

J. N. D. Kelly



History and Use

pp. 35–51

J. N. D. Kelly, (1964) *The Athanasian Creed*, 1st A. & C. Black

Staff and students of Cambridge Theological Federation are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA licence which allows you to:

- access and download a copy;
- print out a copy;

Please note that this material is for use ONLY by students registered on the course of study as stated in the section below. All other staff and students are only entitled to browse the material and should not download and/or print out a copy.

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this Course of Study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by Cambridge Theological Federation.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Course of Study: WCRE – Westfield Creeds

Title: *The Athanasian Creed*

Name of Author: J. N. D. Kelly

Name of Publisher: A. & C. Black

By the same Author

EARLY CHRISTIAN CREEDS

RUFINUS: A COMMENTARY ON
THE APOSTLES' CREED

EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES

A COMMENTARY ON
THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

THE ATHANASIAN CREED

The Paddock Lectures for 1962-3

BY

J. N. D. KELLY, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF ST EDMUND HALL, OXFORD
UNIVERSITY LECTURER IN PATRISTIC STUDIES

ADAM & CHARLES BLACK
LONDON

patre divinitatem et plenum ex matre hominem profitetur . . . neque enim ignorare debemus ipsum in saeculo secundum carnem creatum ex homine, qui sine initio secundum divinitatem . . . est generatus (*C. Ar. resp. ad ob. 3*).

¶ 33 De nostro enim illi est minor patre humanitas, de patre illi est aequalis cum patre divinitas (*Ep. 14, 18*).

¶ 35 f. Verbum enim habitans in homine non est mutatum in hominem (*Ad Tras. 1, 18*). In uno eodemque . . . Christo Iesu divinae humanaeque substantiae indivisa et inconfusa perfectio non negetur (*Ib. 1, 20*).

¶ 37 Deus mirabili virtutis opere ex duabus naturis, hoc est anima rationali et carne, unam naturam hominis composuit et in anima et carne unam personam hominis manere praecepit (*De incarn. 22*).

¶ 40 f. Homines . . . rationem reddituri sunt deo et pro suorum qualitate actuum recipient aut poenam aut gloriam . . . et procedent qui bona fecerunt in resurrectionem vitae, qui vero mala egerunt in resurrectionem iudicii (*De fide 40*).

CHAPTER III

HISTORY AND USE

1. First Appearance

UNTIL the thirties of the present century scholars were obliged to date the first trustworthy reference to the Athanasian Creed to the 7th century, and to look to the 8th for its first certain appearance. As we have remarked, they had detected parallels to it in documents much earlier than this, and had sometimes claimed that these were borrowings from it, or at least echoes of it. But it was always theoretically possible that the relationship was the other way about, the creed itself being dependent on the documents in question; and in any case there could be nothing approaching certainty in such guesses. It can now, however, be taken as established that the earliest witness to the *Quicumque* is Caesarius, the outstanding preacher and pastor who was primate of Arles from 502 (when he was only about thirty-two) to 542.

The credit for this belongs to G. Morin,¹ who in 1931 discovered, or rather rediscovered, at Stuttgart an important MS of c. 1100 (*Theol. Philos. fol. 201*—formerly Zwiefalten 49) containing a selection of Caesarius's sermons. Although the scribe of this particular MS, or possibly one of his predecessors, has made a number of arbitrary omissions and interpolations, it is clear from the table of contents, or *capitula*, at the beginning that the archetype must have included thirty-three sermons. This Zwiefalten collection, as we may call it, is closely related to the so-called homiliary of St Corbinian,² which comprised

¹ RB xlv, 1932, 207-19.

² Cf. G. Morin, *S. Caesarii Arelat. sermones I*, lxii-lxx (CCL 103).

sixty-eight or possibly seventy-two pieces, and may be regarded as a first draft of a Caesarian homiliary covering the liturgical year. As we know¹ that Caesarius made collections of his sermons 'appropriate to particular festivals and places', it is initially probable that he was himself responsible for compiling both these homiliaries. And this probability becomes virtual certainty when we observe that both are introduced by variants of the same preface written in his unmistakable style and breathing his characteristic spirit.

The immense significance of this conclusion comes to light when we notice two further facts about the Zwiefalten codex. In the first place, its version of the preface contains the striking sentence, 'And because it is necessary, and incumbent on them, that all clergymen, and laymen too, should be familiar with the Catholic faith, we have first of all written out in this collection the Catholic faith itself as the holy fathers defined it (*in libellis istis secundum quod sancti patres ipsam fidem catholicam definierunt imprimis scripsimus*), for we ought both ourselves frequently to read it and to instruct others in it'. The preface then concludes with an apology for the inefficiency of Caesarius's scribes, who are, he remarks, 'mere novices'. Then, in the second place, there follows immediately, as the second item in the miscellany (the preface itself is marked in red as the first), the Athanasian Creed itself. In the list of *capitula* it had been announced as *FIDES SANCTI ATHANASII*, and here it is placed under the heading *FIDES CATHOLICA SANCTI ATHANASII EPISCOPI*. Not unexpectedly, it is treated as a homily, its opening sentence having the preacher's address 'Brothers' (*fratres*) inserted into it, and in a number of places the wording has been altered slightly so as to make the style more sermon-like. To all intents and purposes, however, the text² remains substantially identical with that printed in Chapter II.

G. Morin's discovery was epoch-making for the study of the

¹ Cf. Cyprian of Toulon, *Vita Caesarii* 1, 55 (G. Morin, *S. Caesarii opera omnia* ii, 319).

² See Appendix A.

Quicunque. On the basis of linguistic parallels¹ between it and his writings, and also because of its frequent appearance in canonical collections emanating from Arles, scholars had often suspected a connexion between Caesarius and the creed; some had even hazarded the guess that he was its author. The Zwiefalten codex provides proof positive not only of his familiarity with it, but of the determined efforts he made to ensure its circulation among clergy and laity. This incidentally settles the question of the authenticity, generally disputed hitherto, of his tenth sermon,² which contains unmistakable excerpts from the Quicunque. There now seems no sound reason for denying it to him, since his knowledge of, and regard for, the creed have been demonstrated. The new evidence also has an important bearing on the authorship of the creed itself and on its original title; but the discussion of these issues must be postponed to later chapters. A further significant point which comes to light is that, in the eyes of Caesarius and his contemporaries, the creed was not, apparently, a liturgical piece, but a concise summary of orthodox teaching to be studied and mastered by the faithful.

2. The 6th and 7th Centuries

Although further evidence for the existence, and use made, of the Quicunque in the 6th century is often thought to be entirely lacking, an echo of it can possibly be overheard in the writings of Avitus of Vienne, who during his episcopate (c. 490-c. 519) was the champion of orthodoxy against Arianism in Burgundy, and much more probably in the confession of faith in the Trinity which Reccared, king of the Visigoths, included in his allocution to the third council of Toledo (589), at which he formally renounced Arianism.

Only a couple or so sentences of Avitus are relevant.

¹ Cf. list on pp. 31 f. above.

² CCL 103, 50-3: *Serm.* 244 in the Appendix to Augustine's sermons (PL 39, 2194-6).

Referring to the Holy Spirit, he remarks,¹ 'whom we read of as neither made, nor begotten, nor created' (*quem nec factum legimus, nec genitum, nec creatum*); and again,² 'We declare the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Son and the Father' (*a filio et a patre procedere*). Another passage,³ which goes on to mention 'the Catholic faith' (*fides catholica*), states that 'it belongs to the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Father and the Son'. These are just conceivably quotations from or reminiscences of γ . 23 of the Quicunque (cf. the verb 'we read'), but it is at least equally likely that Avitus is simply repeating what had by his day become theological clichés.

On the other hand, two passages in Reccared's confession seem to betray the influence of $\gamma\gamma$. 5 f. (with 21) and γ . 3 of the Quicunque respectively, and this possibility is strengthened by the fact that the confession depends on other creeds too (the Faith of Damasus⁴ and the *Libellus*⁵ of bishop Pastor). The passages run:

. . . sed persona alius sit
Pater qui genuit, alius sit Filius
qui fuerit generatus; unius
tamen uterque substantiae di-
vinitate subsistat. Pater ex
quo sit Filius ipse vero ex
nullo sit alio . . .

. . . sed sicut verae salutis
indiciu[m] est trinitatem in uni-
tate et unitatem in trinitate
sentire . . .

. . . so that the Father who
has begotten is one person, the
Son who is begotten is another,
but both subsist in the Godhead
of one substance. The Father
from whom the Son is derived
is himself from none other . . .

. . . but just as it is an evi-
dence of true salvation to per-
ceive the Trinity in the unity,
and the unity in the Trinity . . .

Even these texts give at best distant echoes of the Quicunque. When we come to the 7th century, we can marshal two much clearer and more impressive witnesses to its prestige and the use

¹ *Fragg. lib. de divin. s. spir.* (PL 59, 385; also MGH, *Auct. antiq.* vi, 6).

² *Ib.*

³ PL 59, 386.

⁴ See below, p. 58; for text, see Appendix D.

⁵ See below, pp. 56 f.

made of it. The first comes from Spain, being provided by the fourth council of Toledo summoned in 633 by the usurper Sisenand and presided over by Isidore of Seville. Its objects were political as well as religious, and the legislation enacted by the sixty-two bishops from Spain and Narbonne not only covered clerical discipline, the penitential system and the liturgy, but also regulated the position of the Jews and confirmed the transference of the royal power from Suintila to Sisenand. The first of its canons, however, consisted of a profession of faith composed of a Trinitarian section, a Christological section and an eschatological finale. The motive for publishing this dogmatic statement has often been taken to be the rebuttal of heresy, and A. E. Burn and others inferred that Priscillianism must have been the false teaching envisaged. But Priscillianism had been a dead issue ever since the council of Braga (563), so that it is difficult to believe that it provoked the bishops to define the faith afresh. The true explanation emerges in the preface to the proceedings, in which the assembled bishops state, 'Since we are holding a general council, the first utterance of our voice ought to be about God, so that after our confession of faith the ensuing business may be established as it were on a most firm foundation'.

Because of its meticulous construction and theological precision this creed has been called² 'the flower of the whole credal literature'. There is every likelihood that Isidore himself drafted it, for at every point it bears the imprint of his thought and language.³ What is of more concern to us is that it is indebted for its characteristic pattern and for several of its formulae to the so-called Faith of Damasus⁴ and the Quicunque. The main borrowings from the latter are printed below, with

¹ Mansi x, 615B.

² K. Künstle, *Antipriscillianiana* (Freiburg i.Br., 1905), 69 f. For the full Latin text, see Mansi x, 615 f.; Hahn, No. 179.

³ Cf. P. Séjourné, *St. Isidore de Séville* (Paris, 1929), 114-117; J. Madoz, *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* xxxiv, 1938, 18-20.

⁴ See below, p. 58; for text, see Appendix D.

an indication of the corresponding verses of the Athanasianum:

Cf. Quicumque, §§. 3 f. and 21 f.

... in divinitate unitatem
praedicantes nec personas
confundimus nec substantiam
separamus. Patrem a uullo
factum vel genitum dicimus;
Filium a Patre non factum sed
genitum asserimus; Spiritum
vero sanctum nec creatum
nec genitum sed procedentem
ex Patre et Filio profiteamur.

Cf. Quicumque, §§. 30 f.

Ipsam autem dominum
nostrum Iesum Christum, Dei
Filium . . . ex substantia
Patris ante saecula genitum . . .

Cf. Quicumque, §. 33

... aequalis Patri secundum
divinitatem, minor Patre se-
cundum humanitatem . . .

Cf. Quicumque, §§. 37 f.

... Deus et homo, non
autem duo Filii et Dei duo
... perferens passionem et
mortem pro salute nostra . . .

Cf. Quicumque, §. 42

Haec est catholicae eccle-
siae fides, hanc confessionem
conservamus atque tenemus:
quam quisquis firmissime
custodierit perpetuam salu-
tem habebit.

Clearly the Quicumque must have been well known, and its
authority established beyond question, for Isidore¹ to have

¹ References to Athanasius's creed appear in *Epp.* 6 and 8 attributed to Isidore (PL 83, 903 and 908), but the former is certainly apocryphal and the

... proclaiming the unity in
the Godhead we neither con-
fuse the persons nor divide the
substance. We declare the Father
to be made by none nor begot-
ten; the Son we affirm to be
not made by the Father but
begotten; the Holy Spirit we
profess to be neither created nor
begotten, but proceeding from
the Father and the Son.

But our Lord Jesus Christ
himself, Son of God . . . begot-
ten from the Father's substance
before the ages . . .

... equal to the Father in
respect of his divinity, less than
the Father in respect of his
humanity . . .

... God and man, but not
two Sons or two Gods . . .
enduring his passion, and death
for our salvation . . .

This is the faith of the Catholic
Church, this confession we pre-
serve and hold fast: which
whosoever shall most firmly
keep shall have everlasting salva-
tion.

made such extensive use of it in the council's profession of faith.
For our second 7th-century witness we turn northwards to
Autun, in Burgundy, the second synod of which made a direct
reference to the creed in its proceedings. This council was held
c. 670 (there is considerable doubt about the exact date, and
there is a wide margin of possibility) under the chairmanship
of the local bishop, Leudegarius (better known, to Englishmen
at any rate, as St Leger), its object being the reformation of
ecclesiastical discipline. The first of its canons decreed:¹

Si quis presbyter aut dia-
conus aut clericus symbolum
quod sancto inspirante Spiritu
apostoli tradiderunt et fidem
sancti Athanasii presulis in-
reprehensibiliter non recen-
suerit, ab episcopo condemp-
netur.

If any priest or deacon or
cleric cannot recite without mis-
take the creed which, inspired
by the Holy Spirit, the apostles
handed down, and the Faith
of the holy primate Athanasius,
he should be episcopally cen-
sured.

In the days before the antiquity of the Quicumque had been
demonstrated, it was entirely reasonable for scholars to have
doubts whether it was in fact the creed denoted by *fides sancti
Athanasii* in this passage, but the identification can be regarded
as absolutely certain nowadays. We have of course no means of
judging what the motive behind Leudegarius's action was, or
how far his decree represented a policy which was becoming
general. But it is interesting to notice that the function of the
Athanasian Creed is still, as in Caesarius's time a century and a
half previously, to serve as a catechetical instruction and test of
orthodoxy for (in this case) the clergy.

3. Further Developments

With the dawn of the 8th century references to the Quicum-
que multiply apace, and it is evident that an increasingly
latter either apocryphal or interpolated (cf. Séjourné, *op. cit.*, 73 f. and
94 f.).

¹ MGH, *Leg.* iii, *Concil.* i, 220.

extensive use was being made of it. The earliest MS to contain the text, Codex Ambrosianus O 212 sup., which came to Milan from the Irish-founded monastery at Bobbio, dates from the very beginning of the century, if not from the last decades of the 7th.¹ From now onwards, too, commentaries on the creed begin to make their appearance. The most ancient seems to be the Fortunatus Commentary,² which probably belongs to much the same epoch, although there is just a possibility that it may be even earlier. It survives in a large number of MSS, the most ancient being 9th century and connecting it with St Gallen and other Benedictine monasteries. The impression left by this and other commentaries is that the creed was still being treated as a compendious instruction in Catholic doctrine. It was as a variation of this use that Denebert, bishop-elect of Worcester, cited³ extracts from it (vv. 1, 3-6, 20-2, 24, 25) in token of his loyalty to the Catholic and apostolic faith at his consecration by Ethelhard, archbishop of Canterbury, c. 798.

By the Carolingian period its prestige as a summary of orthodox theological teaching stood enormously high, and the precedent set by the synod of Autun was being eagerly copied. There is abundant evidence that it was being singled out as one of several instruments for improving the professional competence of the clergy. A typical illustration is an ordinance⁴ attributed to Charlemagne which decreed, 'These are the things all churchmen are ordered to learn: first, the Catholic faith of St Athanasius . . .' The other items include the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the order of mass, etc. Another example is a canon⁵ of a synod held at Rheims in 852, under bishop Hincmar, requiring the clergy to memorize the creed, grasp its meaning, and be able to expound it in the popular speech. Many similar rulings by ecclesiastical authorities could be cited.⁶ About the

¹ Cf. C. H. Turner, *JTS* xi, 1910, 401.

² For the text and a discussion of the date, see A. E. Burn, *Texts and Studies* iv, i, 28-39; lvii-lxix.

³ British Museum MS Cleopatra E.1.

⁴ MGH, *Leg. ii, Capit. reg. Franc.* i, 235.

⁵ PL 125, 773.

⁶ Cf. A. E. Burn, *op. cit.*, xxiv-xxxiii.

same time, however, a new and highly significant development was taking place which was the natural offshoot of this insistence on clerical familiarity with the Quicunque. This was its insertion, along with the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, into psalters, a practice which seems to have begun in the latter part of the 8th century and to have become general in the 9th. Among noteworthy early psalters in which it appears (its usual position is at the end, with the canticles, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, etc.), we may mention the Golden Psalter of Charlemagne, now in the National Library at Vienna (cod. 1861), which the king had written out by the scribe Dagulf and sent as a present to pope Hadrian I (772-95), the Paris Psalter, which was copied 795-800 and now belongs to the Bibliothèque Nationale (cod. Lat. 13159), and the famous Utrecht Psalter (University of Utrecht), which was probably copied, and adorned with its remarkable illustrations, in the region of Rheims in the early 9th century.

The presence of the Quicunque in psalters was the visible token of an even more portentous move, its incorporation in the divine office itself. From now onwards it became an obligatory element in this, and as a result, assisted by the encouragement which Charlemagne gave to church music, it began to be sung as a canticle. We can trace the beginnings of this development in the *Capitula ecclesiastica* of Hatto (763-863), Charlemagne's friend and counsellor, bishop of Basle (807-23) and founder of the abbey there, which laid it down¹ 'that the faith of saint Athanasius be learned by priests and be recited by heart every Sunday at the first hour' (*ad primam horam*, i.e. at prime). His action was typical, and henceforth we find the Athanasian Creed in regular use throughout Europe in the office.

As usual in liturgical matters, Rome was conservative, and in his description² of the Roman office of prime, written c. 820, Amalarius of Metz refers only to the Apostles' Creed. The

¹ MGH, *Leg. ii, Capit. reg. Franc.* i, 363.

² *Liber offic.* 4, 2 (ed. J. M. Hanssens, *Studi e Testi* 139).

11th-century *Micrologus* is also silent about it, and it remains uncertain when Rome fell into line. Elsewhere there was great variation in the frequency with which recitation of the creed was required. In Cluniac circles the custom of singing it daily was introduced,¹ and according to John of Avranches² (†1079) this was strictly observed except from Christmas to the octave of the Epiphany and from Easter to Whitsun (*diebus Pentecostes*). Honorius of Autun³ (early 12th century) and Sicard of Cremona⁴ (†1215) were familiar with this usage, which also characterized the Sarum rite in England. The more general practice, however, as attested, for example, by cardinal Bernhard⁵ (12th century) and Durandus of Mende⁶ (†1296), was weekly recitation on Sundays at prime.

This new role of the Quicunque in church services in no way displaced its primitive function as an instruction for the clergy and test of the correctness of their belief. Its liturgical use, as well as its confessional contents, however, made people think it natural and proper to classify it with the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and hints of this appear for the first time in Raterius of Verona⁷ (†974). It was only in the 13th century, however, as the writings of men like Alexander of Hales⁸ (†1245) and the canonist Durandus of Mende⁹ show, that the custom of speaking of 'three creeds' (*tria symbola*, *triplex symbolum*, etc.) became general.

4. The Quicunque in the East

The history of the Quicunque in the west in the middle ages calls for no further discussion. It is time to explore how and

¹ Udalric, *Consuetudines Cluniac.* 1, 3 (PL 149, 646).

² *Lib. de offic. eccl.* 33 f. (PL 147, 31 f.).

³ *Gemma anim.* 2, 59 (PL 172, 634).

⁴ *Mitrale* 4, 6 (PL 213, 170).

⁵ *Ord. offic. eccl. Lat.* (ed. L. Fischer, 1916, p. 2).

⁶ *Rat. div. offic.* 5, 6 (ed. Boletho, Naples, 1849, p. 365).

⁷ *Itin.* 6 (PL 136, 588).

⁸ *Summa theol.* III, inq. 2, tract. 2, qu. 1, tit. 1 (ed. Coll. S. Bonaventurae, iv, 1122).

⁹ *Rat. div. offic.* 4, 25 (Boletho, pp. 206-11).

when it came to the knowledge of the eastern church, and what reception it found there.¹ The earliest MSS containing the complete Greek text date from the 14th century.² It is possible, however, that John Beccus, the pro-western patriarch of Constantinople (1275-82), knew a Greek version of the creed, for he quoted³ γ. 23 in the collection of patristic authorities he amassed in defence of the *Filioque*. For these reasons it has been conventional to ascribe its translation into Greek to the closing years of the 13th century at earliest. There are grounds, however, for supposing that this date needs to be pushed back at least a century.

From the very start of the great debate about the double procession western writers were fully conscious of the trump card they had in the Quicunque, in which Athanasius himself seemed to give the controverted doctrine his blessing. We can pass over the frequent appeals to it in polemical works by men like Alcuin⁴ (†804), Theodulf of Orléans⁵ (†821), Ratramnus of Corbie⁶ (†868) and Aeneas of Paris⁷ (†870). If their citations ever reached the Greeks, we can be sure that they did not induce them to cast a glance at the compromising document itself, or for that matter accept the fact of its existence. But there were other occasions between 800 and 1250 when it must have been forced on their attention. One was the famous incident⁸ in 808, when the Frankish monks installed on Mount Olivet were charged with heresy (the double procession, of course) and, having been invited to a conference with the Greek clergy of Jerusalem, produced the creed as one of the witnesses in their defence. Two and a half centuries later, in

¹ For a full discussion, see A. Palmieri, *Theologia dogmatica orthodoxa* (Florence, 1911), 1, 362-400; A. Malvy and M. Villar, *La Confession orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila* (Paris, 1927), 139-42; V. Laurent, *Échos d'Orient* xxxv, 1936, 385-404. This section is greatly indebted to Laurent's important article.

² Cf. V. Laurent, art. cit., 386 f.

³ *Epigraphae* (PG 141, 621).

⁴ *De process. san. spir.* 1; 3 (PL 101, 73; 82). If not by Alcuin himself, this book is by a contemporary.

⁵ *C. Graec. oppos.* 2, 3 (PL 121, 247).

⁶ *De spir. san.* (PL 105, 247).

⁷ *Lib. c. Graec.* 19 (PL 121, 701).

⁸ PG 94, 206 ff.; also PL 129, 1258 ff.

summer 1054, cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, writing at Constantinople, addressed his *Rationes de spiritus sancti processione* to the emperor Constantine IX (Monomachus), and included in it three extracts¹ from the creed. Not only did his manner of referring to it (cf. 'in his confession'; 'in the Catholic faith') seem to imply that the emperor knew the document, but he had the treatise itself translated into Greek for his benefit. Again, in 1176, another westerner, Hugh Etherian, who held an important place at the court of Manuel I (1143-80), when assembling a dossier of authorities on the double procession, gave² a prominent place on his list to the key v. 23 of the Quicumque, openly attributing it to the confession of 'the great Athanasius'. We are informed³ that he, too, had his book put into Greek and circulated in the east.

It is easy to point to other occasions in the late 12th and early 13th century when eastern ecclesiastics were brought face to face with the Athanasian Creed. Perhaps the most formal took place in 1234, when the envoys of pope Gregory IX invoked its⁴ authority in full council with the Greeks at Nympha. On all of those so far mentioned, however, it was, as we have observed, a question of fragmentary extracts, and we have no definite proof that the Orientals took any notice of them, much less had a complete Greek text at their disposal. An incident has come to light,⁵ however, which proves that a Greek version of the creed as a whole was in existence well before 1252. In that year two Cistercian (Latin) monks from Constantinople, visiting the emperor John III at Nicaea on the business of their order, surprised a copyist in the Greek convent of Hyacinthus there at work writing out the Quicumque in Greek. To their horror and indignation they noticed that in his version of v. 23 he had

¹ Text in A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios* (Paderborn, 1924), 99; 102; 104.

² *De haer. Graec.* 3, 21 (PL 202, 393).

³ Cf. his letter to Aimericus, patriarch of Antioch (PL 202, 230).

⁴ *Archivum historicum Franciscanum* xii, 1919, 455.

⁵ Cf. cod. Lat. Vat. 4066, f. 45 v.-46 r. (discovered by P. Loenertz, O.P., and printed by V. Laurent, art. cit., 403 f.).

omitted the *Filioque*, but they were soon relieved, indeed overjoyed, to discover that, notwithstanding his omission, the embarrassing words *καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ* stood in the original he was copying. What is immediately important for our purpose is that this original is described in the account, several times over, as *liber vetustissimus*, *exemplum vetustissimum*, or *liber antiquus*. These adjectives must imply a considerable age, and as there seems no reason to doubt the truth of the story, we are entitled to infer that Greek texts of the complete creed had been available in the east at any rate from the latter years of the 12th century.

The subsequent history of the Quicumque in the east can be rapidly summarized. John Beccus's acquaintance with it has already been mentioned.¹ As a result of the appeal made to it both by him and by other western and pro-western theologians, the east could no longer ignore the creed, and its attitude underwent several remarkable alternations down the centuries. At first the line taken (e.g. by J. Beccus's deadly foe, George Moschambar²) was to reject the Athanasian authorship with contempt and argue (*odium theologicum* having for once generated critical acumen) that Athanasius could not have written a Latin creed, that it was nowhere listed among his works, and that its theology differed from his. Gradually, however, a change of front was effected. In the late 14th and early 15th century it became the Orthodox position that the Quicumque was indeed authentically Athanasian (some³ even added the precision that Athanasius had drafted it at Nicaea), but that the clause asserting the double procession was a barefaced Latin interpolation. As a result it was respected, with the appropriate modification of v. 23, as a compendium of sound teaching, and although not used liturgically was printed in the appendix to the Greek *Horologion*, which contains the recurrent portions of

¹ See above, p. 45.

² Cf. the text cited by V. Laurent, art. cit., 402. For G. Moschambar himself, see V. Laurent, *Échos d'Orient* xxviii, 1929, 129-58.

³ E.g. Joh. Cyparissotes, *Expos. mat.* 9, 3 (PG 152, 927).

the office for the ecclesiastical year. We even find Peter Moghila, the Orthodox patriarch of Kiev (1633-46), in his authoritative *Confession*,¹ appealing to it against the *Filioque*! Finally, a reaction set in when it was discovered that, in the judgment of the best scholarship, the Quicumque was after all of western origin, and had nothing whatever to do with Athanasius. Orthodox theologians began once again covering it with abuse, and the attitude of the Greek archimandrite N. Technopoulos may be considered typical of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Writing in 1904, he maintained² that the Athanasianum was one of the principal obstacles to the union of the Greek and Anglican churches, and branded it as 'a symbol without authority, fabricated by papist theologians to bolster up the fallacious doctrine of the *Filioque*'. As the present century advanced, a more objective and temperate view seems to have gained ground. In the *Great Hellenic Encyclopaedia*,³ for example, it is listed with the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds with the addition of the laconic comment, 'It was not composed by the great Athanasius'.

5. The Reformation and After

For completeness, a note on the fortunes of the Quicumque in the west since the middle ages may be useful. By the 16th century it counted as one of the three classic creeds of Christendom, its composition by Athanasius being still taken for granted. In his reform of the breviary (1568) pope Pius V confirmed its use at prime every Sunday, and in the leading Protestant communions it was received with respect. In the Book of Concord (*Konkordienbuch*), for example, which was published in 1580 as a definitive statement of Lutheran orthodoxy, it was given a place of honour alongside the Apostles'

¹ Cf. Qu. 71.

² 'Ἡ δογματικὴ θέσις τῆς Ἀγγλικανῆς ἐκκλησίας καθ' αὐτὴν ἐξεταζομένη, pp. 633-44.

³ Published in Athens in 1933; the relevant note will be found s.v. Σύμβολον.

and Nicene Creeds. In the Latin translation published in 1583 the three were described, in distinction from the Augsburg Confession and other more recent formularies, as *tria symbola Catholica seu oecumenica*. Similarly Zwingli's *Fidei Expositio*, presented to the emperor Charles V in 1531, the Gallican Confession adopted at the First National Synod of Protestants at Paris in 1559 (the first draft was the work of John Calvin), and the Belgic Confession adopted at Antwerp in 1566 and by the synod of Dort in 1619, were all united in recognizing the authoritative character of the Quicumque. In England the eighth of the XXXIX Articles declared it to be one of the creeds which 'ought thoroughly to be received and believed'; and the Book of Common Prayer ordered its recitation at matins, in place of the Apostles' Creed, on thirteen holy days, chosen apparently as being at roughly equal distances from each other. On the other hand, the Presbyterians in Scotland and the churches generally which use the Westminster Confession accord it no formal recognition.

The liturgical use of the creed has been largely confined to the Roman and Anglican communions, and in both there have been significant changes in recent years. In his revision of the breviary pope Pius X (1903-14) drastically reduced its prominence at prime, requiring it to be recited only on the lesser Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost (except when the commemoration of a double or an octave fell on these days), and on Trinity Sunday. As a result of the further revision carried out in the reign of pope Pius XII (1939-58), it is now said only on Trinity Sunday, its place being directly after the psalms at prime, before the concluding antiphon. In the Church of England the original rubric of the Book of Common Prayer has never been legally changed, but in spite of the fierce passions aroused in the late 19th century the recitation of the Quicumque has in practice been very widely abandoned by churchmen of all schools of thought. Surprisingly enough, the rejected Prayer Book of 1928 enlarged the scope of its use, increasing

the number of selected festivals from thirteen to fifteen and permitting it to be said on three of them at evening as an alternative to morning prayer. At the same time it made its recitation entirely optional, on certain days allowed the Trinitarian or Christological section alone to be said, and stipulated that when the new translation provided was employed the so-called damnatory clauses (¶¶. 2 and 42) might be omitted.

Practice in other parts of the Anglican communion has varied considerably. For example, the Scottish prayer book (1929) makes the saying or singing of the Quicumque obligatory on Trinity Sunday only; on other days it may be used, in whole or in part, as an anthem or procession. The Canadian prayer book (issued in 1960) is unique in permitting it to be used instead of the Apostles' Creed at morning prayer on any day of the year, no particular day being specified. On the other hand, the creed has been altogether excluded by the Church of Ireland from its services, and has no place in either the liturgy or the fundamental formularies of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. As this book consists of lectures originally delivered in a seminary in New York in which bishop Samuel Seabury's name is held in honour, it may be appropriate to recall that its exclusion from the latter was accomplished shortly after the War of Independence, during the critical years when the colonial churches were reorganizing themselves after their constitutional separation from the Church of England. Thus in the 'Proposed Book' approved by the Convention of 1785 (at which the states of Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Virginia and South Carolina were represented) it was recommended¹ that 'the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds be entirely omitted' from morning prayer, and that no mention of either should appear in the revised Articles. With the climate of opinion distinctly latitudinarian and veering towards rationalism, these and similar alterations attracted widespread support,

¹ W. S. Perry, *The History of the American Episcopal Church* (Boston, Mass., 1855), vol. ii, 108 and 111.

although they were unpalatable in the highest degree to the more conservative churches of the New England states and, in particular, to bishop Seabury, of Connecticut, who stoutly resisted them. The matter came up finally in October, 1789, when the General Convention meeting at Philadelphia addressed itself to the preparation of a new liturgy. Bishop Seabury argued that the retention of the creed was desirable as a protection against heresy, and induced the house of bishops to agree to its discretionary use. This compromise was vetoed, however, in the house of deputies; and bishop Seabury and his New England allies were eventually obliged to surrender the creed, although 'with great reluctance'.¹

¹ For the history, see W. White, *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* (New York, 2nd ed., 1836), 149-55.