of to-day accepts the solemn charge, 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you'² (John xx. 21).

We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.—Some ancient writers on the Creeds make a great point of a distinction which is of real importance, that our faith is a faith in Persons, not in things or ideas. In this instance our faith is in God the Holy Ghost, not in Baptism as a ceremony, or in the idea of remission of sins as connected with preparation for receiving the Sacrament of Baptism. It is the Holy Ghost who sanctifies water to the mystical washing away of sins, who stimulates and accepts our imperfect faith and repentance, who alone gives grace of perseverance to the baptized children of God in their weary warfare against the world, the flesh, and the devil. This conception was marked according to Rufinus, for example, by the use of the preposition *in*, which he taught should be used before the names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but not when mention is made of the Church or of remission of sins, because our faith in the Holy Ghost carries with it belief that He dwells in and works through the Church, as through the waters of Baptism. And as it is only by the Holy Ghost that we are enabled to confess our faith in Jesus as the Lord, so it is His

¹ *De Præser. Hæv.*, 32.

² Dean Church's *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 127.

privilege to make the Lord's sacrifice of Himself on the Cross effectual for each believer, making us one with Him, making His life our life.

'So it is,' writes Bishop Westcott, 'that the remission of sins has always been connected with Baptism, the Sacrament of incorporation. "We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins" that so the realisation of the atonement may be most vividly connected with the entrance on a new being. And here there is nothing unreal: nothing inconsistent with the purest images which we can form of the justice and holiness of God: nothing which is not confirmed by the experience of the human soul as it strives to forgive.'¹

The question is sometimes raised, why is only one Sacrament mentioned in the Creed? The answer is obvious, because we there speak of first principles only. Just so the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews.(vi. 2) puts among the first principles of Christianity the teaching of Baptism and of laying on of hands, and then goes on to speak of resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment, thus covering the whole life of the baptized from beginning to end. The second great Sacrament of the Gospel, the Holy Eucharist, is not ignored although it is not mentioned. It belongs to the next stage in the Christian life, when the soul that has been hitherto nourished with the milk of the Word is full-grown and able to partake of solid food (Heb. v. 13, 14), is fed with Bread from heaven, not once only, but throughout the remaining days of his earthly pilgrimage.

As Hooker has said in memorable words: 'We receive Christ Jesus in Baptism once as the first beginner, in the Eucharist after, as being by continual degrees the finisher of our life. . . . The grace which we have by the Holy Eucharist doth not begin but continue life. No man therefore receiveth this Sacrament before Baptism, because no dead thing is capable of nourishment. That which groweth must of necessity first live. If our bodies did not daily waste, food to satisfy them was a thing superfluous. And it may be that the grace of Baptism would serve to eternal life, were it not that the state of

¹ *Historic Faith*, p. 133.

our spiritual being is daily so much hindered and impaired after Baptism.'¹

We look for the resurrection of the dead.—As I have shown above, S. Cyril implies that he preferred 'of the dead,' to 'of the flesh,' probably in fear of materialistic explanations. He is careful to explain. 'For this body shall be raised, not remaining weak as now; but raised the very same body, though by putting on incorruption it shall be fashioned anew,—as iron blending with fire becomes fire, or rather as He knows how, the Lord who raises us. This body therefore shall be raised, but it shall abide not such as it now is, but an eternal body; no longer needing for its life such nourishment as now, nor stairs for its ascent, for it shall be made spiritual, a marvellous thing, such as we cannot worthily speak of.'²

From this point of view it will be noticed that our Nicene Creed is freed from the ambiguity which at times has permitted materialistic explanations to gather round the words, 'resurrection of the flesh,' in the Apostles' Creed.

There is a note of triumph in the personal touch, 'We look for,' which rings through the following passage:—

'The root of all good works is the hope of the Resurrection: for the expectation of the recompense nerves the soul to good works. For every labourer is ready to endure the toils, if he sees their reward in prospect; but when men weary themselves for nought, their heart soon sinks as well as their body. A soldier who expects a prize is ready for war, but none is forward to die for a king who is indifferent about those who serve under him, and bestows no honour on their toils. In like manner every soul believing in a Resurrection is naturally careful of itself; but, disbelieving it, abandons itself to perdition. He who believes that his body shall remain to rise again, is careful of his robe, and defiles it not with fornication. . . . Faith therefore in the Resurrection of the dead is a great commandment and doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church; great and most necessary, though gainsaid by many, yet surely warranted by the truth.'³

The question has been raised whether there is any hint here that the Church anticipated a speedy coming for a

¹ *Eccles. Polity*, v. lvii. 6; lxvii. 1. ² *Cat.*, xviii. 18. ³ *Ib.*, 1.

'First Resurrection' of saints preceding a Millennium and the second resurrection unto Judgment. That thought does not seem to have been in S. Cyril's mind, and it rests on misunderstanding of doubtful texts. St. Cyril does not seem to have believed in two Resurrections, but only that S. Paul's words to the Thessalonians taught that *the dead in Christ* should have the privilege of rising first: 'Let us wait and look for the Lord's coming upon the clouds from heaven. Then shall angelic trumpets sound; *the dead in Christ shall rise first*,¹—the godly persons who are alive shall be caught up in the clouds, receiving as the reward of their labours more than human honour, inasmuch as theirs was a more than human strife; according as the Apostle Paul writes, saying, *For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.*'² Our Lord delayeth His coming, and it is often hard to remain steadfast at the post of duty, but this clause of the Creed sounds in our ears the trumpet call of hope. When He comes we shall triumph over sin and death. 'We look for the resurrection of the dead.'

And the life of the world to come.—As compared with the phrase of the Jerusalem Creed 'life eternal' this emendation is not easy to explain. It is not less Scriptural, being quoted in the First Gospel from our Lord's lips (Matt. xii. 32). It may draw attention to the fact that the future life will be a life lived under new conditions rather than a repetition of the life here. The phrase is found in a Creed presented by the heretics Arius and his friend Euzoios to the Emperor Constantine, and in the Creed of the Apostolical Constitutions (Bk. vii.) which we have traced to Antioch. Probably the Creed of Arius has Antiochene rather than Alexandrian connections, since he had been taught in the school of Lucian the Martyr. And in any case there is no dogmatic inference

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 16.

² *Ib.* vv. 16, 17.

to be drawn from the phrase as if this variation in any way supported Arian teaching. It is the most puzzling emendation of all, because S. Cyril rather loves to repeat the words 'eternal life.'

'For ours is no trifling aim, but our endeavour is for eternal life. . . . The real and true life then is the Father, who through the Son in the Holy Spirit pours forth as from a fountain His heavenly gifts to all; and through His love to man, the blessings of the life eternal are promised without fail to us men also. . . . And the ways of finding eternal life are many. . . . For the Lord in His loving kindness has opened, not one or two only, but many doors, by which to enter into the life eternal, that as far as lay in Him, all might enjoy it without hindrance.'¹

¹ *Cat.*, xviii. 28, 29, 36.

CONCLUSION

THE Nicene Creed stands in no need of apology. But it suffers a great deal in the estimation of ordinary men through their ignorance of its proper historical background. I hope that this little book will do something to supply necessary information. What many men fail to understand is the fact that all the great heresies, Arianism included, arise from tendencies common to the human mind in every age and everywhere. The little son of a distinguished philosopher, Sir William Hamilton, came to him one day with the question: How could the Lord Jesus be both God and Man? He suggested an answer, which he was told was wrong. He was sent away to find a better, but before he found it he hit in his childish way on all the chief heresies concerning the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. This proves that we must expect that all those heresies will reappear from time to time. It supplies also a fresh argument in favour of the Vincentian Canon¹ that the true faith is that which is believed everywhere, always, and by all. Many, and sometimes very futile, objections have been raised to this canon, but they apply only to ill-judged misapplications of it. By itself it states no more than the obvious fact that Truth is one, and our single aim as defenders of the faith is to maintain the harmony of truth in the confession of Christ by S. Peter in the Gospel, by S. Paul and S. John in their letters, by S. Athanasius and the Great Councils, and by innumerable believers down to the present day, who, in every variety of style and in many grades of culture, agree to call Christ their Master and worship Him as the Son of God. As Vincentius put it in another striking phrase, we do not say new things but in a new way.

¹ Vincentius of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, c. 2.

But there is a far more serious objection to Creeds, felt perhaps more often than it is stated, that they are attempts to express more than words can utter of the mysteries of the Divine Nature and Personality. It is well met in the following words of Dr. Mill: 'It is a mistake of the nature of the Creeds, to suppose that their definitions pretend to grasp the whole matter revealed, and to bring its unfathomable depths within the cognisance of the understanding. They profess only to methodise, and bring into a compendious shape, easily remembered and repeated, the great outlines of the Faith once delivered to the saints.'¹ That this was the feeling in the minds of some of the greatest Nicene teachers has already been shown in the striking words of S. Hilary of Poitiers, which I have quoted above.² The importance of it has been insisted on more than once. But this is a truth which each age must restate for itself. Time after time men will return with profound thankfulness to our Nicene Creed, as expressing in balanced sentences, and in true perspective, the outline of the Revelation given to us in our Lord Jesus Christ. As has been well said: 'Words are the fortresses of thought.' In these words we entrench our conviction that this Revelation is true.

'THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH AND DWELT AMONG US, AND WE BEHELD HIS GLORY, GLORY AS OF THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN FROM THE FATHER, FULL OF GRACE AND TRUTH.'³

¹ *Sermons on the Temptation*, ed. 3, 1873, p. 17.

² P. 18.

³ John i. 14.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

THE GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS OF THE CREED FORMS QUOTED ABOVE

<p>I. THE CREED OF EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA (Socrates H.E. i. 8 or Theodoret H.E., i. 11)</p>	<p>THE CREED OF THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, A.D. 325 (according to the text of Hort, <i>Op. cit.</i>, p. 140).</p>
<p>Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν· Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον γενὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζῶν ἕκ ζωῆς, υἷον μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα· τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἕξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· [Πιστεύομεν] καὶ εἰς ἕν πνεῦμα ἅγιον.</p>	<p>Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν· Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χρι- στόν, τὸν υἷον τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ—τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ φῶς ἐκ φωτός θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ. τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς [τοὺς] οὐρανοὺς, ἐρχόμενον κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.</p>

Τούτον ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρ- χειν πιστεύοντες, πατέρα ἀληθῶς πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν ἀληθῶς υἱὸν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθῶς ἅγιον πνεῦμα· καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κῆρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς εἶπε· πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.	Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας· Ἦν ποτε ὄτε οὐκ ἦν καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι· Ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι [ἢ κτιστὸν] ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἁλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, [τούτους] ἀναθεμα- τίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.
--	---

II. THE CREED OF NICÆA IN LATIN

As prefixed to the Anathemas of Pope Damasus about A.D. 378-80

(Collated with the MSS. Turner, *Op. cit.*, p. 99)

Credimus in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem [omnium] uisibilium et inuisibilium factorem :

Et in unum Dominum vestrum Iesum Christum,

Filium Dei,

natum de Patre unigenitum,

hoc est de substantia Patris,

Deum de Deo,

Lumen de lumine,

Deum uerum de Deo uero,

natum non factum,

unius substantiæ cum Patre, quod græce dicunt homousion,

per quem omnia facta sunt,

sive quæ in caelo sive quæ in terra ;

qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit,

incarnatus est,

homo factus est, passus [est et] resurrexit tertia die,

ascendit in caelos,

uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos :

et [in] spiritum sanctum [neque facturam neque creaturam sed de substantia deitatis].

Eos autem qui dicunt : Erat [tempus] quando non erat, et Priusquam nasceretur non erat, et quia Ex nullis extantibus factus est, uel Ex alia substantia sive essentia dicentes mutabilem et conuertibilem Filium Dei, hos anathematizat catholica et apostolica ecclesia.

III. THE EARLIER CREED OF JERUSALEM

(Restored from the Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril :

Hort, *Op. cit.*, p. 142)

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα

ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς,
 ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων·

Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,

τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
 τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν
 αἰώνων,

δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.

σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,

σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα,

ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,

καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,

καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς,

καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,

οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος·

καὶ εἰς ἓν ἅγιον πνεῦμα,

τὸν παράκλητον,

τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις·

καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,

καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν

καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν,

καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

IV. THE CREED OF CONSTANTINOPLE

OR REVISED CREED OF JERUSALEM.

- Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
 ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς,
 ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων·
- Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
 τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
 φῶς ἐκ φωτός,
 θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
 γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα,
 ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ
 δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·
- τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
 κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν,
 καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου,
 καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
 σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ παθόντα
 καὶ ταφέντα
 καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,
 καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,
 καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς,
 καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
 οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.
- Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν,
 τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
 τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον,
 τὸ λαλήσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν·
- Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν·
 ὁμολογοῦμεν ἕν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·
 προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν,
 καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

V. THE SAME IN LATIN

THE 'CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM'

(As quoted at the 2nd Session of the Council of Chalcedon)

SANCTA FIDES QUAM EXPOSUERUNT SANCTI CL. PATRES CONSONA
SANCTAE ET MAGNAE NICAENO SYNODO

Credimus in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, factorem caeli et terrae, uisibilium omnium et inuisibilium :

et in unum Dominum Iesum Christum Filium Dei unigenitum, ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula, Deum ex Deo, lumen ex lumine, Deum uerum ex Deo uero, natum non factum, homousion Patri hoc est eiusdem cum Patre substantiae, per quem omnia facta sunt ; qui propter nos et nostram salutem descendit * et incarnatus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria uirgine, homo factus, et passus est sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus, tertia die resurrexit,* ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, iterum uenturus in gloria iudicare uiuos et mortuos, cuius regni non erit finis :

et in Spiritum sanctum Dominum et uiuificantem, ex Patre * procedentem, cum Patre et Filio conglorificandum, qui locutus est per prophetas : in unam * catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam ; confitemur unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum ; expectamus resurrectionem mortuorum, vitam futuri saeculi. *Amen.*

IN TWO FORMS

THE 'CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM'

(As quoted at the 6th Session of the Council of Chalcedon)

ITERUM SYMBOLUM CENTUM QUINQUAGINTA

Credimus in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, factorem caeli et terrae, uisibilium omnium et inuisibilium :

et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei unigenitum, natum ex Patre ante omnia saecula * * Deum uerum de Deo uero, natum non factum, consubstantialiem Patri per quem omnia facta sunt ; qui propter nos homines et salutem nostram descendit * et incarnatus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria uirgine, et humanatus est et crucifixus est pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato * , et sepultus est et resurrexit tertia die * , ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, iterum uenturus [est] cum gloria iudicare uiuos et mortuos, cuius regni non erit finis :

et in Spiritum sanctum Dominum et uiuificantem ex Patre * procedentem, cum Patre et Filio adorandum et conglorificandum, qui locutus est per sanctos prophetos : in unam * catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam ; confitemur unum baptismum in remissionem peccatorum : expectamus resurrectionem mortuorum [et] uitam futuri saeculi. *Amen.*

The asterisks * * denote the points at which later texts include additions as follows:—'Deum de Deo,' 'lumen de lumine,' 'de caelis,' 'passus,' 'secundum scripturos,' 'Filioque,' 'sanctam.'

VI. THE STOWE MISSAL.

Credo in unum deum patrem omnipotentem factorem caeli et terrae; uisibilibus omnium et inuisibilibus :

Et in unum dominum nostrum ihesum Christum filium dei unigenitum natum ex patre ante omnia saecula lumen de lumine, deum uerum de deo uero, natum non factum, consubstantiali patri per quem omnia facta sunt, qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de caelo et incarnatus est de spiritu sancto et Maria uirgine et homo natus est, crucifixus (etiam) pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas et ascendit in caelos, et sedet a[d] dexterum dei patris et iterum uenturus cum gloria iudicare uiuos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.

et spiritum sanctum dominum et uiuificantem ex patre procedentem, qui cum patre et filio coadorandum et conglorificandum qui locutus est per prophetas, et unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam et apostolicam, confiteor unum baptismum in remissionem peccatorum, spero resurrectionem mortuorum et uitam futuri saeculi. *Amen.*

I have quoted the text of the first hand, correcting the spellings. A later hand has added 'filioque' and other words between the lines, now assigned to the tenth century.

LITERATURE

- F. J. A. HORT, *Two Dissertations*. Cambridge, 1876.
- B. F. WESTCOTT, *The Historic Faith*. Macmillan (second edition), 1883. (Cheap edition 6d.)
- H. B. SWETE, *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*. Deighton, 1876.
- J. KUNZE, *Das Nicänisch-Konstantinopolitanische Symbol*. Leipzig, 1898.
- A. E. BURN, *Introduction to the Creeds*. Methuen, 1899.
- H. M. GWATKIN, *Studies of Ariunism*. Cambridge, 1900 (second edition).
- C. H. TURNER, *The History and Use of Creeds and Anathemas*. S.P.C.K., 1908.
- E. C. S. GIBSON, Bp. of Gloucester, *The Three Creeds*. Longmans, 1908.

INDEX

- ADALHARD, Abbot of Corbie, 44.
 Ado, Bishop of Vienne, 42.
 Adoptionism, 46.
 Aetius, 38.
 Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria,
 6, 14.
 Amalarius of Trèves, 46.
 Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, S., 12.
 Apollinarianism, 70, 76 f.
 Apologists, the, 57.
 Arianism, 76.
 Arius, 4, 6, 8, 12, 57, 103.
 Asterius, 9.
 Athanasius S., Bishop of Alex-
 andria, 8, 14, 17, 19, 21, 42, 49 f,
 55, 59, 61, 68 f, 73, 75, 78, 85,
 87, 88 f, 99, 105.
- BANGOR ANTIPHONARY, the, 47.
 Basil of Ancyra, 16.
 Basil the Great, Bishop of Neo-
 cæsarea, 16, 85.
 Benedict VIII, Pope, 45.
 Benson, Archbishop, 53.
 Bethune-Baker, Rev. J. F., 17.
 Bigg, Dr., 81.
 Bindley, Dr. T. H., 33, 64 f.
 Bonn Conference, the, 91.
 Bradshaw Society, the, 47.
 Bright, Dr., 5.
- Bull, Bishop, 60.
- CÆSARIUS, Bishop of Arles, 18.
 Campbell, Dr. M'Leod, 71.
 Chalcedonian Definition, the, 36,
 39, 76.
 Charles the Great, Emperor, 42 ff.
 Clement of Alexandria, 81.
 Clement of Rome, Bishop, 55.
 Constantine, Emperor, 7 f, 14, 21,
 103.
 Council of Aix, A.D. 809, 44.
 Antioch, A.D. 268, 10.
 Arles, A.D. 314, 46.
 Arles, A.D. 353, 18.
 Chalcedon, A.D. 451,
 1, 37, 40, 76.
 Constantinople, A.D.
 381, 1, 17, 30.
 Friuli, A.D. 791, 43.
 Gentilly, A.D. 767, 42.
 Nicæa, A.D. 325, 1 f,
 7, 67.
 Sirmium, A.D. 357, 15.
 Toledo, A.D. 589, 39 ff.
- Cranmer, Archbishop, 47 f.
 Creed of Antioch, 27.
 Antioch, Second Creed
 of, 14.
 Apostles, the, 38, 48 f.

- Creed of Apostolical Constitutions, the, 27, 103.
 Arius, 104.
 Constantinople, The Council of, 21, 38.
 Eusebius, 11, 63 f, 66.
 Jerusalem, Earliest, 22.
 Jerusalem, Second, 23.
 Jerusalem, Revised, 2, 25, 27, 38, 66, 103.
 Mesopotamia, 27.
 Rome, The Old, 70.
 Tarasius, 42.
- Cyprian, Bishop, 17, 73.
 Cyril of Alexandria, Bishop, 33 f, 67.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, Bishop, 1, 21 ff, 28 f, 38, 68, 70, 74, 83 f, 94, 98 f, 102 f, 105, 130.
- DONATISTS, the, 99.
 Dowden, Bishop, 47.
- EBIONITES, The, 5.
 Elipandus, 46.
 Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, 1 f, 21, 24 ff, 29, 48, 69.
 Eunomius, Bishop of Nicomedia, 34.
 Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, 9, 12 f, 15.
 Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, 8, 9, 13, 21, 38, 63, 65, 70.
 Eutychianism, 76 f.
 Euzoius, 103.
- GIBSON, E. C. S., Bishop of Gloucester, 27 ff, 47.
 Gnosticism, 22, 52, 60.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, 16, 31 ff, 65, 80.
 Gregory of Nyssa, 6, 16, 30.
 Gregory Thaumaturgus, 65.
 Gwatkin, Professor, 9, 12, 14.
- HADRIAN, Pope, 42.
 Hamilton, Sir W., 105.
 Harnack, Dr. A., 16 f, 59.
 Henry II., Emperor, 45.
 Hermas, 55 f.
 Hilary, Bishop of Arles, 18 f.
 Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, 16 ff, 70, 86, 88, 106.
 Hooker, R., 52, 61, 101.
 Hort, Dr. F. J. A., 1, 26 f, 29 f.
 Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, 7 f, 10, 60.
- IGNATIUS, Bishop of Antioch, 23, 54 f, 95, 98 f.
 Illingworth, Dr., 19, 71, 77.
 Irenæus, S., 60, 70, 95.
 Isidore, Bishop of Seville, 37.
- JESSE, Bishop of Orleans, 44.
 John of Damascus, S., 91.
 John of Biclaro, 40.
 Julian, Emperor, 15 f.
 Justin, Emperor, 36.
 Justin Martyr, 57.
- KALLINIKOS, Bishop of Apamea, 34.
 Kunze, Professor, 33 f.
- LEBEDEFF, Professor, 27.
 Leo I., Pope, 34, 36.
 Leo III., Pope, 43 ff.

Loofs, Professor, 12,
 Lucian the Martyr, 5, 70, 104.
 Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, 18.

MACEDONIUS, Bishop of Constantinople, 36 f, 38.

Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, 14, 23, 75.

Mark the Hermit, 35.

Melctius, Bishop of Antioch, 28, 30 f.

Migetius, 42.

Mill, Dr., 106.

Milligan, Dr., 90 f.

Moberly, Dr., 71, 90 f.

Montanism, 82.

NEKTARIUS, Bishop of Constantinople, 32 f, 35.

Nestorianism, 33, 70, 76 f.

Niceta, Bishop of Remesiana, 86 f.

Nilus, 35.

Novatian, 96.

ORIGEN, 5, 83.

Orr, Dr. J., 56 f.

PAUL OF SAMOSATA, 10.

Paulinus of Antioch, 31.

Paulinus of Aquileia, 43.

Petavius (Denys Pettau), 1.

Peter the Fuller, 35.

Philo, 81.

Photius, 45.

Plato, 81.

Polycarp, S., 99.

Proclus, 35.

RECCARED, King, 39.

Rufinus of Aquileia, 39, 47, 100.

SABELLIANISM, 5 f, 13 f, 57.

Secundus, Bishop, 13.

Serapion, Bishop, 85.

Smaragdus, Abbot, 44.

Stowe Missal, the, 47.

Strong, Dean, 51.

Swete, Dr., 45, 80, 89.

TACITUS, 72.

Tertullian, 57 ff, 82, 99.

Theodore the Reader, 35, 37.

Theodosius, Emperor, 30.

Theonas, Bishop, 13.

Theophilus of Antioch, 58.

Timothy of Constantinople, 35 f.

Turner, C. H., 12, 35 ff, 46.

VALENS, Emperor, 15, 16.

Victorinus Afer, 89.

Vincentius of Lerins, 105.

WALAFRID STRABO, 46.

Warner, Dr. G. F., 47.

Westcott, Bishop, 69, 107.

Wordsworth, Bishop J., 28.

ZAHN, Dr. T., 72.