The Journal
of
Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1901

FURTHER RESEARCH ON THE HISTORY OF THE CREED[1].

IT is but two short years since an article headed 'Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed' appeared in the opening number of this JOURNAL. During that time the labours of which some account was then given have been vigorously prosecuted; and it may not be without interest if we take up and continue our *résumé*. Just one small change ('History' for 'Origin') may be made in the title, so as to cover the ground a little more adequately.

The most prominent event in this period has been unquestionably the completion of Prof. Kattenbusch's great work *Das Apostolische Symbol, seine Entstehung, sein geschichtlicher Sinn, seine ursprüngliche Stellung im Kultus und in der Theologie der Kirche* [*The Apostles' Creed: its Origin, its Historical Sense, its*

[1] Kattenbusch, Dr. Ferdinand: *Das Apostolische Symbol.* Band ii. Leipzig, 1897–1900.

Kunze, Dr. Johannes: *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntnis.* Leipzig, 1899.

Clemen, Dr. Carl: '*Niedergefahren zu den Toten.*' Giessen, 1900.

Kirsch, Dr. J. P.: *Die Lehre von der Gemeinschaft der Heiligen* in Ehrhard-Kirsch, *Forschungen zur chr. Litt.- u. Dogmengeschichte.* Band i. 1900.

Harnack, Dr. Adolf: *The Apostles' Creed*, tr. Rev. Stewart Means, ed. T. Bailey Saunders. London, 1901.

Wiegand, Dr. Friedrich: *Das Apostolische Symbol im Mittelalter.* Erster Teil. Leipzig, 1899.

Dörholt, Dr. Bernhard: *Das Taufsymbolum der alten Kirche.* Erster Teil. Paderborn, 1898.

Callow, Rev. C.: *A History of the Creeds.* London, 1900.

Primitive Position in the Worship and in the Theology of the Church] (vol. i, 1894; vol. ii, part 1, 1897; part 2, 1900: Leipzig, Hinrichs). I give the title at some length (not quite in full, but sufficiently for the purpose) as the shortest way of conveying an idea of the manysidedness and comprehensiveness of the contents.

On this ground alone Dr. Kattenbusch's work would have a just claim to be accounted 'great,' because the execution amply fulfils the promise of the title. It is within its range almost as exhaustive as a book can be. The one omission that has been noted—that of direct work upon the MSS—is, it is true, thrown into some relief by the conspicuous part which that form of research played in the contributions of Dr. Kattenbusch's most eminent predecessor, the Jewish-German-Norwegian scholar, C. P. Caspari. But where the field is so vast it would be wrong to grudge a division of labour; and Dr. Kattenbusch has given us more than enough to be thankful for as it is.

Writing as an Englishman I cannot help pausing for a moment to express regret that we in England should have so little to put by the side of these immense researches. In the editing of texts and commentaries we keep pace fairly well. The best English work under this head for the last century (and it nearly all proceeds from Cambridge!) may bear comparison with anything anywhere. It is chiefly in the treatment of *subjects*, in the massive treatises that build up a whole science *a fundamento ad culmen*, that not our theologians alone, but our scholars generally, are wanting. There is one illustrious exception in the work of Westcott and Hort on the Text of the Greek Testament; next perhaps would come our contributions to Liturgiology, culminating in Mr. Brightman's *Liturgies Eastern and Western*; and quite a respectable place would be held by the researches of the last generation (Heurtley, Swainson, Lumby, Hort, Ommanney, and now of Mr. A. E. Burn) on the Creed. But what have we to set against such books as Krumbacher's *Byzantine Literature*, Zahn's *History of the Canon* and *Introduction to the N.T.*, Harnack's *History of Doctrine* and *Early Christian Literature*, Schürer's *History of the Jewish People*, Holtzmann's *New Testament Theology*, and the like? It is much to be hoped that some of our younger men may gird up their loins to follow these noble but humiliating examples.

Dr. Kattenbusch's *Apostles' Creed* belongs quite to the same category. It was hinted in the previous article that it has suffered somewhat in point of form from the fact that it has been spread over so wide an extent of time. We learn from vol. i, p. 37, that Dr. Kattenbusch began his researches in 1882, and from the preceding page that 'in substance' (*sachlich*) his present book had been finished in 1889, and that his work since that date had been all of the nature of revision. And the difficulty will be at once apparent of incorporating the work of others (as Dr. Kattenbusch has done in the most scrupulous and vigilant manner) as well as his own in a frame-work determined so long beforehand. It was impossible under these circumstances that the book should not suffer. But all we can say is that the critic who would make much of defects due to this cause would be intent upon dilettantism rather than upon science.

One of the leading characteristics of Dr. Kattenbusch is the extraordinary truthfulness and modesty with which he registers facts and opinions that make against his own conclusions as carefully as those which make for them. The paragraph in which he begins his final summary deserves to be quoted as a specimen of the moral aspect of the true scientific temper.

'I do not like to speak of "results," because, as I insisted in the Preface to vol. i, it is very clear to me that a great deal must happen before the questions which attach to the Apostles' Creed are fully solved; perhaps they will never all be solved completely. I know how much, in problems as complicated as that which I have been discussing, depends upon the point at which one begins, and the observations one comes upon first. The points of view which thus force themselves upon one easily become prejudices. I do not think that I am more in danger than other men of holding obstinately to these. But I gladly regard the leading ideas which run through my now completed work for the present only as *hypotheses*. Perhaps by the reasons which I have given for them I may have established some claim to have them seriously tested' (ii 956).

Whether we agree with Dr. Kattenbusch or do not agree with him, whether we are attracted or repelled by his minute and laborious investigations, we shall at least go away with profound respect for him as a man.

I do not think that I can do better than string the criticisms

that I may have to offer in this essay, not only on Dr. Kattenbusch but upon the other writers enumerated at the outset, upon the thread of the conclusions which Dr. Kattenbusch has so modestly described as 'hypotheses.' I venture to think that they present rather varied degrees of probability; and I am glad to find myself not without support in the estimate I am inclined to form of some of them.

1. The broadest proposition which Dr. Kattenbusch has set himself to prove is that the Old Roman Creed, the Apostles' Creed in its oldest and simplest form (R), *lies at the base of all like-constructed creeds.*

This proposition will meet with a good deal of assent[1], so far as it applies to the creeds of the *West.* It only perhaps needs to be qualified by the reserve that a certain number of clauses and expressions seem to have come in gradually in the course of the history *from the East*[2]. Such would be the clause *creatorem caeli et terrae*, which does not appear in the Apostles' Creed before the seventh century, though it is found at an earlier date in interrogations (Hahn, *Bibliothek*[3], § 31 f, g, also p. 41 note 52 *ad fin.*), the epithets *passus*, *mortuus*, *catholicam*, and perhaps the clause *vitam aeternam.*

Interesting problems gather round all such accretions, both those which finally held their ground and those which did not. As an example we may take the expression *resurrexit* vivus *a mortuis*, which is characteristic of the Spanish creeds (Hahn, *Bibl.*[3], §§ 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 69, cf. 242), but is also found in Nicetas of Romatiana, and in the newly-published Syriac *Testamentum* appears in a form which is rendered *reviviscens ex mortuis* (Kattenbusch, ii 968). From the fourth century onwards there are constant traces of sporadic influence of the East upon

[1] Dr. Clemen in particular is one of those who do not assent to it (*Niedergefahren*, &c., pp. 52–65). In any case the statement can only be made as a rough formula, subject to many qualifications. All that I should be prepared to say is that there is a rather marked tendency in Western creeds to approximate to the Roman type. How this tendency is to be conceived as operating, especially in the first beginnings, is a question that we shall do well to keep open for the present.

[2] Dr. Kattenbusch remarks (ii 966) that while many of these intrusive elements came from the East, it does not follow that they were imported from Eastern creeds; and he thinks that probably they were not. I am not sure that I can go with him in this, at least as to such additions as *creatorem caeli et terrae*, *passus*, *mortuus.*

the West; and although this is no doubt mainly due to increased intercourse, yet the comparative absence of such influence in the earlier period may in part mean nothing more than the want of evidence.

It is another and a much larger and more debated question, whether the Eastern creeds in a body are also to be traced to the same Roman root. We saw in the previous article how the view that they were was maintained by Kattenbusch and Harnack, but under opposition which seemed to be increasing rather than diminishing. This question will meet us again presently under (5). In the meantime we note that Kattenbusch speaks of this part of his theory as 'hypothesis' rather than induction (ii 957). He describes himself as in some degree sceptical of his own conclusion, though rather less sceptical of this than of any other.

2. The one point in the whole of his construction, in regard to which Dr. Kattenbusch appears to feel the greatest confidence, and to which he attaches the highest value, is his conception of *the fundamental character of the Old Roman Creed*. And no doubt this is both interesting and important.

He thinks that this original creed, the parent of all others, was no fortuitous concourse of atoms, no gradual crystallization of current forms and phrases, but that it was from the first a definite artistic creation, the product of a single mind and the expression of an individual conception of the sum of Christian teaching [1].

He seeks this conception not, as others have done (more particularly on the strength of the use of the term μονογενής), in the school of St. John, but he sees in it rather an outcome of the teaching of St. Paul. He believes that the Creed was composed under the fresh impression that Jesus was the true Messiah, and that the proof of His Messiahship was conducted on Pauline lines, and in yet living antithesis to the teaching of the Synagogue.

It is to be observed that although Kattenbusch and Harnack are allies on the question of the relation of the Eastern creeds to the Western, they differ considerably on the ultimate origin of

[1] See, however, p. 958. Dr. Kattenbusch does not think that the author of the creed coined a new vocabulary; he made use of phrases—especially from Scripture and from the Eucharistic liturgy—already existing.

the latter. Not only does Kattenbusch place the origin of the Roman Creed some forty years earlier than Harnack, but he stands alone in the emphasis with which he insists that it had a definite personal author (see especially ii 329).

All that Dr. Kattenbusch says on this head is highly interesting, and will well deserve weighing when the problem of the ultimate origin of the Creed comes up for discussion. For myself I cannot but think that the place which it occupies in his researches is rather premature. We want to be quite sure what is the oldest form of the Creed before we can speculate profitably as to its author. The most crucial problem is to determine whether there were two types of creed current in the second century or only one. When we have settled this, we can go on to discuss which is the older.

I should be willing enough to think that the Roman Creed had an individual author (bishop or prophet), if I could satisfy myself, with Kattenbusch, that no competing or earlier form existed. But when we examine the evidence (Irenaeus, Justin, Patres Apostolici), it seems to me to point quite as distinctly to the existence of another type, the characteristic features of which reappear in the Creeds not of the West but of the East.

Here lies the real crux of the problem, and this is the point that I believe we need first to determine. We need to go over once more the second-century evidence with a view to see which type really preponderated. No doubt much has been done in the way of collecting parallels to the Apostles' Creed, especially by Harnack, both in his larger edition of the *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. i, part 2, pp. 115–142, and in Hahn's *Bibliothek*[3], pp. 364–390. But both Harnack and Kattenbusch have had their minds so filled with the Western type of creed that they have not been equally regardful of the traces of the Eastern type. And although these traces have been pointed out by Loofs in *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1894, p. 679, in JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, i, p. 22, and now also by Kunze, *Glaubensregel*, p. 33 f, and by Clemen, *op. cit.*, p. 80, I believe that the evidence is capable of considerable additions, and that indeed it will be found to be of quite imposing volume.

I will just give a single illustration. In my previous article I argued, very tentatively and provisionally, that the Eastern

forms *ἕνα θεόν, ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* (I should not have written *Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*), as being apparently the more controversial, were likely to be later than the bare Roman form which lays no stress upon the unity. But what are the facts? There seems to be what might be called a continuous chain of evidence for the fuller form leading up to St. Paul himself. It may be worth while to set this down.

1 Cor. viii 6 *ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα . . . καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα.*

Eph. iv 4–6 *ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν Πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν, εἷς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, εἷς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν.*

Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* xlvi 6 *ἢ οὐχὶ ἕνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν καὶ ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς; καὶ μία κλῆσις ἐν Χριστῷ;*

Ignat. *ad Magn.* vii 2 *πάντες ὡς εἰς ἕνα ναὸν συντρέχετε Θεοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀφ' ἑνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα καὶ εἰς ἕνα ὄντα καὶ χωρήσαντα.*

Ibid. viii 2 *εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας, ὅτι εἷς Θεός ἐστιν, ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.*

Ad Philad. iv *σπουδάσατε οὖν μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ.*

Hermas, *Mand.* i 1 *πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας.* [We may compare *Sim.* ix 13. 5 *οὕτω καὶ οἱ πιστεύσαντες τῷ Κυρίῳ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνδιδυσκόμενοι τὰ πνεύματα ταῦτα, ἔσονται εἷς ἓν πνεῦμα, καὶ ἓν σῶμα, μιᾷ χρόᾳ τῶν ἱματίων αὐτῶν.* Also *ibid.* 7 *λαβόντες οὖν τὰ πνεύματα ταῦτα ἐνεδυναμώθησαν, . . . καὶ ἦν αὐτῶν ἓν πνεῦμα καὶ ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν ἔνδυμα.* Note the connexion between the *πνεύματα* (which are *ἅγια πνεύματα*, 13. 2) and the *ἓν πνεῦμα* = *πύργος μονόλιθος*, 13. 5.]

These are only a few jottings from the Apostolic Fathers bearing upon a single, though important, point. I should much like, if I could find time, to pursue the inquiry through the other writers of the second century. Of course I do not mean that the passages to which I have called attention are so many definite allusions to an Eastern form of creed. To determine exactly at what point such allusions begin is a delicate matter, and one

for which we are not as yet prepared. But the gist of the argument is that at any moment in the whole chain, from St. Paul downwards, we might have had a creed which laid stress on the unity of Father, Son, and Spirit, as well as on the ἓν βάπτισμα or μία κλῆσις.

In the face of such evidence, and with the consciousness how much more lies behind the one slight specimen that has been given, I should wish to withdraw entirely any *a priori* arguments that I may have used and to hold my judgement in suspense for the fuller collection which I desiderate. I am convinced that this is the only sound method, and until it has been carried out thoroughly I am afraid that I must regard Dr. Kattenbusch's speculations as resting on an insecure foundation.

3. Dr. Kattenbusch is of opinion that 'there is no reason to doubt that R *had its origin in Rome*.' He believes, as we have already in part seen, that it was composed about the year 100 by some prominent member of the Roman Church—either bishop or prophet. He thinks—in this agreeing with Kunze and Zahn—that the Creed was probably in use at the time when Marcion, Valentinus, and Justin were settled in Rome; but he admits that this is not capable of positive demonstration. At the same time he does not regard his view as depending for its validity on this hypothesis. He considers it to be in any case the most probable explanation of the facts.

It is interesting to observe that the alternative to Rome which Dr. Kattenbusch favours is not Ephesus, with Caspari and others, but rather Antioch (see both pp. 959 n. and 618 f.). This, I confess, had already occurred to me, and on the same ground—the points of contact in leading ideas, temper, and method with the writings of Ignatius. Between Rome, Ephesus, and Antioch there can be little doubt that the choice must lie. But if either of the latter is chosen, I conceive that it would support by preference the further alternative that the most primitive form of creed was rather of the Eastern type than of the Western.

As yet, however, it seems to me that all these hypotheses belong too much to the region of speculation. I am much inclined to agree with an opinion expressed, I believe, some time ago by Dr. Loofs—who, I may remark by the way, is the only

writer on these subjects to whom Kattenbusch has hardly given the place to which he is entitled—that the real key to the situation is in Irenaeus. Until the whole class of questions that culminate in Irenaeus has been worked out, it seems to me, as I have implied, that any conclusions must be purely provisional.

4. On the assumption that the Creed had its origin in Rome Dr. Kattenbusch sketches its probable *subsequent course* as follows:

'In the West it had certainly reached, in the course of the second century, Gaul and Africa, and perhaps all districts that possessed Christian congregations. To the western end of Asia Minor it also made its way during the second century, but not before the middle of it, perhaps in connexion with Polycarp's visit to Rome [in 154]. For the Churches of Corinth, Athens, Thessalonica, &c., we have no materials. Although not a matter of course, it is yet altogether credible that it had spread over those regions. But beyond the province of Asia I could discover no clear traces of the diffusion of a creed like R. For Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, &c., for the districts of Syria and Palestine, as well as for Egypt, materials failed me. In the case of Origen I seemed to see indications of acquaintance with a creed such as R, perhaps with R itself, but under such circumstances that I did not feel justified in drawing the conclusion that such a creed was recognised in Egypt. As all the Oriental creeds that are either known in the fourth century, or can be in part conjectured for the third, led up to Antioch as their starting-point, I began with the Creed of Antioch by inquiring whether and in what way it was dependent upon R; and I came to the supposition that R was received at Antioch after the fall of Paul of Samosata [*c.* 272 A. D.], undergoing some dogmatic adaptation to the necessities of the time. Beyond the limits of the diocese of Antioch I did not think that R had at that time penetrated, and indeed within that wide diocese I did not suppose that it had everywhere obtained recognition. In Egypt and in the interior of Asia Minor I thought that N [the *Nicenum*] was the first to be recognized as a "creed"; and that accordingly in these parts not until the victory of the Nicene Christology in the years 360–370 did a formula like R come to be used in baptism or attain to similar theological and ecclesiastical importance' (ii. 960 f.).

The reader will, I think, be glad to have this concise exposition of Dr. Kattenbusch's view of the gradual diffusion of the Creed; the more so as the geographical districts are carefully mapped out and discriminated, with due regard to the absence of

evidence. He should only perhaps just be reminded that in the last two or three sentences the conjectural element is considerable, and I conceive also precarious. It will be seen that the outline thus given would have to be entirely recast either on the supposition, to which Dr. Kattenbusch tells us that he was himself at one time inclined, that the Creed had its origin at Antioch, or if we preferred Ephesus to Antioch.

5. Under the next head Dr. Kattenbusch goes on *to define rather more exactly his conception of the course of events in the East.* He allows, however, that just this part of the subject, the history of R in the East [with Kattenbusch it is always R, where we should prefer to speak of 'the Creed'], is that on which his views are most liable to correction.

It is naturally a satisfaction to me to find the opinions which I myself expressed two years ago reinforced quite independently by two writers of the ability of Dr. Johannes Kunze and Dr. Carl Clemen. With Dr. Kunze's third chapter in particular, which is devoted to the history of the Creed in the Ante-Nicene Church, I find myself throughout in the fullest agreement. As compared with the corresponding portion of Dr. Clemen's essay I have rather the impression that whereas in both cases I agree with the results, in regard to Dr. Kunze I am more completely able to follow and endorse the reasoning that leads to the results. Dr. Clemen is one of those writers who, with an extraordinary extent of reading and knowledge, and with an extraordinary power of bringing that reading and knowledge to bear, do not possess in quite equal degree the gift of putting their arguments in a form that is attractive and convincing.

Dr. Kattenbusch replies on pp. 980–984 both to Kunze and to myself[1]; and I gladly admit that what he says may be taken to qualify somewhat the force of the arguments used. I cannot, however, think that he does more than qualify it. For myself I am well aware that there is a great deal more to be said. But while I am ready to allow that, as the case at present stands, neither side can claim a decisive victory, I am not at all shaken in my estimate of the competing probabilities.

I would only point to the increasing evidence since I wrote

[1] He has also reviewed Kunze's book at length, and with characteristic generosity and caution, in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* for Jan. 5 of this year.

that the use of the word ἐπιδημεῖν to denote the Incarnation was a characteristic feature of the Egyptian Creed. Mr. Brightman pointed out, also in the first number of this JOURNAL (p. 93), the indications of this in the recently published Prayers of Serapion. And Dr. Kunze carries back the observation as far as Origen (*op. cit.*, p. 52, cf. p. 53, where, however, I am afraid that I should not feel confidence in the expressions retranslated). Dr. Kattenbusch (p. 981 n.) changes front a little to meet the new evidence. It is an example of the refinement of argument that is characteristic of him; but the simpler conclusion that an Egyptian form of Creed really existed seems to me preferable.

Once again, however, I come back to my belief, that the more decisive issue will be fought on the ground of the second-century writers.

6. Another branch of his researches to which Dr. Kattenbusch attaches importance is that part of them which deals with *the rule of faith*. Here he is met directly by Dr. Kunze, who has taken the same subject as a leading theme of his volume. The difference between them is that whereas Kattenbusch distinguishes sharply between the East and the West[1], holding that in the East the rule of faith was primarily the Scriptures and that in the West it was only the Creed (p. 963), Kunze would make the distinction less sharp, and indeed only one of degree, regarding the conception of the rule of faith as including both the Scriptures and the Creed, but in different proportions according to the genius of different writers. Clement of Alexandria, he thinks, went furthest in the direction of seeking his final authority only in the Scriptures, and Tertullian in seeking it only in the Creed, but neither followed the one authority absolutely to the exclusion of the other.

So far as I have a leaning it is to the side of Kunze, because I think that Kattenbusch tends to exaggerate generally the difference between the East and the West. It may be observed also that a little further on (p. 965) Dr. Kattenbusch expressly

[1] It should be said that in the review just mentioned Kattenbusch considerably modifies his statement of the sharpness of this opposition. He allows that it was quite unconscious on both sides, and he regards the writers of the province of Asia as forming a link between East and West by substituting (mentally) *et . . . et* for *aut . . . aut*.

says that he regards the Scriptures in the West as the *regula disciplinae*, while the Creed is the *regula fidei*, adding that the two things are not to be set in opposition (*Man mache doch daraus keine Gegensätze!*). This would lead one to think that the distinction drawn under the previous head was pressed rather artificially.

But the whole question is subordinate for our present purpose.

7. The same must be said of the next head which deals with another point in the appreciation of the Creed in the Western Church. Dr. Kattenbusch lays stress upon its significance as a *sacramentum*. He paraphrases this by the German word *Heiltum*, which appears to be a coinage. Our nearest equivalent would perhaps be a 'means of grace.' The point would seem to be that the solemn delivery of the Creed to the catechumen, with his acceptance and possession of it, gave him the permanent character of *fidelis*, a character of which he could not divest himself except by deliberate apostasy. The delivery of the creed was thus 'a sacrament within a sacrament'; it is a part, itself sacramental, of the more inclusive sacrament of baptism. This I do not think that there is any reason to question. And it is probably true that the stress laid upon the formal act of delivery was greater in the West than in the East, and was in greater danger of lapsing into superstition.

8. The remaining two heads are concerned with *the history of the Textus Receptus*, or enlarged form of the Apostles' Creed with which we are now familiar (= T in Kattenbusch's notation, which is also adopted by Mr. Burn). Here Dr. Kattenbusch makes the interesting remark that this enlargement of the older creed was not regarded as in any way constituting a new creed[1], and that none of the additions were directed against heresies, but were only intended to make existing clauses more explicit. He is thus of opinion that the interest in which they were introduced was mainly catechetical. The Creed was throughout regarded as perfect, but it seemed that in places a rather greater fullness of statement was desirable.

I do not find it quite easy to reconcile these comments (which

[1] In like manner he holds that when, from the fifth century onwards, the enlarged Nicene Creed came into use in the West, it was so used, not as differing from the Apostles' Creed, but as practically identical with it, and only a further expression of its meaning.

seem to me just, so far as I can judge) with the suggestion that follows immediately upon them that the enlarged form of the Creed acquired its shape especially in the monastic services of the 'Hours.' Catechesis is one thing, conventual services are another. Probably Dr. Kattenbusch only means that, while catechesis supplied the substance, recitation in worship gave the finishing touches to the rhythmical form. But he expressly says that he regards his own remarks under this head as only tentative. Looked at in that light they have the advantage of resting upon very considerable study of the facts. Perhaps in this connexion our own accomplished liturgiologists might have something to contribute.

9. The larger questions about T are reserved by Dr. Kattenbusch for his last head. He had just thrown out the question as to T, as he had done previously as to R, whether or not it was to be referred to a single author. He now asks *Where* (and along with this goes the question *When*) *did the enlarged Creed arise?* He had previously, in chapter x, collected a vast quantity of material bearing on this point. And again, as so often, his most laborious researches seem to end in rather vague and unsatisfactory guessing. I am afraid that the faculty of decisive selection among a multitude of particulars is not one of Dr. Kattenbusch's strong points. His very scrupulousness in this respect tells against him, inasmuch as it keeps before his mind all the varied possibilities at once.

Dr. Kattenbusch starts, with most scholars, from Pirminius (or Priminius, as the extant and nearly contemporary MS of his treatise has the name), *c.* 750 A.D., but even here he leaves it open how far the Creed was his personal confession introduced by him on the field of his missions, or how far it was a creed which he found there already in occupation. A number of indications point, he thinks, towards the Church of Burgundy (Vienne or Lyons), which would make it probable that the enlarged creed was in use by the end of the fifth century, and perhaps even considerably earlier.

Mention was made in the earlier article of Mr. Burn's view, which is also Ludwig Hahn's (ed. 3, p. 29 n.), that the enlarged text had its origin in Rome. Dr. Kattenbusch is decidedly opposed to this (p. 785), and indeed it would seem that Rome was

just the centre in which the old unexpanded form maintained itself longest and with the most obstinate conservatism.

For myself I have not yet seen reason to reject the older view which would connect the origin of T with some such literary centre as the great school of Lerinum, throughout all the first half of the fifth century the most active focus of learning in the West. It is just among disciples of this school, like Faustus of Riez and Caesarius of Arles, that the characteristic peculiarities of T are most conspicuous. And the influence of the school made itself felt as far to the north as the Antiphonary of Bangor[1]. We must remember also that Lerinum would be a natural *terminus* for the most direct line of communication with the East[2].

Kattenbusch applauds (p. 979) a suggestion by Kirsch that the distinctive features in the creed of Nicetas of Romatiana (or Remesiana) in Dacia are due to a back-wave of influence from Gaul. But this is surely to invert the order of things. Duchesne has shown (in his *Origines du culte chrétien*) what a strong set of the current there was—and the current was just at its strongest in the time when Nicetas lived—from behind the Balkans, through Aquileia to Milan. And from Milan it was an easy step to Lerinum. In the Roman Empire the number of really generative centres was not very great. And Lerinum was in the fifth century for the West much what the Palestinian Caesarea had been a century earlier for the East.

One of the most important features in Dr. Kattenbusch's book is his extremely close and elaborate commentary upon the Creed, first in its oldest form, and then in another connexion upon the additions which constitute the *Textus Receptus*. In both cases the primary interest is historical—to set both the original creed and the additions as far as possible in the place which they fill historically.

These sections cover in all some 340 densely printed pages (pp. 471–728 and 874–956); and they are highly characteristic

[1] Among the items bearing on this point is the fact that the *Quicumque*, which I believe to be also closely connected with Lerinum, is one of the oldest witnesses to the *Descensus*.

[2] Both Harnack and Loofs agree in seeking for the origin of the Textus Receptus in Southern Gaul.

of the minute patience and concentrated thought which Dr. Kattenbusch has brought to bear upon his work. I know of no such searching study of every conceivable doctrinal point covered by the Creed, in the light of what appears to be its origin. This part of the book should have an especial value for us in England, because I am afraid that the English students are few who would be capable of a piece of intellectual work so exhaustive and exhausting. Other men labour, and we enter into their labours.

Not less attractive to most Englishmen will be the spirit in which these chapters are written. Dr. Kattenbusch is a Ritschlian, but of a mild and temperate type. He is essentially a Ritschlian of the Right; and in his writings the views of his school appear at their very best. Through the dry details of learning and scholarship, severely repressed and never for an instant giving way to rhetorical unction, we yet cannot fail to see the deep religious interest—the interest of practical religion—which the author has in his great theme. This diverting of learning (which yet never ceases to be learning) from scholastic subtleties and resolute keeping it down to the real life of men is the most conspicuous service that Ritschl has done to the world; and in a writer like Kattenbusch it is not disfigured by brusque depreciation of the past in its most precious moments.

It must not be thought that I am blind to what seem to me the defects of this as of other portions of the work. It is not much less difficult to help losing one's way in the maze of intricate details. The patience of the writer exceeds by far the patience at least of the English reader. There is a want of bold relief, which even the distinction of larger and smaller type does not supply. There is the same hesitancy between conflicting possibilities. And every now and then one longs for the exercise of what we should call a little more robust common sense.

There is nothing more admirable in the book than the treatment of the Second Article, especially of the order Χριστὸν (or, as Kattenbusch would print, to bring out its appellative force, χριστὸν) Ἰησοῦν, and on the full meaning of υἱόν. But a number of pages are wasted in considering the possibility (to which Kattenbusch actually inclines) of combining μονογενῆ not with υἱόν but with κύριον. The article before κύριον, of course, has to be removed—without evidence. And of course we are not

surprised that in Latin Rufinus, who puts *unicum* at the head of the phrase, should say that it may be construed both with *filium* and with *dominum*. It may also be possible to produce a few examples in which the proper sense of μονογενής has been lost. But apart from the fact that the Biblical examples are all the other way, and should be in themselves quite conclusive, the idea that a Greek writer of any age would tear away a word like μονογενῆ from its natural correlative υἱόν to unite it in a forced sense with κύριον, is one that should not have been dallied with for a moment [1].

We note in passing that Kattenbusch questions, as I cannot but think rightly, the attempt of Harnack [2] to separate between the clause relating to the Holy Spirit and that relating to Mary in connexion with the Virgin-Birth, and to make out that the former is a later addition. The two clauses are already indissolubly combined in Ignatius.

The most difficult problems arise as to the *Descensus ad inferos* (or *inferna*) and the *Sanctorum communio*. We may say that in regard to both of these the monograph of Clemen overlaps the larger work of Kattenbusch, because although the second comes in only incidentally it is treated by Clemen in considerable detail. It is indeed characteristic of this writer to be able to pour forth on any topic that comes up a profusion of facts or references, which have the additional merit of being always precise; though it must be confessed that in his case, as with Kattenbusch, there is the same difficulty of seeing the wood for the trees.

As to the origin of the *Descensus* there is still a certain amount of mystery. It does not seem to be anti-heretical, whether as directed against the tenets of Apollinaris or brought in to support a doctrine of purgatory (Clemen, pp. 24–27). The more probable explanation would seem to be that just in some particular locality or in the mind of some influential individual the doctrine of the Descent, which (as our two writers have well shown) had a continuous existence in the Church from the Apostolic age downwards, was so naturally associated with the Burial that the mention of

[1] If any further argument were needed, the application of μονογενῆ in the Eastern Creeds should have been not less decisive.

[2] Harnack *Ap. Cr.* p. 73 f., cf. Hahn[3] p. 374 ff.; Kattenbusch p. 619 ff.

the one naturally called up the other, and that so in some one Church the two together found a place in the baptismal Creed and from thence passed into the Creed of other Churches.

Can we at all lay our finger upon the Church where this took place? The only one for which we have any direct evidence is Aquileia. And Kattenbusch (p. 898) appears to think that Aquileia was really the centre in which the *Descensus* clause originated and from which it was diffused. We know that before Rufinus wrote (*c.* 400 A.D.) a similar clause (*εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα* [*κατεληλυθότα*]) had already made its appearance in the three allied *formulae* of Sirmium (359), Nike in Thrace (359), and Constantinople (360). Kattenbusch thinks that the Sirmian clause was the original of the other two, and that the Greek was a translation from the Latin. This hypothesis is in accordance with his tendency, which (as we have seen) is to look to the West rather than to the East. Clemen is more inclined to look eastwards, and in this I should agree with him. The Sirmian formula was composed by Mark of Arethusa in Syria; and although we cannot produce from this region a definite creed containing the clause, we can produce two pieces of evidence which are sufficiently creed-like to serve our purpose. One of these is the Letter to Abgarus (Eus. *H. E.* I xiii 20 *πῶς ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐσμίκρυνεν αὐτοῦ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ἐσταυρώθη, καὶ κατέβη εἰς τὸν Ἅιδην, καὶ διέσχισε φραγμὸν τὸν ἐξ αἰῶνος μὴ σχισθέντα καὶ ἀνήγαγεν νεκρούς*). And the other is from the doxology at the end of the Syrian *Didascalia*. For the reason I have given I do not regard this evidence as put out of court by the fact that it does not prove the existence of a creed. Syria—the Balkan peninsula—Aquileia would be the line of stepping-stones that I should be disposed to construct. Exactly at what point in the line the clause was first embodied in a creed we cannot say.

Clemen has an interesting discussion of the present value of the clause. He takes it as meaning a descent *among the dead*; and he regards it as bearing testimony to the fact that there are possibilities of progress and reformation beyond the grave. In this section of his work Clemen quotes freely, as is his wont, from English and American writers.

As Dr. Clemen has contributed a valuable monograph on the *Descensus*, so has a Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. J. P. Kirsch,

contributed another (to fill two volumes, of which one has appeared), not so much specially on the clause in the Creed as on the whole doctrine of the 'Communion of Saints.' Kattenbusch hails Dr. Kirsch as an ally in reversing the common view that the Dacian bishop Nicetas (in whom the clause is first found) was an important link in the transmission of Eastern influence to the West. Dr. Kirsch, like his predecessor, would prefer to assume that Nicetas received his form of creed from Gaul. I have little doubt that, as I have already hinted (p. 14), the common view is more probable.

In regard to the interpretation of the much-debated phrase Kattenbusch seeks to combine two opposite views.

Are we to take *Sanctorum* as masculine or neuter? What may be called the current acceptation would make it masculine; but Zahn, a few years ago, in his brief but valuable treatise on the Creed[1], contended for a neuter signification. He held that *Sanctorum communio* represented originally the Greek κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων, in the sense of 'communion in the *holy things*,' i.e. in the sacraments. His main argument was that the phrase occurs in the Creed just where we might expect that the sacraments would be mentioned, and at the point where there is in fact a reference to Baptism in many Eastern creeds.

Kattenbusch investigates with his habitual elaborateness the use of the phrase, giving, as I think, a neuter sense rather more often than I should be prepared to do. He points out that the masculine is taken with different shades of meaning; sometimes of the whole body of the saints in heaven and on earth; sometimes of 'the Saints' in the narrower sense (as in a treatise attributed to Faustus of Riez); sometimes, as in Africa at the time of the Donatist controversy, the phrase would appear to have been used for the communion of the Church on earth; sometimes it was taken to mean the communion of the saints *with one another*; and at least in one Exposition as an imparting of the virtues of the saints.

From this great variety of interpretation Kattenbusch infers—and no doubt rightly—that the original sense had been forgotten; and going back like Zahn to the Greek, he believes that it was

[1] *Das Apost. Symbolum*, 1893; afterwards translated in the *Expositor*, and published separately (Hodder & Stoughton).

left purposely ambiguous, that *κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων* meant 'common possession of all that is holy'—whether persons or things, society of the one or enjoyment of the other.

The view would be attractive if it were linguistically admissible. Would a Greek ever leave the distinction of masculine and neuter ambiguous with the deliberate intention of including both? There are one or two instances in the New Testament (e. g. *πάντων* in Rom. ix 5, Eph. iv 6 and *ἐπουρανίων κ.τ.λ.* in Phil. ii 10) where such a view is rather tempting. But I cannot find that the best authorities give any countenance to it.

The translation[1] which has just appeared of Harnack's article in the third edition of the Hauck-Herzog *Realencyclopädie* is welcome as a masterly summary of the writer's views as they stood in the year 1896. Enough will have been said in the way of criticism of these views in the previous article. It should however be added, as the translation is without preface or introduction, and no attempt is made to estimate the place of Harnack's contribution in the literature of the subject, that the works that have appeared since he wrote have tended rather to shake than to confirm his more characteristic positions. We have seen that Kattenbusch, his chief ally, shows some signs of wavering on the broad question of the relation of the Eastern creeds to the Roman Creed, where both writers are directly challenged by Kunze and Clemen. Kunze also vigorously assails the date (*c.* 140) which Harnack assigns to the origin of the Roman Creed, and on this point Kattenbusch very definitely parts company with him. The conception of a gradual crystallization of floating formulae about the year 140 and that of direct composition by a single hand about the year 100 are widely removed from each other. Clemen, however, makes more use of the theory of floating formulae not amounting to a creed, though preparing the way

[1] The translation is not quite so good as those which we associate with the name of Mr. Bailey Saunders, who in this case acts as editor. The German S. (*Seite*) is left standing in many of the references. 'Eusebean' (p. 44) has an unscholarly look. And there are several instances in which the translation suffers through want of familiarity with the subject-matter. 'Communal symbol' (p. 43) will hardly convey a meaning—we should say rather 'local creed'; 'is sufficient to determine' (p. 62) should be 'can be used to determine'; we should not speak of the *descensus* as a 'word' (p. 70) but as an 'article' or 'clause'; and 'carried on throughout the Remesiana' (p. 79) should be 'by way of Remesiana.'

for one. I am inclined to think that both he and Harnack make too much use of this theory; not that it has not some substantial foundation, but that they are too easily deterred from presupposing a complete creed by the mere want of evidence that it is complete[1].

Mention should be made of the appearance of the first part of what promises to be a comprehensive work on the Creed by Dr. Bernhard Dörholt of Münster. At present this has not got beyond a sketch of the history of research as applied to the Creed corresponding to pp. 1–37 of Kattenbusch's first volume. Dr. Dörholt writes in the simple, direct, and easy style to which we are accustomed from Roman Catholic scholars; and he has a wide command of the literature of his subject. It is natural that he should bring to notice the writings of some of his co-religionists who are not very generally known. Among these an essay by a Polish Jesuit, Marian Morawski (in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*, 1895), puts forward an argument, the conclusion of which would be welcome if it could be accepted. Taking hold of the expression *sub Pontio Pilato*, he infers that by selecting, to fix the date, a procurator of Judaea in preference to emperor or consul, the author of the Creed permits us to see that he was himself a provincial, and that Judaea was his province.

It is indeed a rather remarkable feature in the Creed that this mode of dating the Crucifixion should have been so generally preserved[2]. But it does not follow that the Creed itself was written in Palestine. In 1 Tim. vi. 13 we have St. Paul writing far away from Palestine, and to one who was not himself a native of Palestine, and yet making use of the same mode of dating; which also occurs three times in Ignatius and repeatedly in Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian. Clearly the phrase had become a standing formula; and it is probable enough that it assumed this character in Palestine. But it must have already done so when St. Paul wrote to Timothy. The presence of the phrase in the Creed is one proof more that the Creed is essentially

[1] I say this chiefly with reference to Irenaeus and Justin. The fact that their writings do not contain clear indications of the third paragraph should not be held to weaken the unequivocal indications of the other two.

[2] Just as it is also remarkable that 'on the third day' should be so often used to define the time of the Resurrection.

biblical, and in the main stream of apostolic tradition; but it is too much to infer that it was composed in Palestine.

The two other books on our list hardly come within the strict range of this survey. Dr. Wiegand's volume promises to be of much utility for the history of the use of the Apostles' Creed in the Middle Ages, but it only touches the early period by tracing up to its beginnings the custom of commenting upon the Creed and by the account that is given of the early commentaries. The whole subject of catechetical preparation in Western Christendom is systematically treated. It will thus be seen that although the book is important for its bearing on the circumstances under which the Creed was used, the questions with which we have been dealing do not come up.

Mr. Callow's popular account of the History of the Creeds does not concern us for another reason. Though a convenient and useful summary of the results more especially of English work as they stood a few years ago, it hardly comes under the head of 'research,' and still less of 'recent research.' The latest work quoted is Prebendary Ommanney's *Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed*, published in 1896. [This author's name is unfortunately misspelt throughout the volume, as also in that of Dr. Kattenbusch.] Even the work of Mr. A. E. Burn does not appear to be known. But as a clearly and brightly written introduction to the earlier stages of the subject the modest and inexpensive book has much to commend it. Its broader canvas and easy flow of narrative and exposition may fitly lead up to Mr. Burn's more analytical methods. But it must not be at all taken to represent the latest and best opinions at a time of great activity.

W. SANDAY.