

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1859.

---

ART. I.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELLER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

---

VIII. MY WANDERINGS AMONG THE MANIOTES IN SOUTHERN PELOPONNESUS.

---

*Description of Southern Laconia—Bardunian Filibusters—Levezova—Battle of Trinasa—Marathonisi—Maurovouni—Capture of Bavarian Troops—Zanet-Bey—Colonel Feder—Castle of Passavd—Charming Scenery—Kakovouli and its Robbers—Langadi—Dangerous Defile—Tsimova—Manners and dress of the Maniotes—Kutrakos the Pirate—Antiquities—Vtilos—Battle of Condura—Messenian plain—Historical recollections—Charles O. Müller—Temple of Diana Limniatis—Border Stones—Ithome—Messene and its ruins—Fall and restoration of ancient Messenia.*

In several earlier numbers of our Review,\* I have attempted to give some account of modern Sparta, its fate during the Sclavic invasions of the middle ages and the amalgamation of those barbarians with the native Greek population. I then described the conquests and feudal settlements of the French Crusaders, their victories and defeats in the fourteenth century, the re-establishment of the Byzantine Emperors at Sparta and their final overthrow by the Turks.

Instead of continuing with the melancholy and dull

---

\* See the three articles on "Sparta and the Dorians" in Mercersburg Quarterly Review for 1856 and 1857. •

## ART. V.—THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

WE propose in this article to discuss the name, origin, authority, contents, value and use of the so called *Athanasian Symbol*, which, next to the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene, or rather Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, is the most generally received Confession of faith in the Christian Church, and presents to us a succinct and clear summary of ancient Catholic theology concerning the fundamental articles of the holy Trinity and the person of Christ.\*

For the convenience of the reader, we give first the symbol itself in three parallel columns, in the original Latin, the old English translation of the sixteenth century, and the revised translation prepared for the new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church in the United States.

We give the old translation precisely as it is found in the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England, and in the old Dutch Reformed Liturgy; but we italicize those

---

\* The necessary information on this subject may be found in *Tillemont*, *Memoirs pour servir à l'histoire eccles.* (tom. VIII, 667 sqq.), *Montfaucon*, edition of the Works of Athanasius (tom. II, 719 sqq., *Diatrise de Symbolo Quicunque*); *Bingham*, *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (vol. IV, 118 sqq.); *J. G. Walch*, *Introductio in libros ecclesiae Luth. symbolicos* (lib. I, cap. 2 de tribus symbolis oecumenicis, p. 36 sqq.); and *Koellner*, *Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen*, Theil I. p. 53 sqq. We have consulted more particularly Walch and Köllner, who have made good use of all their predecessors. Besides there are a number of special dissertations on the Athanasian Creed, to which, however, we have unfortunately no access just now. The best of them are the following: *G. J. Voss* (a Dutch Reformed divine), *De tribus symbolis*, Amsterd. 1642; *J. H. Heidegger* (German Reformed), *De symbolo Athanasiano*, Zur. 1680; *Dan. Waterland* (Anglican), *A critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, representing the opinions of the Ancients and Moderns concerning it: with an account of the Mss, Verss. and Comments and such other particulars as are of moment for the determining of the Age, and Author, and Value of it, and the Time of its Reception in the Christian Churches, Cambridge, 1724; *Speroni* (Roman Catholic), *De symbolo vulgo S. Athanasii*, Patav. 1751; and *Harvey* (Anglican), *History and Theology of the Three Creeds*, Lond. 1856, 2 vols. The last (from the learned editor of *Irenæus adv. hæreses*) is probably the fullest, to judge from its size and some notices I have seen in English Reviews. (Who will have mercy on the Seminary Library at Mercersburg, and furnish it with a sufficient working apparatus for the industry of poor professors?)

words which have been changed in the revised translation for reasons of taste, clearness and closer adherence to the original.

<i>The Latin Original.</i>	<i>Old Translation.</i>	<i>Revised Translation.</i>
1. Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est, ut teneat catholicam fidem;	1. Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith;	1. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith;
2. Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit.	2. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.	2. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.
3. Fides autem catholica hæc est, ut unum Deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate veneremur;	3. And the Catholick Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity;	3. And the Catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;
4. Neque confundentes personas, neque substantiam separantes.	4. Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the substance.	4. Neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance.
5. Alia est enim persona patris: alia filii: alia spiritus sancti.	5. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.	5. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.
6. Sed patris et filii et spiritus sancti una est divinitas: aequalis gloria, coæterna majestas.	6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.	6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the glory equal, majesty co-eternal.
7. Qualis pater, talis filius, talis spiritus sanctus.	7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.	7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost.
8. Increatus pater: increatus filius: increatus spiritus sanctus.	8. The Father <i>uncreate</i> , the Son <i>uncreate</i> : and the Holy Ghost <i>uncreate</i> .	8 The Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Ghost uncreated.
9. Immensus pater: immensus filius: immensus spiritus sanctus.	9. The Father <i>incomprehensible</i> , the Son <i>incomprehensible</i> : and the Holy Ghost <i>incomprehensible</i> .	9. The Father unlimited, the Son unlimited, and the Holy Ghost unlimited.
10. Aeternus pater: æternus filius: æternus spiritus sanctus.	10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.	10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal and the Holy Ghost eternal.
11. Et tamen non tres aeterni; sed unus æternus.	11. And yet <i>they are</i> not three <i>eternals</i> : but one eternal.	11. And yet not three eternal, but one eternal.

<i>The Latin Original.</i>	<i>Old Translation.</i>	<i>Revised Translation.</i>
12. Sicut non tres in- creati; nec tres immensi; sed unus increatus et unus immensus.	12. As also there are not three <i>incomprehen-</i> <i>sibles</i> , nor three uncreated: but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible	12. As also, not three uncreated, nor three un- limited; but one uncrea- ted, and one unlimited.
13. Similiter omnipo- tens pater: omnipotens filius: omnipotens spiritus sanctus.	13. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty.	13. So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Ghost almighty.
14. Et tamen non tres omnipotentes; sed unus omnipotens.	14. And yet <i>they are not</i> three <i>Almighties</i> : but one Almighty.	14. And yet not three almighty, but one al- mighty.
15. Ita deus pater: deus filius: deus spiritus sanctus.	15. So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.	15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.
16. Et tamen non tres dii; sed unus est Deus.	16. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.	16. And yet not three Gods, but one God.
17. Ita dominus pater: dominus filius: dominus spiritus sanctus.	17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord.	17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord.
18. Et tamen non tres domini: sed unus Dom- inus.	18. And yet not three Lords. but one Lord.	18. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord.
19. Quia sicut singu- latim unamquamque per- sonam Deum ac Dominum confiteri, christiana veritate compellimur:	19. For like as we are compelled by the Chris- tian verity: to acknowl- edge <i>every</i> Person by himself to be God and Lord;	19. For like as we are compelled by the Chris- tian verity, to acknowl- edge each person, by him- self to be God and Lord;
20. Ita tres deos, aut tres dominos dicere, catho- lica religione prohibemur.	20. So are we forbid- den by the Catholick Reli- gion: to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.	20. So are we forbid- den by the Catholic Reli- gion to say: There be three Gods or three Lords,
21. Pater a nullo est factus, nec creatus; nec genitus.	21. The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.	21. The Father is made of none, neither created, nor begotten.
22. Filius a patre solo est: non factus; nec crea- tus; sed genitus.	22. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begot- ten.	22. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.
23. Spiritus sanctus a patre et filio: non factus; nec creatus; nec genitus, sed procedens.	23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.	23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

## Original Latin.

## Old Translation.

## Revised Translation.

24. Unus ergo pater. 24. So there is one 24. So there is one  
 non tres patres: unus fi- Father, not three Fathers; Father, not three Fathers;  
 lius, non tres filii: unus one Son, not three Sons: one Son, not three Sons;  
 spiritus sanctus, non tres one Holy Ghost, not three one Holy Ghost, not three  
 spiritus sancti. Holy Ghosts. Holy Ghosts.

25. Et in hac trini- 25. And in this Trinity 25. And in this Trinity  
 tate nihil prius; aut pos- none is afore, or after other: there is no before, nor  
 terius: nihil majus; aut none is greater, or less after; no greater nor less-  
 minus. than another;

26. Sed totae tres per- 26. But the whole three 26. But the whole three  
 sonae coaeternae sibi Persons are co-eternal persons are co-eternal,  
 sunt et coaequales. together: and co-equal. and co-equal.

27. Ita, ut per omnia, 27. So that in all things, 27. So that in all things,  
 sicut jam supra dictum as aforesaid: the Unity in as already said: the Uni-  
 est, et trinitas in unitate: Trinity, and the Trinity ty in Trinity, and the  
 et unitas in trinitate vene- in Unity, is to be worship- Trinity in Unity is to be  
 nenda sit. ped. worshipped.

28. Qui vult ergo salvus 28. He therefore that 28. He therefore that  
 esse, ita de trinitate sen- will be saved: must thus will be saved, must thus  
 tiat. think of the Trinity. think of the Trinity.

29. Sed necessarium est 29. Furthermore it is 29. Furthermore, it is  
 ad aeternam salutem, ut necessary to everlasting necessary to everlasting  
 incarnationem queque salvation: that he also salvation, that we also  
 domini nostri Jesu Christi believe rightly the Incar- believe truly the Incarna-  
 fideliter credat. nation of our Lord Jesus tion of our Lord Jesus  
 Christ. Christ.

30. Est ergo fides rec- 30. For the right Faith 30. For the right faith  
 ta, ut credamus et confi- is, that we believe and is, that we believe and  
 teamur, quod dominus confess: that our Lord confess, that our Lord  
 noster Jesus Christus Jesus Christ, the Son of Jesus Christ, the Son of  
 Dei filius, deus et homo God, is God and Man; God, is God and man;  
 est.

31. Deus ex substantia 31. God, of the Sub- 31. God, of the sub-  
 patris, ante secula geni- stance of the Father, be- stance of the Father, be-  
 tus, et homo ex substan- gotten before the worlds: gotten before the worlds;  
 tia matris, in esculo na- and Man, of the Substance and man, of the substance  
 tus. of his Mother, born in of his mother, born in  
 the world;

32. Perfectus deus: per- 32. Perfect God and 32. Perfect God, and  
 fectus homo, ex anima perfect Man: of a reason- perfect man, of a reason-  
 rationali et humana car- able soul and human flesh able soul and human  
 ne subsistens. subsisting; flesh subsisting;

33. Aequalis patri se- 33. Equal to the Fath- 33. Equal to the Fath-  
 cundum divinitatem: mi- er, as touching his God- er, according to His God-  
 nor patri secundum hu- head: and inferior to the head, and inferior to the  
 manitatem. Father as touching his Father, according to His  
 Manhood.

<i>Original Latin.</i>	<i>Old Translation.</i>	<i>Revised Translation.</i>
34. Qui licet Deus sit et homo; non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus.	34. Who although he be God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ;	34. Who although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ;
35. Unus autem, non conversione divinitatis in carnem; sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum.	35. One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by <i>taking</i> of the Manhood into God;	35. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God;
36. Unus omnino, non confusione substantiæ; sed unitate personæ.	36. One altogether; not by confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person.	36. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.
37. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo; ita deus et homo unus est Christus.	37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ;	37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and man is one Christ.
38. Qui passus est pro nostra salute: descendit ad inferos: tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.	38. Who suffered for our salvation: descended into <i>hell</i> : rose again the third day from the dead.	38. Who suffered for our salvation, descended into Hades, rose again the third day from the dead.
39. Ascendit ad coelos: sedet ad dexteram dei patris omnipotentis.	39. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the <i>Father God</i> Almighty:	39. He ascended into heaven, He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.
40. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.	40. From <i>whence</i> he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.	40. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
41. Ad cuius adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis;	41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies,	41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;
42. Et redditori sunt de factis propriis rationem.	42. And shall give account for their own works.	42. And shall give account for their own works.
43. Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam eternam; qui vero mala, in ignem æternum.	43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.	43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire.
44. Haec est fides catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.	44. This is the Catholic Faith: which except a man believe <i>faithfully</i> , he cannot be saved.	44. This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe truly and firmly, he cannot be saved.

## NAME.

The third ecumenical or universal Creed of the Christian Church bears a double name.

It is sometimes called the *Symbolum Quicumque* or simply the *Quicumque*,\* from its beginning in Latin: *Quicumque vult salvus esse, Whosoever will be saved.*

But more generally it goes by the name of the *Athanasian Creed*,† from the supposed authorship of St. Athanasius, or its agreement with his theology. This makes it necessary to say a few words on this distinguished father.

Athanasius was the leading champion of the orthodox doctrine on the divinity of Christ and the holy Trinity in the Nicene age. He was born towards the close of the third century at Alexandria, the capital of Egypt. His youth fell in that remarkable transition period of the Christian Church from oppression and persecution to victory and power in the Roman Empire. He made his first appearance on the stage of history at the first general Council, convened by Constantine the Great at the city of Nice in 325, for the purpose of settling the Arian controversy, i. e., the question whether Christ is strictly divine or not; whether he is the eternal Son of the Father and equal in essence with him (*ομοουσιος*), or whether he be a creature of God, though made before the world, and consequently of a different substance (*ετεροουσιος*). Although at that time merely an archdeacon and secretary of bishop Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius occupied by his talents and zeal the most prominent place in that Council among the defenders of the strict divinity of the Saviour against the Arians who denied it, and materially helped the triumph of the orthodox view, as embodied and symbolically fixed in what has since been called the Nicene Creed. Soon afterwards he became the successor of Alex-

\* First by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, about A. D. 852, who calls it also "Sermonem Athanasii de fide, cuius initium est: quicumque vult salvus esse."

† It first bears this name in the oldest complete manuscript copy extant, called Cod. Usserius secundus, ascribed to the year 703. It has the title: "Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini."

ander in the first episcopal see of Egypt. From this time on, during the long continued Arian and Semi-Arian conflicts which soon followed the temporary settlement at the Nicene Synod, he stood forth as the acknowledged leader of the Nicene or orthodox party, beloved by his friends, feared by his enemies, admired and respected by all. He devoted his whole life, with unwavering consistency in prosperity and adversity, at home and in exile, to the defence of the true Godhead of Christ. This was the one great idea of his mind, the ruling passion of his heart, the all-absorbing object of his will. For this he suffered five times deposition and exile. For this he was willing at any time to shed his blood. He was a man of one idea, indeed, but an idea which he firmly and justly believed to be absolutely fundamental to the Christian system and the salvation of the world. To the violence and intrigues of the imperial court, to the passions and fanaticism of heretical parties, he uniformly opposed the overwhelming force of a commanding genius and a holy life. Although he died several years before the final settlement of this great controversy by the second œcumenical council, held at Constantinople in 381, the triumph of the orthodox view must, under God, be mainly attributed to him. Athanasius was unquestionably the greatest man of his age, and one of the purest and noblest in the history of the Church. He is justly called *the Great* and *the Father of Orthodoxy*. ●

Even Gibbon, with all his strong prejudices, has pronounced an eloquent eulogy on him in the XXI chapter of his celebrated work. "We have seldom," says this deistic historian, "an opportunity of observing, either in active or speculative life, what effect may be produced, or what obstacles may be surmounted, by the force of a single mind, when it is inflexibly applied to the pursuit of a single object. The immortal name of Athanasius will never be separated from the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defence he consecrated every moment and every faculty of his being. Educated in the family of Alexander, he had vigorously opposed the early progress of the Arian heresy: he exercised the important functions of secretary



under the aged prelate ; and the fathers of the Nicene council beheld with surprise and respect the rising virtues of the young deacon. In a time of public danger, the dull claims of age and rank are sometimes superseded ; and within five months after his return from Nice, the deacon Athanasius was seated on the archiepiscopal throne of Egypt. He filled that eminent station above forty-six years, and his long administration was spent in a perpetual combat against the powers of Arianism. Five times was Athanasius expelled from his throne ; twenty years he passed as an exile or a fugitive ; and almost every province of the Roman empire was successively witness to his merits and his sufferings in the cause of the Homousion, which he considered as the sole pleasure and business, as the duty and as the glory of his life. Amidst the storms of persecution, the archbishop of Alexandria was patient of labor, jealous of fame, careless of safety ; and although his mind was tainted by the contagion of fanaticism, Athanasius displayed a superiority of character and abilities, which would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy. . . . The archbishop of Alexandria was capable of distinguishing how far he might boldly command, and where he must dexterously insinuate ; how long he might contend with power, and when he must withdraw from persecution ; and while he directed the thunders of the Church against heresy, he could assume, in the bosom of his own party, the flexible and indulgent temper of a prudent leader. The election of Athanasius has not escaped the reproach of irregularity and precipitation ; but the propriety of his behavior conciliated the affections both of the clergy and of the people. The Alexandrians were impatient to rise in arms for the defence of an eloquent and liberal pastor. In his distress he always derived support, or at least consolation, from the faithful attachment of his parochial clergy ; and the hundred bishops of Egypt adhered, with unshaken zeal, to the cause of Athanasius. In the modest equipage which pride and policy would affect, he frequently performed the episcopal visitation of his

provinces, from the mouth of the Nile to the confines of Aethiopia ; familiarly conversing with the meanest of the populace, and humbly saluting the saints and hermits of the desert. Nor was it only in ecclesiastical assemblies, among men whose education and manners were similar to his own, that Athanasius displayed the ascendancy of his genius. He appeared with easy and respectful firmness in the courts of princes ; and in the various turns of his prosperous and adverse fortune he never lost the confidence of his friends, or the esteem of his enemies."

#### ORIGIN.

But is Athanasius really the author of the creed which has so long been identified with his distinguished name ? This question must now be decided in the negative, as much so as the question of the strictly apostolic origin of the first ecumenical creed. And yet in both cases there is a certain propriety in the name, if we leave out of view the form of words and actual composition, and look merely to the contents and their essential agreement with the faith and teaching of the supposed authors.

It is probable that the designation was first given to this document with the view simply to characterize its doctrinal tone, as the expression of the faith of Athanasius,\* (hence the oldest titles: "*fides Athanasii*," "*fides Catholica*"), and not to indicate the literal authorship and thus to clothe it at once with the authority of a great and universally revered name. At all events there is no room here for a wilful pious fraud. An innocent mistake explains the matter sufficiently, especially in an uncritical age. The real author of this trinitarian creed being unknown, it was naturally traced, first by way of mere conjecture and supposition, to the great representative of the received doctrine of the holy Trinity, whose very name was identified with orthodoxy as regards this particular article. For the terms

\* This was the view of Weber, *Lib. symb.* p. 17: *Ab Athanasio nomen habet, non quod ab illo viro vere scriptum sit, sed quod cum sententia Athanasii maxime conveniat.* See Köllner, *l. c.*, p. 55.

Athanasian, homoousian, Nicene, orthodox, are used synonymously in the history of the Arian and Semi-Arian controversies of the Nicene Age. This conjecture was, however, by no means generally received at first. Several manuscript copies of the Creed give either no name at all,\* or ascribe it to a different author, Anastasius.† We find doubts yet as late as the twelfth century.‡ But after this time the belief in the Athanasian origin became general and prevailed, without examination, down towards the middle of the seventeenth century,|| when Gerhard John Vossius, a Dutch Reformed divine, made it the subject of a critical dissertation in 1642, and turned the current. Since that time it is almost universally given up by historians and critics, not only by Protestants, as Vossius, Heidegger, Usser, Jeremy Taylor, Pearson, Cave, Bingham, Waterland, Buddeus, Walch, Schroeckh, Neander, Gieseler, Köllner, but also by Roman Catholics, as Petavius, Quesnel, Pagi, Tillemont, Montfaucon, Muratori, Natalis Alexander, Du Pin, Speroni, and even pope Benedict XIV.

The arguments against the authorship of Athanasius are so strong indeed that it is impossible to resist them. Köllner enumerates nineteen. We will mention only the principal ones.

1.) Athanasius himself never mentions this symbol in any of his works, and had no occasion to compose it, being satisfied with the Nicene creed and bent upon explaining and maintaining it against every opposition. Yea, he says distinctly, in one passage,§ that the Nicene creed was suffi-

\* Codd. Uss. 1, Treves, Ambrosian., Colb. 1, Regius, Benet C. 2, Benet C. 3, Cotton 3, Cambridge, St. Jam. 2. Comp. Waterland, p. 24, and Köllner, p. 72.

† So the German MSS. Waterland, however, supposes that this is a mere orthographical mistake for Athanasius.

‡ In 1138 by Otho in the words: Athanasius a quibusdam dicitur edidisse; and in 1190 by Beleth in the words: Quod ab Athan. P. A. compositum est: plerique eum Anastasium fuisse falso arbitrantur. See Montfaucon Diatr. etc. in Opp. Athan. II, 722.

|| The last distinguished defendants were the Roman Catholic divines, Baronius (Annal. ad ann. 340 num. 11), Bona and Bellarminus.

§ Ep. ad Antioch. tom. I. p. 772. Comp. Köllner p. 73, and Walch, l. c. p. 149.

cient, and that no other profession of faith should be issued.

2.) It is not found in any of the older manuscripts of the works of Athanasius, and those which have it, either deny it to him or express a doubt as to his authorship.\*

3.) It is not mentioned by any cotemporary of Athanasius, nor his biographers and eulogists,† nor by any of the fathers and councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, although during the all absorbing trinitarian and christological controversies, they had frequent occasion to allude to this important document if it existed, and although they frequently appeal to the authority of Athanasius and mention his other writings. Under these circumstances the silence is absolutely conclusive against the very existence of the Athanasian creed, unless we choose to suppose that it was concealed for nearly three hundred years, and then suddenly turned up in the sixth or seventh century, which would imply an almost miraculous preservation.

4.) The symbol under consideration was evidently first written in the Latin language and seems to have been unknown among the Greeks before the eleventh century. There are but few Greek manuscript copies extant,‡ and they differ so much, that they unmistakably point to several and rather unskilled translators. Now it is very improbable that Athanasius, even if he knew Latin sufficient-

\* Scultetus, in *Medulla Patrum*, part. 2. de Athan. c. 40, says: *In nullo codice extat quos ego quidem vidi, inter Athanasii opera. In uno legitur; sed auctoris nomine suppresso. Speroni, l. c. (quoted by Köllner p. 72) says more distinctly: At multi codd. Mss. sunt, qui non modo non habent hoc symbolum, quamquam opera omnia comprehendant Athanasii; sed negant omnino his verbis: Symbolum vulgo Athanasii, Symbolum quod non est Athanasii, Symbolum perperam Athanasio tributum.*

† The only allusion which former writers have been able to find, is a passage of Gregorius Nazianz, in his laudatory oration on Athanasius, where he speaks of him as having confessed (*ομολογησας*) the Godhead and essence of the three (*την τριων Στοιχη και ουσιας*). But it is now universally conceded that this does not refer to a particular creed at all, or if so, to one of the two other confessions still extant, in which he likewise speaks of the Godhead and essence of the three Persons.

‡ Four according to Montfaucon, eight according to Waterland. The former asserts that none of them was written before 1300. "Nullum vidimus Græcum huius symboli codicem, qui trecentorum sit annorum; nec antiquum alium a quopiam visum fuisse novimus." *Diatrise de Symb. Quicunque* in *Opp. Athan.* II, p. 727.

ly to write so well, should have composed such an important document in a foreign tongue, instead of his own vernacular Greek, which was then the prevailing language of the Church and used even by the early Western fathers, as Clement of Rome, Irenaeus of Gaul, and Hippolytus of Rome. (The report, that Athanasius composed it during his exile at Treves, about 340, and submitted it to pope Julius of Rome, in proof of his orthodoxy against the charge of heresy, or that he wrote it at Rome, and that it remained concealed there for a long time, is utterly worthless, since it is not even mentioned before the twelfth century (1130), and is evidently one of the many falsehoods which were manufactured in the middle age for the supposed benefit of the absolute papacy. No Roman divine of any weight, since Baronius and Bellarmin, has dared to give it credit.)

5.) To these external arguments, though mostly of a negative and indirect character, must be added the internal evidence of the Creed itself, which alone is conclusive. For while it omits the favorite expressions of Athanasius, especially the term *homoousios*, on which the whole Arian controversy turned, it contains the later Latin addition *et filio*, concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost,\* which the Greek Church never admitted, and generally goes beyond the Athanasian theology and the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, not only in the Trinity, but still more in the Christology, evidently presupposing the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, which were not concluded till the council of Chalcedon in 451, about eighty years after the death of Athanasius. We fully admit that he had already substantially the same faith, but by no means the same logical consciousness or scientific comprehension of it, as is here implied. † He nowhere in his writings speaks

\*V. 23: Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens.

† This is honestly admitted even by his learned Benedictine editor, Montfaucon, l. c. p. 723: Licet enim una eademque semper fuerit ea de re Ecclesiae doctrina, nondum tamen hae formulae in Ecclesia receptae vel in confesso erant. He asserts an entire difference of style between the Symbolum Quicumque and the genuine Athanasian writings.

so clearly and definitely of the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, and as to the two natures of Christ, he even uses expressions which in a *later* age would have been justly liable to a Monophysite or Eutychian construction,\* while the Creed which bears his name, is as clear and distinct on this subject as the council of Chalcedon.

But the more difficult question now arises, who is the real author of this remarkable production? Here is a wide field for critical conjecture. Quite a number of persons have been proposed with more or less plausibility, but without sufficient evidence in any case, viz: Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus in Africa, about 484,† Vincentius Lirinensis, about 434,‡ Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, about 560,|| Hilarius Arelatensis, about 429,§ Hilarius Pictaviensis, about 354, Eusebius Vercellensis, 354, pope Anastasius I, 398. Athanasius, bishop of Speier, in Germany, 642. Others assign the symbol indefinitely to some Gallican divine,¶ or to Spanish origin,° others less indefinitely

\* Especially in one passage De incarnatione Verbi (Opp. ed. Montfauc. II, 1) where he says: "We profess also that there is one Son of God who is God according to the Spirit, and Son of man according to the flesh; not two natures, the one to be worshipped, the other not, but one nature of the God Logos which became incarnate (*αλλα μιαν φεσιν του θεου λογου σαρκαρωμενην*) and is to be worshipped together with his flesh in one worship." This, and similar passages of Hilary and even pope Julius I, have given great trouble to such Roman divines who deny all development and change in the doctrine of their Church. Comp. Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte I, 2, §83 p. 133 seq.

† By Paschas. Quesnel, diss. xiv. ad Opera Leonis M. p. 384 sqq., Natalis Alexander, Pagi, Dupin. So also Neander, in his posthumous work on Doctrine History edited by Jacobi, Vol I, p. 323, where he says that this Symbol was made most probably in the fifth century in the North African Church by Vigilius Tapsensis, during the renewal of the Arian controversy under the rule of the Vandals. The principal argument for this view is taken from the similarity of thought and style and the occurrence of the passage: "Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus S.; Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus Spiritus S.; Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus S." Vigilius is supposed by some to be the author of the twelve books De Trinitate which go under the name of Athanasius, and also of the Dialogue between Athanasius, Arius and Probus; but this is rather uncertain.

‡ By Jos. Anselmi, on the ground especially of some resemblance between the Symbl. Athan. and the Commonitorium of Vincentius.

|| By Muratori.

§ By Waterland.

¶ So Pitheous, Vossius, Montfaucon, Köllner.

° Gieseler.

to a Latin father;\* while still others leave the authorship entirely doubtful.†

This very diversity of opinion shows that we do not know the real author. Even the arguments in favor of the claims of Vigilius Tapsensis, which are the most plausible, prove only the possibility, not even the probability, of his authorship.

The case seems to us almost parallel with that of the Apostles' Creed, and in a less degree also with that of the Nicene Creed, and we are surprised that none of the numerous writers on this subject, as far as we can see, has directed attention to this fact.

The Apostles' Creed, it is now universally admitted, can not be traced to the Apostles,‡ nor to any particular author, age or country, but must be regarded as the production of the ancient Catholic Church. Its living root and substance goes back, indeed, to the Apostolic age, to the baptismal formula (Matth. 28 : 19) and the confession of Peter (Matth. 16 : 16). But its present form is the result of a gradual and imperceptible growth which can be traced through the various and yet essentially identical rules of faith or baptismal creeds of the second and third centuries, as found in the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and which attained its maturity towards the end of the third, or at all events at the beginning of the fourth century, before the Council of Nice in 325, the Nicene Creed being an expansion and more explicit definition of the Apostles' Creed.||

\* Pearson and Fabricius.

† Patavium, Taylor, Cudworth, Tillemont, Buddeus, Walch.

‡ As was done first by the presbyter, Rufinus of Aquileja, about 400, in his Exposition of the Creed. He represents it as the joint production of the twelve Apostles before leaving Jerusalem, each contributing one article, and thus explains the word *συμβολον*, taking it in the sense of *συμβολη*, collatio, while in fact it means sign, distinctive mark, form of confession. This tradition became soon current in the fifth century and obtained to the fifteenth, when Laurentius Valla and subsequently Erasmus undermined it.

|| On the particulars of the origin, history and character of the Apostles' Creed, we must refer to the following treatises: *Rufinus*, *Expositio in Symbolum Apostolicum* (in the works of Hieronymus). *Augustinus*, *De Fide et Symb.* *Heidegger*, *De Symb. Apost.* *Giob. Voetius*, *De Symb. Apost.* *J. Pearson*, *Exposition of the Creed.* *P. King*, *The History of the Apostles' Creed.* *Koellner*, *Symbolik aller Christl. Confessionen*, vol. I, p. 6 sqq. *J. W. Nevin*, *The Apostles' Creed*, three articles in the *Mercersburg Review* for 1849.

As to the origin of the Nicene or rather Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, we can speak more definitely. We know the precise time of its composition: it was formed at Nice in 325 and completed at Constantinople in 381, with the exception of the clause *filioque*, which is a later addition of the Latin Church and became a bone of contention between it and the Greek Church. We can go further and say that the formula proposed by Eusebius of Caesarea at Nice, was, in all probability, made the basis of the first draft. But this was shaped into a far more definite, anti-Arian character, especially by the insertion of the famous predicate of the Son: *homousios*, or *consubstantialis*, *coequal*, of one substance with the Father, which Eusebius wished to avoid in the interest of peace. Half a century afterwards the Constantinopolitan Council made several omissions and an important addition concerning the Holy Ghost, called forth by the intervening doctrinal controversies. Thus even this symbol, though less catholic than the Apostolicum, can by no means be traced to any individual author, but must be regarded as the joint product of the Nicene age or of the first two ecumenical Synods.\*

We may illustrate the formation of the Nicene Creed by alluding to the official reports and acts of our ecclesiastical and political assemblies. Important matters are generally first referred to a committee of three, five or more persons, with a responsible chairman. He draws up a report, submits it to the other members of the committee for approval, rejection, or revision, which may result in a radical reconstruction. Then it is brought up before the general body for action, and there it again undergoes, in many cases, a variety of changes before it is finally adopted. At all events, if adopted, it ceases to be the work of an individual, or even a committee and becomes the property of the whole body, clothed with all the weight and authority which it may possess.

\* The origin and history of the Nicene Creed is more fully discussed by Vossius, Usser, Bingham, Heidegger, Walther, Baier, Blanchini, Suicer, Walch, Köllner, and others. See the literature in Walch, *Introductio in libros symbolicos* p. 121 sqq., and in Köllner, *Symbolik*, etc., I, p. 6 and p. 28.



Now, as the Apostles' Creed is the work of the ante-Nicene age, and the Nicene Creed the work of the Nicene age, so the Athanasian Creed may justly be called the work of the post-Nicene age, or of the Catholic Church from the close of the fourth to the close of the fifth century. Its germ may indeed be traced back to Athanasius, and so far it may still go under his name; single words and passages may be found in the writings attributed to Vigilius Tapsensis, and others. But its final shape and form evidently presupposes the Arian, Semiarian, Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, and the first four general councils, none of which alludes to it, although such allusion, if the work existed already, could not possibly be avoided. Its composition, therefore, must be placed after the year 451, when the Council of Chalcedon settled that very doctrine of the two natures in Christ's person, which is so distinctly expressed in this Creed. On the other hand it cannot be carried down to a much later period, since it contains no allusion yet to the Monothelite controversy concerning the two wills of Christ, which commenced in 633 and was finally settled by the sixth general Council in 680. We assign it, therefore, to the second half of the fifth century, or the beginning of the sixth.\* It must have proceeded, moreover, from the Latin Church, for reasons already stated, and more particularly from the school of St. Augustine, who insisted more clearly and emphatically than any of the preceding fathers, on the strict equality and coördination of the Son and *Holy Ghost* with the Father, and represented the creation, redemption and sanctification as the work of the one undivided Divinity. The place of composition can not be decided with any degree of certainty. It may have been written in North Africa, the country of Augustine, or in Spain, but more probably in Gaul, where it first spread and found favor.

---

\* We can not agree with Dr. Gieseler (*Kirchengeschichte* II. §12, p. 109, note 7, fourth ed.) who thinks that the Athanasianum can not be traced beyond the eighth century, and regards all the earlier allusions to it uncertain. He inclines to the opinion that it originated in Spain, where the conflict between the Athanasian and the Arian party continued longer than in any other country. But the majority of critics assign it to an earlier period and to Gaul.

This view of the case is sustained by the manner in which the Athanasian Creed comes to notice. It appears not in full at once, but gradually as it were. We meet first single words and passages of it in several writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, as Vigilius Tapsensis, of Africa (484),\* Avitus Viennensis, of Gaul (500),† Caesarius Arlatensis, of Gaul (520),‡ Venantius Fortunatus, of Gaul (560),|| and also in acts of Councils, especially the Councils of Toledo in Spain, of the seventh century.§ Then we have it in full in a number of Latin manuscript copies, the precise age of which, however, it is impossible, in most cases, to fix with any degree of certainty. The oldest, which is now lost, is assigned to the year 600,¶ the next to 660,° the third to 700,\*\* the fourth to 703,†† etc. The last men-

\* In the passage already quoted, p. 244.

† Who uses the terms *nec factus, nec creatus, nec genitus*, of the Holy Ghost.

‡ In a sermon which found its way among those of St. Augustine (Opera, tom. v. p. 399,) but which the Benedictine editors of Augustine, also Oudin, Waterland, and Köllner, (l. c. p. 60) ascribe to Caesarius of Arles (503-543) There occurs the first clear allusion which sounds like a direct quotation from the Athanasianum, as Gieseler admits, who, however, doubts the authorship of Caesarius. It reads thus, (we italicize the words corresponding to the symbol): "*Rogo et admoneo vos, Fratres carissimi, ut Quicumque vult salvus esse, Fidem rectam et Catholicam discat, firmiter teneat inviolatamque conservet.—Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus: sed tamen non tres Dii, sed unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus. Attamen credat unusquisque fidelis, quod Filius aequalis est Patri secundum divinitatem, et minor est Patre secundum humanitatem carnis, quam de nostro assumpsit.*"

|| Who is supposed by Muratori, Waterland, and Köllner to be the author of the *Expositio fidei catholicae*, which assumes already the general reception of the *Symbolum Quicumque*, and defends the *filioque*. For this reason Gieseler denies said *Expositio* to Fortunatus, but without being able to assign it to any other source.

§ Conc. Tolet. IV. (anno 633) cap. 1. Conc. Tolet. VI. (a. 638) c. 1. Conc. Tolet. XI. (a. 675) praef., and C. T. XIV. (a. 684) c. 8. The close relation between these councils and several passages of the Athanasianum is undeniable, and the question is merely, whether the councils quote from the Symbol without naming it, as most writers suppose, or whether the Symbol borrowed from the councils, as Gieseler (l. c. p. 110) thinks.

¶ It is called *Codex Usser*. I. Archbishop Usser or Usher saw it in a *Psalterium Latino-Gallicum* of the *Bibliotheca Cottoniana*, and assigned it "tum ex antiquo picturae generae, tum ex literarum forma grandiuscula" to the age of Gregory I (590-604). But it has since disappeared.

° The manuscript of Treves on the borders of Gaul and Germany.

\*\* Ms. Ambros in the Ambrosian library at Milan.

†† Cod. Usser. II. (Cotton. I.) in a copy of the Gallican Psalter of King Aethelstan. Usser says of it, *De symb. p. 8: "Psalterium illud anno aerae nostrae Christianae 703, longe ante Aethelstani regnantis tempora, ex regulis. Calendario in libri initio subjunctis scriptum fuisse deprehendi."* Wat-

tioned is the first copy which ascribes the symbol to Athanasius, though in a somewhat equivocal way, by calling it the "*Faith of Saint Athanasius.*"

If this view be correct, the *Symbolum Quicunque* is less individual and more catholic in its very origin, than any other confession of Christendom, with the only exception of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. This fact does not weaken, but rather strengthens its authority as a confession of faith. If Athanasius were an inspired apostle, then the case would be very different. But as all the teachers of the Church, since the apostles, are fallible men, their writings carry no more weight and authority with them than their merits justify, and the Church has given them by its own consent. The validity and value of the Athanasian creed can in no case be made to rest on the authority of any individual, however great and good, and the more it is separated from individual authorship, the better for its catholic and churchly character.

#### RECEPTION AND AUTHORITY.

As soon as the Athanasian Symbol clearly appears in history, we find it in high esteem and quietly assuming its position among the authoritative doctrinal and liturgical standards of the *Latin Church*, first in France about 550, then in Spain 630, in Germany 800, in England 880, in Italy 880, in Rome 930.\* The Roman Church in this point did not lead but follow public opinion. The Creed was frequently commented upon,† embodied in copies of the *Psalter* and *Breviary*, ordered to be committed to memory by the priests, and introduced into the weekly or even daily worship.‡

erland (l. c. p. 51, as quoted by Köllner p. 62) remarks: "The *Psalter*, wherein this Creed is, is the Gallican *Psalter*, not the Roman; the title is, *Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini*: the oldest monument of any we have extant (—Cod. Uss. I. being lost—) ascribing this Creed to Athanasius."

\* See Waterland l. c. and Köllner p. 85.

† By Venantius Fortunatus, Hincmar, Bruno of Würzburg, Peter Abälard, St. Hildegard, Alexander ab Hales, John Wycliffe, and others.

‡ Hatto, bishop of Basel, A. D., 820: "Ut Fides S. Athanasii a sacerdotibus discatur et ex corde, die Dominico, ad Primam recitetur." A more ex-

In the Greek Church the Athanasian Creed, when it first became known, after the tenth century, met with opposition, especially on account of the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Spirit *from the Son*, as well as from the Father. || Subsequently it was likewise introduced, but less extensively than in the Latin Church, and with some alterations, and with the omission of the *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, et filio*, (corresponding to the *filioque* in the Latin versions of the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Symbol). §

From the Latin Church the Athanasian Creed, together with the other two ecumenical Creeds, passed over into the orthodox Protestant Churches, and was either separately and expressly acknowledged, or substantially incorporated into their doctrinal or devotional standards.

The Lutheran Church received it among its symbolical books. Luther appreciated it highly and was disposed to regard it as the most important and glorious production since the days of the Apostles. † The "Augsburg Confession" substantially repeats its doctrine of the Trinity, and of Christ's person, without naming it. ‡ The "Form of Concord" distinctly recognizes it as scriptural, true and authoritative. § Hence it is found in all the editions of the

---

PLICIT testimony for the liturgical use of this Creed in the French and English Churches is furnished by Abbo of Fleury about 997 (quoted by Köllner, p. 65). Of later usage Bona (Tract. de divina Psalmodia, p. 863) says: "Illud symbolum olim, teste Honorio, quotidie est decantatum, jam vero diebus Dominicis in totius coetus frequentia recitatur, ut sanctae fidei confessio ea die apertius celebretur."

|| Some Greek divines denied that Athanasius ever wrote it; others maintained that he was drunk when he composed it; still others that the Latins corrupted his Creed by the insertion of the *et filio*. The last is also asserted in the Confessio Metrophanis Critopuli, comp. Kimmel's Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orient., P. II. p. 23.

§ Bingham: Presenter Graeci eo utuntur nonnullis additamentis aucto et aliquantum mutato.

† "Es ist also gefasset," he says, "dass ich nicht weiss, ob seit der Apostel Zeit in der Kirche des Neuen Testaments etwas Wichtigeres und Herrlicheres geschrieben sei." Comp. Luth. Opp. Hal. VI. 2318 sqq.

‡ Art. I and Art III (p. 9 and 10 ed. Hase).

§ Epit. p. 571, and more fully in the Solida Declar. p. 632 (ed. Hase): "Amplectimur etiam tria illa Catholica et generalia summae auctoritatis Symbola, Apostolicum, videlicet, Nicenum, et Athanasii. Haec enim agnoscimus esse breves quidem, sed easdem maxime pias, atque in verbo Dei solide fundatas, praeclaras Confessiones fidei, quibus omnes haereses, quae iis temporibus Ecclesiae Christi perturbant, perspicue et solide refutantur."

“Book of Concord” as the third symbol of the Lutheran Confession.

The *Reformed Church of England* gave it a place in the *Common Prayer Book* and ordered it to be sung or said alternately by the minister and people standing, in the morning service on several festival days, viz: Christmas, the Epiphany, St. Matthias, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, John the Baptist, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude, St. Andrew, and on Trinity Sunday. In all these days it takes the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The *Reformed Churches of the Continent* have not given the Athanasian Symbol that direct formal sanction and prominence, as the Lutheran and the Anglican.\* But they unanimously profess, in their symbolical books, the same doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation; reject the errors of the Arians, Semiarians, Nestorians, Eutychians and Monothelites, and thus acknowledge in fact, if not always in form, the authority of the ancient ecumenical Creeds, in due subjection, of course, to the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures. The Second Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Bullinger in the name of the Swiss Churches in 1566, and approved by them, endorses, in very strong and unmistakable terms, the doctrine of the first four general councils and of the Athanasian Symbol.† Dr. David Pareus, the pupil and friend of Ursinus, and editor of his Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, wrote a special

\* Dr. Ebrard, on the contrary, thinks that the Reformed Church makes in some respects even more account of the ecumenical Creeds than the Lutheran (Christl. Dogmatik, Vol. II, p. 89 and 90). This may be true as to the doctrine itself, but not as to the formal recognition of these Creeds. Dr. Ebrard has overlooked the distinct recognition in the passage just quoted, in the preceding note, from the Lutheran Form of Concord, and the somewhat disrespectful manner in which Calvin at least (*De vera ecclesie Reformatione*) speaks of the Symb. Nicaenum as a “*carmen cantillando magis aptum, quam confessionis formula.*”

† Cap. XI. (p. 487 in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confess. in Eccl. Reform. public.*): “*Quaecunque de Incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi mysterio definita sunt ex Scripturis sanctis, et comprehensa symbolis ac sententiis quatuor primarum et praestantissimarum Synodorum celebratarum Niceae, Constantinopoli, Ephesi et Chalcedone, una cum beati Athanasii Symbolo, et omnibus his similibus symbolis, credimus corde sincero et ore libero ingenue profitermur, condemnantes omnia his contraria. Atque ad hunc modum retinemus inviolatam sive integram fidem Christianam, orthodoxam atque catholicam: scientes, symbolis praedictis nihil contineri, quod non sit conforme verbo Dei, et prorsus faciat ad sinceram fidei explicationem.*”

exposition of the Athanasian Creed, which, however, we have never seen.\*

So far the faith in the doctrines of our Symbol was unshaken in the Church and was shared in common by the Greeks, (if we leave out of view their dissent from the *filioque*), Romans and Protestants. The Socinians alone differed from it and prepared the way for a still greater dissent. During the seventeenth century the origin of the Athanasian Creed was first made the subject of critical investigation by Continental and Anglican divines, and resulted in the almost unanimous rejection of the ancient tradition as to its authorship. This had the effect to weaken its authority as a primitive symbol, without undermining the faith in its contents. But when the skeptical and rationalistic flood of the eighteenth century swept away from a large portion of the Church the orthodox faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, this Creed was almost forgotten and figured only in Church histories among the many idle fabrications of a superstitious and intolerant age.

The reviving faith of the nineteenth century led to a gradual return to the ancient Confessions, first of the period of the Reformation and then also to those of the primitive Church. And although the Athanasian Creed is still comparatively neglected and even passed by in silence by eminent writers† on the very doctrines it so ably and clearly sets forth, it begins again to attract attention more and more and to be appreciated in its true worth without being unduly overestimated as in times past. Dr. Kling, an Evangelical divine of Würtemberg, claims for it a permanent significance in the Christian Church which will never give

---

\* *Symbolum Athanasii, notis breviter declaratum.* Heidelb. 1618 (as Walch has it, l. c. p. 156), or 1619 (according to Köllner, p. 87. Probably the one gives the date of the preface, the other the date of publication.)

† Dr. Baur, in his learned and eminently scholarly, though unsound, work on the history of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of God, alludes to this Creed only *en passant* in a foot note, Vol. II, p. 33, and p. 168. But what is more surprising still, is that Dr. Dorner, in his invaluable Christological work, should not even mention it, so far as we can see from a cursory glance over both volumes and the index.

up its dogmatic substance.\* Dr. Ebrard, one of the leading representatives of the modern German Reformed school of theology, makes still greater account of it in his "Christian Dogmatics,"† represents it as the completion of the ancient Catholic theology and christology, and asserts that it has been most fully taken up and best understood by the symbols and early divines of the Reformed communion.

As to our own country, I am not aware that the Athanasian Creed has ever been made the subject of serious discussion. The Episcopal Church, at its separate organization after the revolutionary war, has thrown it out of its Liturgy, together with the Nicene Creed, (which, however, was subsequently restored at the instance of the English bishops). But this omission must be traced to the prevalence of the latitudinarian spirit of the eighteenth century, which proposed, in the General Convention held at Philadelphia in 1785, a number of other omissions and changes in the Liturgy, the Thirty Nine Articles and even in the Apostles' Creed.‡ If the Episcopal Church were to be re-organized now, as it was in 1784, the Athanasian Creed, as well as the Nicene, would probably keep its place in the Liturgy, and many of its ministers would gladly see it restored.—The Lutherans of the United States are still bound to this Creed as far as they respect at all the Book of Concord.—The Presbyterians and Congregationalists never, as far as I know, acknowledged it in form, but they teach substantially the same doctrine in their standards.—The Dutch Reformed Church has it as an appendix to its Liturgy, although it is probably never used there in public service.—The new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church, which

\* Art. in Herzog's Encyclopaedie, Bd. I, 577.

† Band I. §138 p. 185 sq., u. Vol. II, §377, p. 89 sq.

‡ Comp. on this subject bishop White's Memoirs of the Prot. Episc. Ch. in the U. St. of A. Phil., 1820, p. 102 sqq. and 448 sqq., and the "Proposed Book," i. e., the provisional Liturgy of that Church as revised by the Convention of 1785. Many of the alterations, especially also the omission of the Nicene Creed and the article on the descent into hades in the Apostles' Creed, were subsequently given up on the remonstrance of the English bishops, who refused ordination, except on condition of the restoration of that article and of the Nicene Creed.

is as yet, however, merely of a provisional character, has received it, together with the two older ecumenical Creeds, among the Primitive Forms (p. 17-19), recommends its use on the last communion in the ecclesiastical year (p. 192), and requires the consent to it on the part of the candidates for the ministry in the ordination office (p. 245). This is a step in advance of every other Protestant communion of the country and just the reverse of the negative action of the Episcopal Church in 1785; but, as compared with the original position and doctrinal standards of the Churches of the Reformation, Lutheran, Anglican and Reformed, it is certainly no innovation, but a return rather to old usage under a modified, and we may say simplified and restricted form as to its actual use in public service. Whether the Athanasianum will retain its place at the final revision of this work, remains to be seen. The more closely it is examined, the less objectionable will it appear to those who cherish a strong and hearty belief in the ancient Christian doctrine of the holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God.

#### CHARACTER AND CONTENTS.

Let us now examine the theology of the Athanasian symbol, the nature of which must determine its value and use in the Christian Church.\*

The third ecumenical Creed is an epitome of ancient Catholic theology and sets forth, in clear logical statement, the orthodox faith concerning the fundamental articles of the triune God and the divine-human Saviour, without attempting to explain these unfathomable mysteries. It embodies the permanent results of the trinitarian and christological controversies which agitated, with uncommon violence, the Nicene and post-Nicene age, and were decided successively by the four general Synods held at

---

\* On the theology of the Creed, which we regard as the most important part of the subject, Walch and Köllner are altogether superficial and unsatisfactory.



Nice in 325, at Constantinople in 381, at Ephesus in 431, and at Chalcedon in 451.

For all practical purposes we may say the Apostles' Creed was sufficient, and it is so to this day, as a guide for catechetical instruction of the young and as a confession at baptism and confirmation. In this respect it can never be superseded or improved. Its very simplicity gives it a decided preference for popular catechetical and liturgical use over the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and every subsequent Confession of faith. But theologically and scientifically considered, it is defective, inasmuch as it does not clearly and unmistakably teach the Godhead of Christ and of the Holy Ghost in the full sense in which the Church intended it from the beginning.

Hence it was found necessary to define it more fully at the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, in opposition to the Arian and semi-Arian hypothesis which acknowledged Christ to have existed before the world and to be divine in some sense, but denied his equality with the Father, and which made the Holy Ghost the first creature of the Son, or a mere power and influence of the Godhead. The Nicene Creed calls Jesus Christ not simply the "only begotten Son our Lord," as the Apostles' Creed, but the "only begotten Son of God; begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of one substance (*homoousious*) with the Father, by whom all things were made." This is certainly an advance, not in faith, we may say, for this was the same in the beginning, but in knowledge and in expression.

But the theology of the Church could not stop here. The Nicene Creed even in the more explicit form which it received at the Synod of Constantinople in 381, teaches, indeed, the true Godhead of Christ beyond the possibility of mistake, but it gives by no means yet a complete view of the holy Trinity. For in the first place, like the Apostles' Creed, it speaks of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost separately only, without bringing out their oneness of sub-

stance, their mutual relations and distinctive personal properties, so as to exclude every possible form of tritheism on the one hand, and subordinationism on the other. Secondly, it is especially defective in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, which did not come into full view at all during the Arian controversy. In the third place, it is entirely silent on the exact relation which holds between the divine and human nature of Christ, which was brought out only during the succeeding Nestorian and Eutychian controversies.

In all these respects, and especially in the last, the Athanasian Symbol is a decided advance upon its two predecessors. It naturally divides itself into two parts. Each part is introduced by a prologue on the necessity and importance of holding the true faith as afterwards taught, and the whole concludes with an epilogue to the same effect. The first, and larger part, from v. 3-27,\* teaches the true doctrine of the Trinity; the second, from v. 26-44, the doctrine of the Incarnation, or the proper constitution of Christ's Person.

1. The doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY, or the THEOLOGY, in the strict sense of the term. The Holy Trinity is the sacred symbol and type of the Christian religion, as distinct from the abstract monotheism of Judaism, Mahometanism, and deism on the one hand, and from the dualism and polytheism of the various forms of Paganism on the other. It comprehends all the truths and all the blessings of the revelation or self-communication of God for the salvation of men. Hence it is expressed in the baptismal formula, and confessed in the Apostles' Creed at the very entrance into the Christian Church in the sacrament of baptism (Matth. 28: 19), and made the all-comprehending and concluding benediction by the Apostle (2 Cor. 13: 14).

---

\* The division in verses differs somewhat, although the succession is the same in all manuscripts and editions. The Book of Concord makes 42 verses, Weber 48. The best critical edition of the text is said to be that of Waterland. But the Latin codices, of which Montfaucon compared 12, Waterland 24, present a very small number of lectiones variantes, while the Greek copies, though less numerous (8), differ more materially.

It stands thus at the beginning and at the end of Christian worship and controls it throughout. But it is not simply in the two express passages alluded to, that the Bible teaches the Holy Trinity, nor in all the far more numerous passages which prove the Godhead of Christ, or of the Holy Ghost, and which can only be reconciled with the fundamental idea of the Divine unity on the assumption of a trinity of persons in this unity of substance. We may say the doctrine runs through the entire Scriptures from beginning to end in the form of living facts, or in the exhibition of the revelation of the one only true and living God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost in the work of the creation, redemption and sanctification of the world. We need not be surprised, therefore, that this article stands out so prominently in the faith, worship and theology of the early Church, and gave rise to a long succession of doctrinal controversies. In this article again the divinity of Christ, as the incarnate God and Saviour of the race, formed naturally the central interest and fills the greater portion of the ancient Creeds, since it is the starting point of the Christian consciousness, determines the true idea of God, and was the main object of attack on the part of the ancient heresies, both of Jewish and heathen origin.

The Holy Trinity is a mystery which transcends our present power of comprehension and will furnish food for sacred meditation and praise throughout the countless ages of eternity. Nevertheless, as faith is never irrational and unnatural but merely superrational and supernatural, the subject matter of this article of faith can and ought to be clearly known and stated.

This is done with admirable clearness, precision, brevity and completeness in the Athanasian Creed. It betrays a mind which had evidently mastered the entire subject and fully appropriated it to the intellect as well as to the heart. It not only rejects *Unitarianism* or *Monarchianism*, which either as *Patripassianism*, or as *Ebionism*, denies the trinity altogether, but it avoids, also, with singular care and discrimination, the three erroneous forms in which the trinity

may be held and has been held at different times before and since. It excludes, in the first place, *Sabellianism* or *Modalism*, which teaches merely a trinity of revelation, not of essence, and thus falls back at last upon Unitarianism or abstract monotheism; secondly, *Tritheism*, which teaches three divine beings, and thus runs into polytheism; and thirdly, *Subordinationism*, which subordinates the Son to the Father, and the Holy Ghost to both, as partaking in part only, as it were, or to a limited extent, of the Divine essence, or dignity. These errors are not expressly mentioned, but necessarily denied by the positive statement of the opposite view.

The Symbol teaches the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity, neither dividing the substance, nor confounding the persons.\* 1) The *Unity* of the Godhead as to being, substance or essence: "The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coequal. . . There are not three eternal, but one eternal. . . not three uncreated, nor three unlimited; but one uncreated, and one unlimited. . . not three almighty, but one almighty. . . not three Gods, but one God. . . not three Lords, but one Lord. . .

We are forbidden by the Catholic religion to say: There be three Gods, or three Lords." 2) The *Trinity* of persons or hypostases. These terms, it is true, must be taken in a peculiar sense, if applied to God. For in human relations three persons constitute three different beings. Yet there is no other term equally expressive. The trinity is in the first place immanent and essential, a distinction in God himself, independent of, and prior to, his manifestation in the world. It is a living relationship and process in God, the vitality, so to say, of infinite intelligence and infinite love. God was from everlasting Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and will remain for ever Father, Son and Holy Ghost as certainly as he is supreme wisdom and supreme

\* V. 3 and 4. In v. 27, there is an unimportant difference of reading as to the order. The *textus receptus*, as found in the Book of Concord, reads, *trinitas in unitate et unitas in trinitate*, while Waterland reverses the order, *unitas in trinitate et trinitas in unitate*. The latter is the order in the old English version and in the revision.

love. This trinity of essence reflects and manifests itself in the economical trinity or trinity of revelation,\* that is the threefold divine work of creation, salvation and sanctification. "There is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. . . The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. .

. Each person by himself is God and Lord." 3) The internal *relation* of the three persons or their distinctive properties which, however, do not in the least interfere with the strict unity of substance. The Father is himself not made, nor created, nor begotten, but eternally *begetting* the Son; the Son is not made, nor created, but eternally *begotten* of the substance of the Father; the Holy Ghost is not made nor created, but eternally *proceeding* from the Father and the Son.† It is true, in this last point there is a difference of opinion between the Greek and the Latin Church, the former denying the procession from the Son as a later innovation and corruption. But the equality of the Son and the Father in its full sense necessarily requires the *filioque*. Here the Athanasianum follows the Latin view as brought out especially by St. Augustine,‡ and embodied also in the later clause to the Nicene Creed.

This same doctrine of the Trinity, including the *filioque*, was unanimously professed by the Reformers, reasserted in opposition to the Socinians and incorporated into the doctrinal standards of the evangelical Churches. Hase says that the view of the Athanasian symbol "was received *without change* into the symbolical books of the Lutheran

\* We employ here a terminology which is much later, but the distinction itself between an essential or immanent trinity, and an economical or transient trinity enters unquestionably into the ancient Creeds and is implied already in the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, or the eternal Sonship of Christ.

† Or to express it in nouns according to a later terminology, to the Father belongs negatively the *innascibilitas* or *αγεννησία*, positively the *generatio activa Filii* and *spiratio (πνοή) activa* Spiritus Sancti; to the Son belongs the *filiatio generatio (γεννησία) passiva*, and *spiratio activa* Spiritus s.; to the Holy Ghost the *processio (εκπορευσις)* and *spiratio passiva*.

‡ Comp. Augustin, De Trinit. IV, 20: Nec possumus dicere, quod Spiritus S. et a Filio non procedat; neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video, quid aliud significare voluerit, quum suffians in faciem discipulorum ait: Accipite Spiritum S. Neque enim flatus ille corporeus substantia Spiritus S. fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre, sed et a Filio procedere Spiritum.

Church and defended as the most sacred mystery of orthodox Christendom against every kind of opposition.”\* The Reformed Church, in some of its standards, is even more full and clear on the subject than the Lutheran.† Let us hear the four Reformed symbols which are most extensively used and enjoy the greatest authority, the second Helvetic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Thirty Nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession.

The larger Helvetic Confession not only expressly endorses the ancient symbols, including the Athanasianum, as we have observed already, but also, in its exposition of the Trinity, is so clear and explicit as to leave no room for doubt whatever.‡ “We believe and teach that God is one as to essence and nature (*unum esse essentia vel natura*), self-subsisting and self-sufficient for all things, invisible, incorporeal, immense, eternal, the creator of all things visible as well as invisible, the highest good. . . . Nevertheless we believe and teach that this same infinite God one and undivided (*unum et indivisum*) is inseparably and without confusion distinct in persons (*personis inseparabiliter et inconfuse esse distinctum*) as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, so that the Father from eternity begat the Son (*ab aeterno Filium generaverit*), that the Son was begotten by an ineffable generation (*filius generatione ineffabili genitus sit*), and that the Holy Ghost eternally proceeds from both and is to be adored with both (*Spiritus S. vero procedat ab utroque, idque ab aeterno, cum utroque adorandus*); so that there are not three Gods, but three persons consubstantial, coëternal and coëqual, distinct as to hypostases, and in order (not dignity) one preceding the other, yet without any inequality (*nulla tamen inaequali-*

\* *Hutterus Redivivus, oder Dogmatik der Evang. Luth. Kirche.* p. 171 of the 8th ed. Comp. his quotations from the Augsb. Conf., the Apology, and the old Lutheran divines, on the subsequent pages. Also Hase's *Evang. Dogmatik*, p. 515, 4th ed.: “Die hergebrachte Lehre ging ohne alle Durchbildung in die evang. Kirche über, theils durch Reception des Athanasianum, theils durch Wiederholung seines Grundgedankens, wie seiner praktischen Anwendung.”

† *Comp. Ebrard l. c. l. p. 186 sqq.*

‡ *Cap. 8 (not cp. 2, as Ebrard quotes), p. 470 ed. Niemeayer.*

itate).” Then the Confession quotes several Scripture passages in support of this doctrine, and condemns not only the Jews and Mahomedans and all who blaspheme “sacrosanctam et adorandam hanc Trinitatem,” but also those heretics who deny or pervert it, as the Monarchians, Patripassians, Sabellians, Arians, Macedonians and the like.

The Heidelberg Catechism, necessarily more brief, but sufficient for its purpose, says, in the 25th question: “Since there is but one divine essence, why speakest thou of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Because God hath so revealed himself in his word, that these three distinct persons are the only true and eternal God.”

The Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England recognize the Athanasian Creed,\* and teach in the very first article, which is retained unchanged in the Episcopal Church of the United States: “There is but one living and true God. . . . And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.”

The Westminster Confession which is held by the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies of England and the United States, approaches more closely to the phraseology and letter of the Athanasian Creed:† “In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the

\* Art. VIII “of the Three Creeds,” in the original articles as they still obtain in England. The Episcopal Church of the United States has not only removed the Athanasian symbol from the liturgical service, but also stricken out its name from said article, in the revision of 1801, retaining, however, the Nicene and Apostles’ Creeds, and also Art. I and II unaltered, which teach the same doctrine on the Trinity and the Incarnation.

† Chapt. II. § 8. Comp. the Larger Catech. Quest. VIII–XI.

The Westminster standards are hardly ever noticed by German writers, not even by Ebrard and Schweizer, in their works on Reformed Dogmatics, while they refer to every other symbol, the Scotch Confession among the rest, which was superseded by the far more full and accurate Westminster Confession and Catechisms. It is characteristic that Niemeyer in his Collection of all the Reformed Symbols, originally omitted the Westminster standards entirely, but furnished them afterwards in an Appendix, with the excuse that he was unable before to find a single copy of them any where (*quod ne unum quidem confessionis Westmonasteriensis sive Puritanæ exemplar usquam reperire potueram.*)

**Holy Ghost.** The Father is of none, neither begotten, nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."

Similar quotations might easily be multiplied, but it is not necessary, since the orthodoxy of the Protestant evangelical Churches on this article has never been seriously questioned, not even by Roman Catholic controversialists.

2. The doctrine of the INCARNATION, or the CHRISTOLOGY.

The doctrine of Christ is substantially contained in the confession of Peter, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, i. e. the promised Messiah, the Son of the living God, or in the declaration of John: The word became flesh, or in the word of Paul: God manifest in the flesh. The Church has ever believed in the mystery of the incarnation or the abiding union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, as the central truth of our holy religion and the foundation of all our hopes. Christ must be the Son of God and the Son of man in the fullest sense of the term, if he really is what he claims to be, the Mediator between God and man, and the Saviour of the world. To deny either his divinity, or his humanity, to reduce him either to a mere man, however great and good, or to resolve him into a gnostic phantom and spectral idea, is a radical heresy and overthrows the Christian salvation. Hence the uncompromising hostility of the ancient Church against Ebionism on the one hand, and Gnosticism on the other. But the exclusion of these two extreme errors is not sufficient. It may be admitted that Christ is both God and man, and yet the *relation* of the divine and human in him be so conceived as seriously to affect either their difference or their unity. The difference may be made so great, as virtually to result in two persons, or the unity may be so pressed, as to teach but one nature. The former is the Nestorian, the latter the Eutychian or Monophysite error. The one allows merely a mechanical and external relation between the divine and human nature in Christ, and substitutes the idea of an indwelling of the former in the latter or of a



moral fellowship for the idea of an incarnation. The other assumes a total absorption of the human nature into the divine in the act of the incarnation, so that Christ ceases to be man and cannot be our model for imitation. In both cases the truth of the incarnation and its result, the redemption and reconciliation of man with God, are seriously endangered and virtually annihilated. Nestorianism falls back at last upon an Ebionite christology, while Eutychianism ends logically in Gnosticism and Pantheism.

Here now the Athanasian Creed, in the second part, steers with equally sound instinct and discrimination between the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, as it steered in the doctrine of the Trinity between Tritheism and Unitarianism. It teaches that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, equal to the Father as to his divine nature, equal to man as to his human nature, sin only excepted, and yet one and the same Christ, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person,\* not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God.

It is interesting to compare with it the confession of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which rejected the Eutychian heresy and gave at the same time an exposition of the orthodox doctrine in these words:

“Following the holy fathers, we all teach unanimously that we confess one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, truly God and at the same time truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; of the same substance with the Father as to his Godhead, and of the same substance at the same time with us as to his manhood; in all things like unto us, except sin; eternally begotten of the Father according to his Godhead, but in the last days for our sake and for our salvation (born) of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God (*της θεοτοκου*), according to his manhood; one and the same Christ (*ενα και τον αυτον χ.*), Son, Lord, Only-begotten, who is known in two natures† without mixture and change,‡ with-

\* *Unus omnino, non confusione substantiæ, sed unitate personæ, v. 36.* This sounds like a direct denial of the Eutychian theory and seems to point to a period after the fourth general Council in 451. But the same view was substantially advanced before Eutyches, and opposed in similar forms as in this passage. Comp. Waterland and Köllner, p. 89sq.

† *εν δυο φυσεσι*, in duabus naturis, as all Latin copies read, instead of the other reading, *εκ δυο φουσεων*, which might be understood in a Eutychian or Monophysite sense.

‡ *αμευχυριστος, απεικτως*—against Eutychianism.

out division and separation,|| so that the difference of the natures is by no means abolished by the union, but rather the peculiarity of each nature is saved, and they are united into one person and one hypostasis,§ not divided or torn into two persons, but one and the same Christ: as the prophets from on high and the Lord Jesus Christ himself have taught us, and the faith of the fathers has handed down to us."

The statement of the Athanasian Creed is more simple and condensed and omits the term "mother of God," which is not to be regretted,\* but it is equally, if not more clear and explicit. It also illustrates the relation of the two natures in Christ by the union of soul and body in man. It then enumerates, like the Apostles' Creed, the leading facts in the life of the Saviour to his return in glory, and concludes with the doctrine of the last judgment, where the good shall receive everlasting life and the wicked everlasting damnation.

The christology of the Athanasian Creed has likewise passed over, without any material change, into the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Leaving out of view the Lutheran doctrine, we will confine ourselves again to the four leading confessions of the Reformed communion.

The Heidelberg Catechism teaches,† that Christ as a Mediator and Deliverer must be *very man*, and perfectly righteous, because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which has sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin, and one who is himself a sinner, cannot satisfy for others; and that he must be at the same time in *one person very God*, that he might by the power of his Godhead sustain, in his human nature, the burden of

|| ἀδιαίρετος, ἀχωρίστος—against Nestorianism.

§ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν.

\* It must be admitted that the term, θεοτοκος, so obnoxious to the Nestorians, has a good sense, and follows with logical necessity from the orthodox view of the Incarnation. But it is equally certain that it is one-sided (χριστοτοκος and θεοανθρωποτοκος would be more complete), that it was not used by the apostles and ante-Nicene fathers, that it is liable to be grossly misunderstood by the illiterate, that it has been greatly abused and made the basis of an excessive, yea idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin in the Greek and Roman Churches. We prefer the Scriptural term, "Mother of our Lord." Luke 1. 48.

† Quest XV-XVIII. Comp. Qu. XXIX-XL.

God's wrath, and might obtain for and restore to us righteousness and life.

The second Helvetic Confession,\* after teaching distinctly the eternal generation of the Son and his strict equality with the Father, goes on as follows: "The same eternal Son of the eternal God, we believe and teach, has become the Son of man of the seed of Abraham and David, without the cohabitation of man, as Ebion said, being conceived in the purest manner, by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, according to the evangelical history." Then after rejecting the Gnostic and Appollinarian view of the humanity of Christ, it continues: "We acknowledge in one and the same Christ our Lord two natures, the divine and the human, and these we hold to be so connected that they are not absorbed, or confused, or mixed, but united or conjoined in one person, without destroying the permanent properties of the natures; so that we worship one Lord Christ, not two, who is very God, of one substance with the Father according to his divine nature, and very man, of one substance with us men according to his human nature, sin only excepted. Therefore we abominate the Nestorian dogma which makes two out of one Christ, and dissolves the unity of person; so also we utterly execrate the folly of Eutyches, the Monophysites and Monothelites who expunge the property of the human nature."

The Thirty Nine Articles of the Anglican Communion:† The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man," etc.

The Westminster Confession is equally clear and distinct on this subject.‡ "The Son of God, the second per-

\* Cap XI: De Jesu Christo vero Deo et homine, unico mundi Salvatore, p. 483 sq. ed. Niemeyer. † Art. II.

† Chapt. VIII, § 2.

son in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance: so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man."

It is perfectly plain, then, that the theology and christology of the Athanasian symbol is to this day the public doctrine of the Evangelical as well as the Roman Catholic Churches. To recognize and acknowledge it in form is perfectly consistent with orthodox Protestantism. To reject it altogether, is at the same time to reject the corresponding articles of all our leading confessions of faith.

The only real difficulty in the way, is the *damnatory* clause in the prologue and epilogue of the Athanasian Creed, which makes the eternal salvation dependent upon the reception of this faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. This is the great objection to this symbol even in the eyes of many who otherwise altogether agree with its contents. No doubt the objection would be serious and valid, if the damnatory clause referred to the *form* as well as to the *substance* of faith, and required us to condemn any particular *persons*, especially all those who held loose and unsatisfactory philosophical views on the Holy Trinity, as was the case even with most of the ante-Nicene fathers, not to speak of such men as Milton, Watts, Schleiermacher, Neander, Bushnell and many other distinguished divines in the later ages of the Christian Church. But this is a false interpretation of the clause. The more it is examined and understood in its proper sense, the less objectionable will it appear.

For in the first place, if faith is at all saving, the rejection of faith must be condemning. The assertion of truth

is necessarily also the negation of error. There is no avoiding the conclusion. "He that believeth," says the highest authority, "and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."\* "He that believeth on him, is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."†

Secondly, the energy and earnestness of faith in its negative as well as positive expression, must not be confounded with intolerance and uncharitableness. The question is here not of persons at all, but simply of truth and error. We are bound as Christians to love the sinner and heretic, and to labor for his conversion, while we abhor and condemn his sin and error.

Thirdly, the Protestant symbols, both Lutheran and Reformed, do substantially the same thing which is found so objectionable in the Athanasian Creed. The Augsburg Confession, the Articles of Smalkald, the Form of Concord, the Helvetic, Gallic, Belgic, Scotch, and other Confessions, expressly condemn, in the strongest terms, such as *damnamus, abominamur, detestamur, execramur*, the trinitarian and christological heresies of the Gnostics, Docetists, Ebionites, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Servetians, Socinians and others.

Finally, in all these cases salvation and condemnation is not made to depend upon the acceptance or rejection of the logical form of statement or any particular degree of knowledge of these mysteries, but only upon the presence or absence of *faith* in the doctrinal *substance* or the great *truth* contained in the statement. The form of expression is simply the outer hull to guard the kernel of truth against misapprehension and perversion. The strength and nourishment lies in the kernel, not in the hull. So it is the truth alone, as apprehended by faith, which can save, and can save a child and a barbarian as well as the ripest and profoundest scholar. But what is the central truth, the main object of saving Christian faith? It is undoubtedly

\* Mark 16 : 16. † John 3 : 18. Comp. s, 24, 6, 40 and 47.

the one only true and living God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who made us, who redeemed us, and who sanctifies us, and the one Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man, the only Saviour. This is the faith taught in the Protestant confessions, as well as in the three ancient Creeds; this faith is necessary for salvation, while its wilful rejection must exclude from it; this faith will remain the same to the end of time, however much its philosophical apprehension and logical expression may change and improve with the progressive march of theological science.\*

It is in this sense, and in this only, that the ordination service in the new German Reformed Liturgy requires the assent of the candidate of the ministry to the Athanasian as well as the Apostles' and Nicene Creed. The question first gives the contents of these Creeds by way of comment: "Do you believe in one God the Father; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father; and in one Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and with the Father and the Son one God Almighty? And do you believe in one holy Catholic Church, in which is given one true Baptism for the remission of sins? *And do you consent unto the system of faith set forth in the three Creeds, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian Creed?*"† Here the "system of faith" to which the candidate is expected solemnly to declare his adherence, is just the belief in the triune God as stated before. But for the purpose of making it still more clear it might be better perhaps to substitute for the last *And do you*, the words, *Do you thus*, i. e., in the sense previously indicated.

\* Dr. Kling in his short article on the Athanasian Creed, in Herzog's Encyclopaedia, takes the same view of the offensive clause: "Das Vorurtheil," he says, "wird schwinden in dem Maasse, als man sich darüber verständigen wird, dass es (the Athan. S.) uns nur angeht hinsichtlich seines wesentlichen dogmatischen Gehaltes, das heisst, insofern als es die Einheit der Gottheit in der dreifachen persönlichen Unterschiedenheit und umgekehrt, und die vollkommene Gottheit und vollkommene Menschheit des Einen untheilbaren Christus als unvermengt, unverwandelt und ungeschieden feststellt." . . . "Darin liegt seine bleibende Bedeutung, und nie wird sich die christliche Kirche diesen Gehalt und unser Symbolum, insofern es denselben in sich trägt, nehmen lassen, wie auch immer die positive theologische Vermittlung desselben sich ändern und vervollkommen mag."

† p. 244 sq.

## VALUE AND USE.

With this explanation of the damnatory clause we should think that no strong believer in the holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God as the fundamental doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, can justly deny the Athanasian Creed a great and permanent value, and object to its reception into the new Liturgy among the Primitive Forms, together with the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. This was not done without due consideration and precedent. Besides the formal recognition of it in several symbolical books of the Reformed Church, it has long had a place in the Anglican, and the Dutch Liturgies. It has also quite recently been embodied in the new hymn book and liturgy of the Reformed Church of Elberfeld, which is perhaps more strictly Reformed than any other congregation in Germany and Switzerland. This work, published in 1853, in addition to the Psalms and two hundred and forty three well selected choice hymns, accompanied with the tunes, contains the Heidelberg Catechism, a number of prayers and short liturgical services, the three ancient Creeds, and also the doctrinal decisions of the Councils of Ephesus A. D. 431, and of Chalcedon A. D. 451.

It is not intended, of course, to place these Creeds on a par with the holy Scriptures in a Romanizing sense, or to weaken in the least the fundamental Protestant principle concerning the rule of faith. The authority of the Word of God is absolute, that of the Confessions of the Church is relative only and conditioned by their agreement with, it; the former is, strictly speaking, the only rule of faith the *norma normans fidei*, the latter are only exponents of the true sense of the Bible and safeguards of sound doctrine, the *norma normata doctrinae*.

Among these Confessions of faith the three Symbols of the ancient Church have always held, and should continue to hold, the highest place, because they are nearest the apostolic fountain; they really contain the fundamental articles of the Christian faith in the shortest and simplest

form ; they are ecumenical or universal, being received by all the branches of orthodox Christendom, and they form a link of union between the Church of the present with the Church of the past, up to the age of the confessors, martyrs and immediate disciples of the apostles. The most sacred associations of many centuries cluster around them ; they are fraught with the piety, faith, hope, joy and spiritual experience of God's people of all generations and tongues. Why should the Athanasian Creed be banished from its former time-honored position, since it is only the legitimate completion of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, embodies, as we have seen, the purest results of the theology of the first five centuries, and gives the clearest and fullest expression to the Church's faith in the triune God and the divine-human Saviour of the world,—a faith so earnestly and emphatically reconfessed, as with one voice, by all the symbols of evangelical Christendom.

In addition to their doctrinal value the ancient Creeds have also from time immemorial been used for liturgical purposes. Here a proper distinction must be made.

The Apostles' Creed stands decidedly first on account of its simplicity for all practical and popular use. It alone, as already intimated, is properly adapted for catechetical instruction, for baptism and confirmation, and should also be more frequently confessed than any other in the regular service of the Lord's day, as the solemn utterance of the common congregation and a united act of worship, like singing and prayer.

The Nicene Creed, being already more artificially constructed and rising somewhat in its terminology above the ordinary popular comprehension, should be confined to communion or festival seasons, where it may take the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The Athanasian Symbol, finally, being still more theological and scientific in tone and expression, might be said and sung once a year, either as the new German Reformed Liturgy directs, on the last communion season, or what perhaps would be more appropriate, as the canticle for



Trinity Sunday. The frequent use of it in the mediæval Latin, and the Anglican Protestant Churches, is to be attributed in part to the former scarcity of hymns, now so happily supplied by our rich treasures of sacred poetry, and can, therefore, not be taken as a precedent. The most solemn and impressive form of professing these Creeds in public worship is the chanting by the choir, either alone or in connection with the whole congregation properly trained for responsive liturgical worship.

Mercersburg, Pa., March, 1859.

P. S.

---

ART. V.—THE PALATINATE: A HISTORICO-GEOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

ITS HISTORY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE EXTINCTION OF  
ELDER ELECTORAL LINE, IN 1559.

THE lands on the Middle Rhine, which afterward formed the Electorate of the Rhenish Palatinate, were in antiquity inhabited by the Vangiones, Nemetes and Tribochi, German tribes, who were conquered by Julius Cæsar and incorporated in the Roman province of Germania Superior. During the decline of the empire the confederated German hordes of the Alemanni crossed the Rhine, but after their defeat by Clovis, in the battle of Zülpich, 496, they were reduced to subjection and the Franks extended their conquests beyond the Neckar.

Thus the mass of the inhabitants in these regions consisted of the relics of old Roman subjects, some stray bands of vanquished Alemanni and the domineering Franks, among whose warriors the lands were divided; to this mixed population may be added Saxon colonists, whom Charlemagne afterward, in 804, settled on the left bank of the Rhine.