D-45
W2993
1724

12.19.05.

From the Library of
Professor Samuel Miller
in Memory of
Judge Samuel Miller Breckinridge
Presented by
Samuel Miller Breckinridge Long
to the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

SCC
1351

A

CRITICAL HISTORY

OF THE

ATHANASIAN CREED.

REPRESENTING THE OPINIONS OF

ANTIENTS AND MODERNS

CONCERNING IT:

With an Account of the MANUSCRIPTS, VERSIONS, *and* COMMENTS, *and such other particulars as are of moment for the determining the* Age, *and* Author, *and* Value *of it, and the Time of its* Reception *in the Christian Churches.*

By DANIEL WATERLAND. D.D.

CHANCELLOR *of the* CHURCH *of* YORK, *and Chaplain in ordinary to His* MAJESTY.

CAMBRIDGE,

Printed at the UNIVERSITY PRESS for CORN. CROWNFIELD, Printer to the UNIVERSITY: And are to be sold by J. KNAPTON, R. KNAPLOCK, W. and J. INNYS Bookſellers in LONDON. 1724.



To His GRACE,

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP

OF

YORK,

PRIMATE of ENGLAND

and METROPOLITAN.

MY LORD,



AM desirous of sending these Papers abroad under your GRACE's Name, in confidence you will be a *Patron* to Them, as you have been to the *Author*. I would make their way short and easy to the *publick* Esteem, by introducing them first into your

GRACE's Acquaintance, and good Opinion: Which if they have once the Honour to obtain, I may then be assured that they will be both *useful* to the *World*, and acceptable with all *good Men*; the Height of my Ambition.

THE *Subject*, my Lord, is the *Athanasian Creed*, the most accurate System of the *Athanasian*, that is, the *Christian* Faith: Of which your GRACE is, by your Station and Character, by Duty and Office, and, what is more, by Inclination and Principle, and real Services, the watchful *Guardian*, and *Preserver*.

THE Happy Fruits of it are visible in the slow and inconsiderable Progress that the *New Heresy* has been able to make within your *Province*; where it died, in a manner, as it first arose, and no sooner began to lift up its Head, but sunk down again in Shame and Confusion: As if the Plenty of *good Seed* sown had left

left no room for *Tares*, or They could take no root in a *Soil* ſo well *Cultivated*.

WHILE your GRACE is promoting the Honour and Intereſts of our Holy Faith, in the *Eminent* Way, by the Wiſdom of your *Counſels*, the Authority of your *Precepts*, and the Brightneſs of your *High Example*; I am endeavouring, in ſuch a way as I can, to contribute ſomething to the ſame *Common Cauſe*, tho' it be but ſlight and ſmall, tho' it be only reviewing the *Fences*, and ſurveying the *Outworks*; which is the moſt I pretend to in the *Hiſtory* here preſented.

WHAT Advantage *Others* may reap from the *Publication*, will remain in ſuſpence: But I am ſure of One to *my ſelf* (and I lay hold of it with a great deal of pleaſure) The *Opportunity* I thereby have of returning my *publick* Thanks to your GRACE for your *publick* Favors.

Tho'

The DEDICATION.

Tho' This, my *Lord*, is but a ſcanty Expreſſion for them, and far ſhort, where the engaging *Manner* and *Circumſtances*, known but to *Few*, and not to be underſtood by *Many*, make ſo conſiderable an Addition in the whole, and almoſt double the Obligation upon

My LORD,

Your GRACE's *moſt obliged,*

moſt dutiful,

and moſt obedient Humble Servant,

DANIEL WATERLAND.

THE
PREFACE.

WHAT I here present the Reader with, will not require much Preface. The Introduction intimates the Design, and Use, and Partition of the Work. The Appendix, which is an additional Inlargement beyond my first Design, gives account of it self. I subjoin Two Indexes, for the Ease and Convenience of such Persons as may be disposed, not only to read these Sheets, but to study the Subject. I should scarce have thought of making Indexes to so small a Treatise, had I not found the like in Tentzelius, upon the same Subject, and to a smaller Tract than This is. His were of considerable use to Me, as often as I wanted to review any particular Author, or Passage, or to compare distant Parts, relating to the same Things, one with another. The Benefit therefore which I reap'd from his Labours, I am willing to pay back to the Publick by mine.

As to the Subject of the following Sheets, I make no question of its well deserving the Thoughts and Consideration of every studious Reader; having before pass'd through the Hands of many the most learned, and most judicious Men, and such as would not misemploy their Time, and Pains upon a Trifle. As to the present Management of it, it must be left to the Reader to judge of, as He sees Cause.

I should throw in a few previous Hints about the Chronology of the several Parts, and the Rules I have set to my self in it. For our Saxon Kings, where I have occasion to mention them, I

content

content my ſelf with Tyrrell's Tables, *printed at the end of Dr.* Hickes's Theſaurus. *They are the beſt for giving a ſhort and ſuccinct view of the whole, and are accurate enough for my purpoſe; tho' They may ſometimes differ a little from the other, and perhaps truer, Accounts. However, now I have given this previous notice of it, there will be no danger of leading any Perſon into miſtakes on that Head.*

For the Chronology *of the other Parts, I have conſulted the beſt Authors; endeavouring to fix it with as much Accuracy as I could. Wherever I could certainly determine the Age of any Tract,* printed *or* manuſcript, *to a* Year, *I ſet down That Year: Where I could not do it (as in Manuſcripts one ſeldom can) I take any probable year within the Compaſs of Time when an* Author *is known to have* flouriſh'd; *or for a Manuſcript, any probable year within ſuch a* Century, *or ſuch a* King's Reign *wherein the Manuſcript is reaſonably judged to have been written: And I generally chuſe a* round *number, rather than otherwiſe, in ſuch indefinite Caſes and Inſtances.*

Thus for example, firſt in reſpect of Authors: *There is a Comment of* Venantius Fortunatus, *upon the* Athanaſian *Creed, which I have reprinted in my* Appendix. *I cannot fix the Age of it to a Year, no nor to 20 Years. All that is* certain *is, that it was made between* 556 *when* Fortunatus *firſt went into the* Gallican *Parts, and* 599 *when He was advanced to the Biſhoprick of* Poictiers. *Within This wide compaſs, I chuſe the year* 570. *If any one ſhall rather chuſe* 580, *or* 590, *I ſhall not diſpute it with Him, nor doth any thing very material depend upon it: But if any good reaſon can be given for taking ſome other year rather than* 570, *I ſhall immediately acquieſce in it.*

I ſhall

I ſhall mention one Inſtance more, where the Compaſs of Time is not near ſo wide. In fixing the Date of one of the Pieces of Ratram, *which I refer to in page* 21, *I guide my ſelf by the Pontificate of Pope* Nicholas *I. who ſat in the See from* 858 *to* 867: *And ſo I place* Ratram *in* 864, *upon probable preſumption, which may ſuffice. But if it be certain that Pope* Nicholas's *Letter to the* Gallican *Biſhops bore date ſo low as* 867 (*which I have ſince found reaſon to believe*) *then* Ratram *ought to be placed rather in* 868; *which I here intimate in the way of Correction.*

As to Manuſcripts, *it is well known there is no fixing them preciſely to a Year, meerly from the* Hand, *or,* Character: *And there are but few, in compariſon, that carry their own certain Dates with them. The beſt Judges therefore in theſe matters, will think it ſufficient to point out the* King's Reign, *or ſometimes the* Century, *wherein a Manuſcript was written: And in the very antient ones, above* 1000 *years old, They will hardly be poſitive ſo much as to the* Century, *for want of certain diſcriminating marks between Manuſcripts of the Vth, VIth, and VIIth Centuries.*

It may be ask'd then, why I pretend to fix the ſeveral Manuſcripts, *hereafter to be mention'd, to certain years in the margin; thoſe that carry no certain Dates, as well as the other that do? I do it for* order *and* regularity, *and for the more* diſtinct *perception of Things; which is much promoted and aſſiſted by this orderly ranging them according to* Years. *At the ſame time, the intelligent Reader will eaſily underſtand where to take a thing as certain, and where to make Allowances. It is ſomething like the placing of Cities, Towns, Rivers,* &c. *in a* Map, *or a* Globe: *They have all their* certain *Places there, in ſuch or ſuch preciſe*

Degrees of Longitude, *and* Latitude; *which perhaps ſeldom anſwer to the ſtrict Truth of Things, or to a mathematical exactneſs. But ſtill it ſerves the purpoſe very near as well as if every thing had been adjuſted with the utmoſt nicety: And the Imagination and Memory are mightily relieved by it. Thus much I thought proper to hint in vindication of my* Method, *and to prevent any deception on one Hand, or miſconſtruction on the other. I have, I think, upon the whole, generally gone upon the faireſt and moſt probable preſumption, and according to the moſt correct Accounts of the knowing, and moſt accurate Men. But if I have any where through inadvertency, or for want of better information, happen'd to miſtake in any material part, the beſt way of apologizing for it, will be to correct it the firſt opportunity, after notice of it.*

As to meer Omiſſions, *They will appear more, or fewer, according to Mens different Judgments, or Opinions what to call an* Omiſſion. *I might have inlarged, conſiderably, the firſt* Chapter, *which treats of the* Learned Moderns: *Tho' ſome perhaps will think it too large already, and that it might better have been contracted. I omitted ſeveral* Moderns *mention'd by* Tentzelius, *whoſe profeſs'd Deſign was to take in all: Mine was only to take the* principal, *or as many as might ſuffice to give the Reader a full and diſtinct* Idea *how this matter had ſtood, with the learned* Moderns, *for* 80 *years laſt paſt. However, I muſt ingenuouſly own, that Some were omitted purely becauſe at That Time I had not met with Them: Otherwiſe* Ruelius *of the year* 1675, *who has ſpent above* 20 *Pages, in* 4to, *particularly upon the ſubject* (Concil. Tom. 2. *p.* 646. *to p.* 670) *had certainly merited a place in my* Table *of* Moderns. *Nevertheleſs there is ſcarce an obſervation of any moment, or ſo much as a Thought in*

all

all his Pages, but what may be found, with improvements, among Thoſe whom I have mention'd: which, I believe, will prove equally true of any other whom I have not taken into my Liſt.

There may be Omiſſions *of another kind, which really render the work in ſome meaſure* defective, *and which I could not help. There are undoubtedly ſeveral uſeful materials,* concealed *in Libraries, which, could I have come to the knowledge of them, might have contributed to the perfection of the following Treatiſe. I would have waited ſome Time longer for Things of That kind, but that I thought, the ſureſt and the ſhorteſt way to draw out thoſe hidden Stores, was firſt to ſhow by This, as by a* Specimen, *of what uſe They may really be when brought to Light. And now I ſhall be very glad if what hath been here done may but prove an uſeful Introduction to more, and larger Diſcoveries upon the ſame Subject. If Any thing conſiderable ſtill remains, either in private Hands, or publick Repoſitories; Any thing that may be ſerviceable to clear up ſome* dark Part, *or to correct any* Miſtake, *or to confirm and illuſtrate any important* Truth *relating to the Subject; I ſhall be very thankful to the Perſon that ſhall oblige either* Me *with private notice of it, or the* Publick *with new Improvements on This Head.*

Cambridge. Magd. Coll.
Octob. 25. 1723.

ERRATA.

Page.	Line	For	Read
6.	4.	704.	703.
9.	24.	VIth.	Vth.
22.	10.	Adelbertus.	Adalbertus.
39.	8.	N.	N. 2339.
44.	13.	*confidently averr'd*	*faid*
53.	31.	decauratum.	deauratum.
58.	36.	defcribentur.	defcribantur.
87.	33.	Bellario.	Bullario.
108.	37.	negatæ.	negata.
109.	ult.	104.	124.
164.	9.	contente.	content.
Index		Riculphius.	Riculphus.
		Julianus. 168.	72.

A

CRITICAL HISTORY

OF THE

ATHANASIAN CREED.

THE

INTRODUCTION

SHEWING

The Design and Use of this Treatise: with the Method and Partition of it.



MY Design is, to inquire into the *Age*, *Author*, and *Value* of that Celebrated *Confession*, which goes under the Name of *The Athanasian Creed.* The *general* Approbation it hath long met with in the Christian Churches, and the *particular* Regard which hath been, early and late, paid to it in our *Own*, (while it makes a part of our *Liturgy*, and stands recommended to us in our *Articles*) will, I doubt not, be Considerations sufficient to justify an Undertaking of this kind: Provided only, that the Performance be answerable, and that it fall not short of its Principal Aim, or of the just Expectations of the ingenuous, and candid Readers. No one will expect more of me than my *present* Materials, such as I could procure, will furnish me with; nor any greater *certainty* in an Essay of this nature, than Things of this kind will admit of. If a reasona-

ble Diligence has been uſed in *collecting*, and due pains in *digeſting*, and a religious Care in *building* thereupon (more than which I pretend not to) it may, I hope, be ſufficient with all equitable Judges.

Many learned and valuable Men have been before employed in the ſame Deſign: But their Treatiſes are moſtly in *Latin*, and ſome of them very ſcarce, and hard to come at. I know not that any one has hitherto attempted a juſt Treatiſe upon the Subject in our own Language, however uſeful it might be to the *Engliſh* Readers; and the more ſo at This time when the Controverſy about the *Trinity* is now ſpread abroad among all Ranks and Degrees of Men with us, and the *Athanaſian Creed* become the Subject of common, and ordinary Converſation. For theſe Reaſons, I preſumed, an *Engliſh* Treatiſe might be moſt proper and ſeaſonable: Tho' otherwiſe, to avoid the unſeemly mixture of *Engliſh*, and *Latin* (which will here be neceſſary) and becauſe of ſome parts which none but the *Learned* can tolerably judge of; it might be thought more proper rather to have written a *Latin* Treatiſe, and for the uſe only of Scholars. However, there will be nothing very material but what an *Engliſh* Reader may competently underſtand: And I ſhall endeavor to lay before Him all that has been hitherto uſefully obſerved, or diſcover'd upon the Subject, that He may want nothing which may be conceiv'd of any moment for the inabling Him to form a true Judgment. What I borrow from Others ſhall be fairly acknowledged as I go along, and referr'd to it's proper Author, or Authors; it being as much my Deſign to give an *Hiſtorical* Account of what others have done, as it is to ſupply what They have left undone, ſo far as my preſent materials, leiſure, and opportunities may inable me to do it. Now, to preſent the Reader with a Sketch of my Deſign, and to ſhow Him how one part is to hang upon another, my method will be as follows.

I. Firſt, in order to give the clearer *Idea* of what hath been already done, and of what may be ſtill wanting, I begin with recounting the ſeveral Conjectures, or Diſcoveries of the *Learned Moderns*.

2. Next

II. Next, to enter upon the matter it Self, and the Evidence proper to it, I proceed to lay down the direct *Teſtimonies* of the *Antients* concerning the *Age*, *Author*, and *Value* of This Creed.

III. To theſe I ſubjoin an Account of the antient *Comments* upon the ſame Creed, being but another kind of *Ancient Teſtimonies*.

IV. After Theſe follows a brief recital of the moſt antient, or otherwiſe moſt conſiderable, *Manuſcripts* of This Creed, which I have either ſeen my ſelf, or have had notice of from Others. This part, I fear, will be in ſome meaſure imperfect, for want of a fuller ſearch into the many Excellent Libraries we have in *England*; tho' I have ſpent ſome pains in ſearches of that kind, and have been obliged to the kind offices of Friends in ſearching for me.

V. Next to the *Manuſcripts* of the Creed it ſelf, I ſhall inquire alſo into the antient *Verſions* of it, printed, or manuſcript; which will be alſo very ſerviceable to our main Deſign.

VI. I come in the next place to treat of the antient *Reception* of this *Creed*, or *Formulary*, in the Chriſtian Churches; as being a Point of great moment, and what may be more *certainly* determin'd than the Time of its *Compoſition*, and may give great Light into it.

VII. Theſe preliminaries ſettled, to introduce to what follows, I then fall directly to the darkeſt part of all; namely to the Inquiry after the *Age*, and *Author* of the *Creed*: which I diſpatch in Two diſtinct *Chapters*.

VIII. Next, I lay before the *learned* Reader the Creed it ſelf in its *Original* Language, with the moſt conſiderable *various Lections*; together with *ſelect* Paſſages from antient Writers, either parallel to Thoſe of the Creed, or explanatory of it. And leſt the *Engliſh* Reader ſhould appear to be neglected, I ſubjoin the Creed in *Engliſh* with a running *Engliſh* Commentary, ſerving much the ſame purpoſe with what is intended by the *Latin* Quotations going before.

IX. I conclude all with a Brief Vindication of our own Church in receiving, and ſtill retaining This excellent Formu-

lary of the Chriſtian Faith; anſwering the moſt *material* Objections which have been made againſt us, on that Account; and ſhewing the Expediency, and even Neceſſity of retaining This Form, or ſomething equivalent, for the preſervation of the Chriſtian Faith againſt Hereſies. The Reader, I hope, will excuſe it, if in compliance with Cuſtom, and to ſave my ſelf the Trouble of Circumlocution, I commonly ſpeak of it under the Name of the *Athanaſian Creed*; not deſigning thereby to intimate, either that it is a *Creed* ſtrictly and properly ſo called, or that it is of *Athanaſius*'s compoſing: Both which points will be diſcuſs'd in the Sequel.

CHAP. I.

The Opinions of the learned Moderns *concerning the* Athanaſian *Creed.*

A. D. 1642 IN reciting the Opinions of the learned *Moderns*, I need go no higher than *Gerard Voſſius*: who in his Treatiſe *de Tribus Symbolis*, publiſh'd in the Year 1642, led the way to a more ſtrict and critical Inquiry concerning This Creed than had been before attempted. The Writers before Him, moſt of Them, took it for granted that The Creed was *Athanaſius*'s, without troubling Themſelves with any very particular Inquiry into it: And Thoſe few who doubted of it, or aſcribed it to Another, yet enter'd not cloſely into the merits of the Cauſe, but went upon looſe Conjectures rather than upon any juſt Rules of true and ſolid Criticiſm. It will be ſufficient therefore to begin our Accounts from *Voſſius*, who, ſince the Time of his writing, has been ever principally mention'd, and chiefly quoted, by as many as have written upon the Subject, as being the firſt and moſt conſiderable Man that has enter'd deep into it, and treated of it like a Critick. He endeavour'd to ſift the matter thoroughly, as far as He was well able to do from *Printed* Books: As to *Manuſcripts* He either wanted leiſure, or opportunity to ſearch for Them. The Reſult of his Inquiries concluded in the following particulars, ſome of them dubiouſly, all

all of them modeſtly offer'd, or propoſed by Him. 1. That the *Athanaſian* Creed is not *Athanaſius*'s. 2. That it was originally a *Latin* Compoſure, and of a *Latin* Author or Authors. 3. That it was made in the 8th or 9th Century, in the Time of *Pepin*, or of *Charles* the *Great*; and probably by ſome *French* Divine. 4. That the firſt Time it was produced, under the Name of *Athanaſius*, at leaſt, with any Aſſurance and Confidence of it being his, was in the Year 1233, when Pope *Gregory* the IXth's Legates pleaded it at Conſtantinople in favor of the *Proceſſion* againſt the *Greeks*. 5. That it ſcarce ever obtain'd in any of the Chriſtian Churches before the Year 1000. How far *Voſſius* was miſtaken in his Accounts, will appear in the Sequel. Thus far muſt be allow'd Him, that He managed the Argument with great Learning and Judgment, made a good uſe of ſuch Materials as He was poſſeſs'd of; and tho' He was not very happy in determining the *Age* of the Creed, or the Time of its *Reception*, yet He produced ſo many, and ſuch cogent Arguments againſt the Creed's being originally *Greek*, or being made by *Athanaſius*, that they could never be anſwer'd.

The learned *Petavius*, who in the Year 1622 (when He publiſh'd *Epiphanius*) had fallen in with the Common Opinion of This Creed's being *Athanaſius*'s, did yet afterward in his Treatiſe of the *Trinity*, publiſh'd in the Year 1644, ſpeak more doubtfully of it; in the mean while poſitive that it was written in *Latin*.[a] 1644

The next conſiderable Man, and who may be juſtly called a *Firſt Writer* in this Argument, as well as *Voſſius*, was our learned *Uſher*. He had a good Acquaintance with Libraries, and Manuſcripts; and was able from Thoſe Stores to produce new Evidences which *Voſſius* knew not of. In the Year 1647, He printed his *Latin* Tract *de Symbolis*, with a prefatory Epiſtle to *Voſſius*. He there appeals to the Teſtimonies of *Ratram* of *Corbey*, and *Æneas* Biſhop of *Paris*, neither of them at That Time made publick, as alſo to *Hincmar*'s of *Rheims* (which had been publiſh'd but had eſcaped *Voſſius*'s obſervation) to prove that This Creed had been confidently cited under the Name of *Athanaſius* almoſt 1647

a Petavius de Trin. l. 7. c. 8. p. 392.

400 Years before the Time of Pope *Gregory*'s Legates, the Time ſet by *Voſſius*. And further, by Two Manuſcripts found in the *Cotton* Library, He thought He might carry up the Antiquity of the Creed to the Year 704, or even to 600. In ſhort, He ſcrupled not to ſet the Date of it above the Year 447: For He ſuppoſes a Council of *Spain*, held in that Year, to have been acquainted with it, and to have borrowed the *Filioque* from it.[a] Thus far He, without any more particular determination about either the *Age*, or the *Author*.

1647 About the ſame Time Dr. *Jeremy Taylor* (afterwards Biſhop of *Down* and *Connor*) publiſh'd his *Liberty of Propheſying*, wherein He expreſſes his Doubts whether the Creed be juſtly aſcribed to *Athanaſius*. But as He had never ſeen *Uſher*'s Treatiſe, nor indeed *Voſſius*'s, nor was at that Time furniſh'd with any proper Aſſiſtances to inable Him to make any accurate Inquiries into This matter; it may ſuffice juſt to have mention'd Him, in regard to the deſerved Name He has ſince born in the Learned World.

1659 *Leo Allatius*, about This Year, printed his *Syntagma de Symbolo S. Athanaſii*; which no Doubt muſt be a very uſeful Piece, eſpecially in relation to the Sentiments of the *Greek* Churches, and the Reception of this Creed amongſt them: But I have never ſeen it; only I learn from *Tentzelius* (who yet could never get a ſight of it) and *Fabricius*, that ſuch a Piece was written by *Allatius* in *Modern* Greek; in 12°. publiſh'd at *Rome* in 1658, or 1659. It appears to be very ſcarce, ſince none of the Learned who have ſince written upon This Creed have either referr'd to it, or given Extracts out of it, ſo far as I have obſerved: excepting only ſomething of that kind at *Rome*, A. D. 1667, by The *Congregation for propagating the Faith*.[b]

1663 Cardinal *Bona*, ſome Years after, in his Book *de Divina Pſalmodia*, makes frequent mention of This Creed, touches but ſlightly upon the Queſtion about its *Age* or *Author*, takes ſome

a *Uſſer: de Symbolis, p.* 24. N. B. *Uſher* went upon the ſuppoſition that the Words, *a patre, filioque procedens*, were genuine; and not foiſted into the *Confeſſion* of That Council; as They now appear to have been, after a more careful view of the MSS. of beſt Note, and greateſt Antiquity.

b *Vid.* Tentzel. judic. &c. p. 147.

curſoty

curſory notice of what *Voſſius* had ſaid, but nevertheleſs aſcribes it to *Athanaſius*, as being compoſed by Him while in the Weſtern parts, *Teſte Baronio*; reſting his Faith upon *Baronius*, as his Voucher.[a]

Our very Learned Biſhop *Pearſon* in his *Expoſition* of the *Creed*, occaſionally delivers his Opinion, that the *Athanaſian* Creed was written in *Latin*, and by ſome Member of the *Latin* Church.[b] 1669

Our next Man of Eminent Character is *Paſchaſius Queſnel*, a celebrated *French* Divine. In the Year 1675, He publiſh'd his famous Edition of Pope *Leo*'s Works, with ſeveral very valuable *Diſſertations* of his own. His XIVth contains, among other matters, a particular Inquiry about the Author of this Creed. He aſcribes it to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, the *African*[c]; and ſo well defends his Poſition that He has almoſt drawn the Learned World after Him. He is look'd upon as the Father of that Opinion, becauſe He has ſo learnedly and handſomly ſupported it: But He is not the firſt that eſpouſed it. For *Labbe*, about 15 Years before, had taken notice of Some that had aſcribed This Creed to *Vigilius*, at the ſame Time ſignifying his Diſſent from Them[d] 1675

The Year after *Queſnel*, *Sandius*, the famous *Arian*, printed a Second Edition of his *Nucleus* &c. with an *Appendix*: Wherein He corrects his former Judgment[e] of This Creed, taken implicitely from *Voſſius*; and allows, nay contends and inſiſts upon it, that This Creed was not only known, but known under the Name of *Athanaſius*, as high at leaſt as the Year 770[f]. He aſcribes it upon Conjecture to one *Athanaſius*, Biſhop of *Spire* in *Germany*, who died in the Year 642. 1676

I ought not to paſs over our very learned *Cudworth*, tho' He has entred very little into the point before us. He gives his judgment, in paſſing, of the Creed commonly called *Athanaſian*; that it *was written a long time after* Athanaſius *by ſome other Hand*.[g] 1678

a *Bona* de Divina Pſalmod. Cap. 16. Sect. 18. p. 864.
b *Pearſon on the Creed. Articl.* 8. p. 324. ed. 3.
c Queſnel. Diſſert. XIV. p. 729. &c.
d Labbæi Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. 2. p. 477.
e *Vid.* Sandii Nucl. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. p. 256.
f Sandii Append. p. 35.
g *Cudworth* Intellect. Syſt. p. 620.

Henricus

1680 *Henricus Heideggerus* is a Writer whom I have not ſeen, but find mention'd with particular reſpect by *Caſim: Oudin*; upon whoſe credit, I here take notice of his publiſhing at *Zurich* ſome *Select Diſſertations*, and his aſcribing this Creed to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, in his XVIIIth Diſſertation. Tom. 2.

1681 *Wolfgang Gundling*, a *German* writer, the Year after publiſh'd a ſmall Tract, containing Notes upon a little Piece relating to the Religion of the *Greek* Churches, written by *Euſtratius Johannides Zialowski*. What is chiefly valuable in *Gundling*, is his Account of the *Greek* Copies of this Creed; (printed ones I mean) giving us ſix of them together. He occaſionally expreſſes his Doubts whether the Creed be *Athanaſius*'s, or of ſome later Writer.[a]

1683 I may next mention our celebrated Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian, Dr. *Cave*, who about this Time publiſh'd his *Lives of the Fathers*, and particularly of *Athanaſius*. His account of This Creed is, that it *was never heard of in the World till above* 600 *years after* Athanaſius *was dead; but barely mention'd then, and not urged with any confidence till above* 200 *years after, when the Legates of Pope* Gregory *the IXth produced and pleaded it at Conſtantinople*.[b] The learned Doctor, it is plain, took this Account from *Voſſius*, and had never ſeen *Uſher*'s Treatiſe; which one may juſtly wonder at. Five years after, in his *Hiſtoria Literaria*, He allows that This Creed had been ſpoken of by *Theodulphus*, which was within 436 years of *Athanaſius*: But not a Word yet of any elder Teſtimony, or Manuſcript, tho' Both had been diſcovered, and publickly taken notice of, before This Time. He ſtill contends that the Creed obtain'd not in the Chriſtian Churches before the Year 1000, nor became famous every where before 1233; but inclines nevertheleſs to aſcribe it to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, who flouriſhed about the Year 484.[c]

1684 Doctor *Comber*, in his Book intituled, *A Companion to the Temple*, cloſes in with the old Tradition of the Creed being

a *Gundlingii* notæ in Euſtratii Johannidis Zialowski Delineationem Eccleſiæ Græcæ. p. 68. &c.

b Cave: *Life of Athanaſius*. Sect. VI. Art. 10.

c Cave. Hiſtor. Literar. Vol. 1. p. 146. 371.

Atha-

Athanasius's; repeating the most considerable Arguments usually pleaded for that Perswasion.[a]

To Him I may Subjoin Bishop *Beveridge*, who perhaps about This Time might write his Thoughts on the Creed, in his *Exposition of* our *Articles*, publish'd after his Death. He was so diligent and knowing a Man, that had He been to consider This matter in his *later* years, He would certainly have given a more particular and accurate Account than that which now appears. He ascribes the Creed to *Athanasius*, but with some diffidence; and thinks it might have been originally a *Greek* Composition, but that the old Greek Copies have been lost, and that the only remaining ones are *Versions* from the Latin.[b] 1684

Cabassutius, in his *Notitia Ecclesiastica*, hath a short Dissertation about the Author of This Creed.[c] He contents Himself with repeating *Quesnel*'s Arguments, to prove that *Athanasius* was not the Author of it, determining nothing farther, save only that it was originally a *Latin* Composure, known and cited by the Council of *Autun* about the Year 670. 1685

The celebrated *Dupin*, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, summs up the reasons usually urged to prove that the Creed is none of *Athanasius*'s, and assents to them. He determines with confidence that it was originally a *Latin* composition, and not known till the VIth Century; repeats Father *Quesnel*'s reasons for ascribing it to *Vigilius Tapsensis*, and acquiesces in them, as having nothing more certain in this matter.[d] 1687

About the same Time *Tentzelius*, a learned *Lutheran*, publish'd a little Treatise upon the Subject;[e] setting forth the several Opinions of Learned Men concerning This Creed. He is very full and accurate in his Collection, omitting nothing of moment that had been said before Him by any of the learned *Moderns*, but bringing in some further materials, from his own searches, to add new Light to the Subject. He determines nothing; but 1687

a Comber *Companion to the Temple* p. 144.
b Beveridge *on the 8th Article*. p. 162.
c Cabassutii Notit. Eccles. Dissert. 19. p. 54.
d Dupin Eccles. Histor. Vol. II. p. 35.
e *Erneſti Tentzelii* judicia Eruditorum De Symb. Athanas. studiose collecta. *Gothæ*, An. D. 1687.

leaves it to the Reader to make a Judgment as He ſees cauſe from a full view of the Pleadings.

1688 I may place here the learned *Pagi*, who in his *Critick* upon *Baronius* paſſes his judgment of This Creed: [a] which being the ſame with *Queſnel*'s, and little more than Repetition from Him, I need not be more particular about Him.

1690 *Hamond L'Eſtrange*, in his *Alliance of Divine Offices*, falls in with the now current Opinion; [b] that The Creed is not *Athanaſius*'s, nor later than the VIth Century.

1693 *Joſeph Anthelmi*, a learned *Paris* Divine, firſt began directly to attack *Queſnel*'s Opinion; and to ſap the reaſons on which it was founded. He publiſh'd a particular *Diſſertation* to That purpoſe, [c] of which I have ſeen ſeveral, and pretty large Extracts, but could never yet get the Book it ſelf however deſirous of it, or however ſerviceable it might be to my Deſign. He aſcribes the Creed to *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, who flouriſh'd in the Year 434.

1695 The famous *Tillemont* wrote after *Anthelmius*, for He makes mention of his Treatiſe, and examines his *Hypotheſis*: And yet it could not be long after; for He died in the Year 1697. He commends *Mr. Anthelmi*'s performance as a conſiderable Work; but inclines ſtill rather to *Queſnel*'s Opinion. All that He pronounces *certain*, is, that the Creed is none of *Athanaſius*'s, but yet as old as the *ſixth* Century, or older. [d]

1698 In the Year 1698, *Montfaucon* publiſh'd his new and accurate Edition of *Athanaſius*'s Works. In the ſecond *Tome*, He has an Excellent Diſſertation upon This Creed; the beſt that is extant, either for *order* and *method*, or for Plenty of uſeful Matter. The Sum of his Judgment is, that the Creed is certainly none of *Athanaſius*'s, nor yet *Vigilius Tapſenſis*'s, nor ſufficiently proved to belong to *Vincentius Lirinenſis*; but probably enough compos'd about the Time of *Vincentius*, and by a *Gallican* Writer or Writers. [e]

a *Pagi*. Critic. in Baron. An. 340. n. 6. p. 440.
b *L'Eſtrange Alliance of Divine Offices*. Ch. 4. p. 99.
c *Joſephi Anthelmii* Diſquiſitio de Symbolo Athanaſiano. *Pariſ.* 1693. 8vo.
d *Tillemont*. Memoires. Tom. 8. p. 667.
e Symbolum *Quicunque* Athanaſio incunctanter abjudicandum arbitramur ——

In

In the ſame year, *Ludovic: Antonius Muratorius*, an *Italian* 1698
Writer, publiſh'd a ſecond Tome of *Anecdota* out of the *Ambroſian* Library at *Milan*. Among other Manuſcripts there, He had met with an Antient *Comment* upon This Creed, aſcribed to *Venantius Fortunatus*, who was Biſhop of *Poictiers* in *France* in the VIth Century. He publiſhes the *Comment*, together with a *Diſſertation* of his own concerning the Author of the Creed: concluding, at length, that *Venantius Fortunatus*, the *certain* Author of the *Comment*, might poſſibly be Author of the *Creed* too. He entirely rejects the opinion of Thoſe that would aſcribe it to *Athanaſius*, and diſapproves of *Queſnel*'s perſwaſion about *Vigilius Tapſenſis*; but ſpeaks favourably of *Anthelmi*'s, as coming neareſt to the Truth.[a]

Fabricius, in his *Bibliotheca Græca*,[b] (highly valued by all Men 1712
of *Letters*) gives a Summary Account of the Sentiments of the Learned relating to This Creed. His Concluſion from all is, that thus far may be depended on as *certain*; that the Creed was not compoſed by *Athanaſius*, but long after in the Vth Century, wrote originally in *Latin*, and afterwards tranſlated into *Greek*.

In the ſame year, the learned *Le Quien* publiſh'd a new E- 1712
dition of *Damaſcen*, with *previous Diſſertations* to it. In the firſt of theſe, He has ſeveral very conſiderable Remarks, concerning the *Age*, and *Author* of the *Athanaſian* Creed. He appears inclinable to aſcribe it to Pope *Anaſtaſius* I, (who entred upon the Pontificate in the year 398) becauſe of ſome antient Teſtimonies, as well as Manuſcripts, carrying the Name of *Anaſtaſius* in the Title of the Creed: But He is poſitive that the Creed muſt be ſet as high as the Age of St. *Auſtin*, *Vincentius*, and *Vigilius*.[c] And, as *Anthelmius* before had made light of the ſuppo-

Afro itaque *Vigilio* nihil eſt quod ſymbolum *Quicunque* tribuatur. ——— non ægrè quidem conceſſerim *Vincentii ætate* editam fuiſſe illam Fidei profeſſionem. — Haud abs re conjectant Viri eruditi in *Gallis* illud (*ſymbolum*) fuiſſe elucubratum. *Montf.* Diatrib. p. 723.

a Hæc & ſimilia pluribus pertractavit eruditiſſimus *Anthelmius*, cujus opinioni, quorumnam eruditorum ſuffragia acceſſerint, me penitus fugit: Fateor tamen ad veritatem omnium maxime illam accedere. *Murator.* Tom. 2. p. 222.

b Fabricii Biblioth. Græca, Vol. V. p. 315.

c Omnino fateri cogor *Auguſtini*, *Vincentii*, & *Vigilii* ætate extitiſſe expoſitionem latinam Fidei, quæ poſtmodum *Athanaſio Magno* attribui meruerit. *Le Quien* Diſſert. 1. p. 9.

sition that the *internal Characters* of the Creed show it to be later then *Eutyches*; He makes as light of the other supposition of the *internal Characters* setting it later than *Nestorius*.

1714 *Natalis Alexander*'s new Edition of his *Ecclesiastical History*, bears Date A. D 1714. He had examin'd into our present Question some years before (about 1676 when his first Edition came abroad) subscribing to the Opinion of *Quesnel*: And He does not appear to have alter'd his mind since. He takes notice of *Anthelmi*'s Opinion, and speaks respectfully of it, as also of the *Author*; but prefers the other Hypothesis.[a]

1715 I ought not here to omit the very worthy and learned Mr. *Bingham*, to whom the *Publick* is so highly indebted for his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, collected with great Judgment, and digested into a clear Method. He had a proper Occasion to say something of the *Athanasian* Creed, in passing, and very briefly. He observes, that it was not composed by *Athanasius*, but by a later and a *Latin* writer; and particularly *Vigilius Tapsensis*; referring to such learned Moderns as I have above mention'd, for the proof of it; and giving no more than short Hints of their reasons.[b]

1719 The learned Dr. *Clarke* of St. *James*'s, in his second Edition of his *Scripture Doctrine*,[c] gives us his last Thoughts in relation to This Creed. Referring to Dr. *Cave*, He informs us, that *This Creed was never seen till about the year* 800, *near* 400 *years after the Death of Athanasius* (They are his own words) *nor was received in the Church till so very late as about the year* 1000. Yet Dr. *Cave* does not say, *was never seen* (for He Himself ascribes it to *Vigilius Tapsensis* of the 5th Century) but only that it was not *quoted* before the year 800, or nearly; which yet is a very great mistake. What the learned Doctor intended by saying *about the year* 800, and yet only *near* 400 *years after the Death of Athanasius*, or, as He elsewhere[d] expresses it, *above* 300 *years after the death of Athanasius*, I do not under-

a Natal. Alexand. Eccl. Hist. Tom. IV. p. 111.
b Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*. Vol. IV. p. 118. &c.
c Clarke's *Script. Doctr.* p. 379 2d. Ed.
d Clarke's *Scrip. Doctr.* p. 447. 1st. Ed.

stand;

ſtand; but muſt leave to Thoſe that can compute the Diſtance between 373 (the lateſt year that *Athanaſius* is ever ſuppoſed to have lived) and the year 800. I am perſwaded, the Doctor was thinking, that if *Athanaſius* had lived to the year 400, then the Diſtance had been juſt 400 years; but as he died 27 years before, the Diſtance muſt be ſo much the *leſs*, when it is quite the *contrary*.

The laſt Man that has given his Sentiments in relation to This Creed, is *Caſimirus Oudinus*, in his new Edition of his *Supplement* (now called a *Commentary*) to the *Eccleſiaſtical* Writers. I need ſay no more than that He does not ſeem to have ſpent much pains in re-examining this Subject, but reſts content with his firſt Thoughts; aſcribing the Creed, with *Queſnel*, to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*. [a] 1722

Theſe are the principal *Moderns* that have fallen within my Notice: And of theſe, the moſt conſiderable are *Voſſius*, *Uſher*, *Queſnel*, *Tentzelius*, *Anthelmius*, *Tillemont*, *Mountfaucon*, *Muratorius*, and *Le Quien*; as having particularly ſtudied the Subject, and ſtruck new Light into it, either furniſhing freſh *materials*, or improving the old by *new* Obſervations. Some perhaps may wiſh to have the ſeveral Opinions of the Moderns thrown into a narrower Compaſs: For which reaſon I have thought it not improper to ſubjoin the following *Table*, which will repreſent all in one view, for the eaſe and conveniency of every common Reader.

[a] *Vid.* Oudin Commentar. de Scriptor. Eccl. Vol. 1. p. 345. 1248. 1322.

A. Dni

A. D.	Writers	Author of the Creed.	what Century compos'd in	What Year compos'd.	When reciev'd.
1642	Voſſius	A *Latin* Author		not Before 600[a]	A D. 1000
1644	Petavius	Doubtful			
1647	*Biſhop* Uſher		Vth	Before 447	Before 852
1647	*Biſhop* Taylor	not *Athanaſius*			
1659	Leo Allatius				
1663	*Card.* Bona	*Athanaſius Alex.*	IVth	340	
1665	*Biſhop* Pearſon	A *Latin* Author			
1675	Paſchaſ. Quelnel	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth	484	Before 670
1676	Sandius	*Athanaſ.* of *Spire*	VIIth	Before 642	Before 770
1678	Dr Cudworth	not *Athanaſius*	After the IVth		
1680	Heideggerus	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth	484	
1681	Wolf Gundling	Doubtful			
1683	Dr Cave	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth	484	1000
1684	Dr Comber	*Athanaſius Alex*	IVth	336	
1684	*Biſhop* Beveridge	*Athanaſius Alex.*	IVth		Before 850
1685	Caballutius	A *Latin* Author			Before 670
1687	Dupin	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth	484	
1687	Tentzelius	Doubtful			
1688	Pagi	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth		
1690	Ham. L'Eſtrange	not *Athanaſius*		Before 600	
1693	Anthelmius	*Vincentius Lirinenſ.*	Vth	Before 450	
1695	Tillemont	not *Athanaſius*	VIth, or ſooner		
1698	Montfaucon	A *Gallican* writer	Vth		Before 670
1698	Ant. Muratorius	*Venant. Fortunatus*	VIIth	570	800
1712	Fabricius	A *Latin* Author	Vth		663
1712	Le Quien	*Anaſtaſius* I.	IVth, or Vth	Before 401	
1714	Natal. Alexander	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth	484	
1715	Mr Bingham	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth		670
1719	Dr Clarke	Doubtful	VIIth, or VIIIth		1000
1722	Oudin	*Vigilius Tapſenſis*	Vth	484	

a *According to* Voſſius's *laſt Thoughts, in a poſthumous Work:* Neque ante annum fuiſſe Sexcenteſimum, fuſe oſtendimus in libro de Symbolis. *Voſſ.* Harm. Evang. *l.* 2. *c.* 13. *p.* 215.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Antient Teſtimonies.

HAVING taken a view of the *Moderns*, in relation to the Creed, we may now enter upon a Detail of the *Antients*, and their *Teſtimonies*; by which the *Moderns* muſt be tried. My Deſign is to lay before the Reader all the *Original* Evidence I can meet with, to give any Light either into the *Age*, or *Author* of the Creed, or its *Reception* in the Chriſtian Churches; that ſo the Reader may be able to judge for Himſelf concerning the *Three* particulars now mention'd, which are what I conſtantly bear in my Eye, producing nothing but with a view to one, or more of them.

Antient Teſtimonies have been pretended from *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Gaudentius Brixienſis*, St. *Auſtin*, and *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*, of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Centuries. But they have been ſince generally, and juſtly exploded by the *Learned*, as being either *Spurious*, or *foreign* to the Point; and therefore I conceive it very needleſs to take any further notice of them. As to *Quotations* from our Creed, or *Comments* upon it, falling within the compaſs of the Centuries now mention'd; if there be any ſuch, They ſhall be conſider'd under other Heads, diſtinct from That of *Antient Teſtimonies*, properly ſo called, to be treated of in This *Chapter*.

The oldeſt of this kind, hitherto diſcovered, or obſerved, is 670
That of the *Council* of *Autun* in *France*, under *Leodegarius*, or St. *Leger*, the Biſhop of the Place in the VIIth Century. There is ſome Diſpute about the year when the Council was held, whether in 663, or 666, or 670. The laſt is moſt probable, and moſt generally embraced by learned Men. The words of this Council, in *Engliſh* run thus: "If any *Presbyter*, *Deacon*, *Subdeacon*,

a Si quis Presbyter, Diaconus, Subdiaconus, vel Clericus *Symbolum* quod Sancto inſpirante Spiritu *Apoſtoli* tradiderunt, & *Fidem Sancti Athanaſii Præſulis* irreprehenſibiliter non recenſuerit; ab Epiſcopo condemnetur. *Auguſtodun. Synod.* Harduin. Tom. 3. p. 1016.

"or *Clerk*, doth not unreprovably recite the Creed which the "*Apoſtles* deliver'd by Inſpiration of the Holy-Ghoſt, and alſo "*The Faith of the holy Prelate Athanaſius*, let Him be cenſured "by the Biſhop."[a] By *The Faith of Athanaſius* is here meant what we now call the *Athanaſian Creed*; as may be reaſonably pleaded from the *Titles* which This Creed bore in the earlier Times, before it came to have the name of a *Creed:* which *Titles* ſhall be exhibited both from Manuſcripts, and written evidences in the Sequel. Yet it muſt not be diſſembled that *Papebrochius*, a learned Man, and whom I find cited with Approbation by *Muratorius*,[a] is of opinion that the *Faith of Athanaſius*, here mention'd, means the *Nicene Creed*, which *Athanaſius* had ſome Hand in, and whereof He was the great Defender. I can by no means come into his Opinion, or allow any force to his reaſonings. He asks; why ſhould the *Nicene* Creed be omitted, and not mention'd with the *Apoſtles*? And why ſhould the *Athanaſian*, not then uſed in the *Sacred* Offices, be recommended ſo carefully, without a word of the *Nicene?* I anſwer, becauſe it does not appear that the *Nicene* Creed was ſo much taken notice of at That Time in the *Gallican* Churches, while the *Apoſtolical*, or *Roman* Creed, made uſe of in Baptiſm, in the *Weſtern* Churches, inſtead of the *Nicene* (which prevailed in the *Eaſt*) in a manner ſuperſeded it: Which no one can wonder at who conſiders how prevailing and univerſal the Tradition had been in the *Latin* Church, down from the 5th Century at leaſt, that the *Apoſtolical* Creed was compoſed by the 12 Apoſtles, and therefore as *ſacred*, and of as great Authority as the inſpired writings themſelves. Beſides that it appears from *Hincmar*, who will be cited in his place, that it was no ſtrange Thing, even ſo low as his Time, about 850, to recommend the *Athanaſian Creed* along with the *Apoſtles*, without a word of the *Nicene*. And why

a Atqui, ut eruditiſſime adnotavit Cl. P. *Papebrochius*, in Reſponſ. ad exhibitionem Error. par. 2. Art. 13. n. 3. verbis illis *Fidem S. Athanaſii*, minime Symbolum *Athanaſianum* deſignatur, ſed quidem *Nicænum*, in quo elaborando plurimum inſudaſſe *Athanaſium* veriſimile eſt. Etenim cur *Apoſtolico* Symbolo commendato *Nicænum* prætermiſiſſent *Auguſtodunenſes* Patres? Cur *Athanaſiani Symboli*, cujus tunc nullus erat uſus in ſacris, cognitionem exegiſſent, *Nicænumque* ne uno quidem verbo commemoraſſent? *Murator.* Anecdot. Tom. 2. p. 223.

ſhould

ſhould it be thought any objection againſt the *Athanaſian* Creed, that it was not at That Time received into the *Sacred Offices* (ſuppoſing it really was not, which may be queſtion'd) when it is certain that the *Nicene* was not yet received into the *Sacred Offices* in *France*, nor till many years after, about the Time of *Pepin*, or of *Charles* the *Great?* There is therefore no Force at all in the Argument of *Papebrochius:* But there is this ſtrong prejudice againſt it, that the *Title* there given is a very common Title for the *Athanaſian Creed*, and not for the *Nicene*. Nor would the Fathers of that Council have been ſo extravagantly fond of the name of *Athanaſius*, as to think it a greater Commendation of the Creed of *Nice* to call it after Him, than to call it the *Nicene*. There is then no reaſonable Doubt to be made but that the Council of *Autun*, in the *Canon*, intended the *Athanaſian Creed*; as the beſt Criticks, and the generality of the Learned have hitherto believed.

But there are other Objections of real weight againſt the Evidence built upon This *Canon*. 1. *Oudin* makes it a queſtion whether there was ever any Council held under *Leodegarius*, a Suffragan Biſhop under the Arch-Biſhop of *Lyons*, having no *Metropolitical* Authority.[a] But it may ſuffice, if the Council was held at *Autun*, while He was Biſhop of the place, a good reaſon why He ſhould be particularly mention'd; eſpecially conſidering the worth and Fame of the Man: To ſay nothing of the dignity of his *See*, which from the Time of *Gregory* the *Great*, had been the *Second*, or next in dignity to the Metropolitical See of *Lyons*. Nor do I perceive any Force in *Oudin*'s objection againſt St. *Leger*'s holding a *Dioceſan* Synod (for a *Provincial* Synod is not pretended) tho' He was no *Metropolitan*. 2. A ſtronger Objection is, that the *Canon* we are concern'd with, cannot be proved to belong to the Council held under *Leodegarius*. It is not found among the *Canons* of that Council publiſh'd by *Sirmondus* from the Manuſcripts of the Library of the Church of *Angers*, but it is from another Collection, out of the Library of the Monaſtery of St. *Benignus* of *Dijon*, with This Title only; *Canones Auguſtodunenſes*: So that one

a Oudin. Comment. de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. 1. p. 348.

cannot be certain whether it belongs to the Synod under St. *Leger*, or to ſome other Synod of *Autun* much later. It muſt be own'd that the Evidence can amount to no more than probable preſumption, or conjecture. Wherefore *Dupin*,[a] *Tentzelius*,[b] *Muratorius*,[c] and *Oudin*[d] do not ſcruple to throw it aſide as of too ſuſpected credit to build any thing certain upon: And even *Queſnel*[e] expreſſes ſome diſſatisfaction about it; only, in reſpect to ſome great Names, ſuch as *Sirmondus*, *Peter Le Lande*, *Godfr. Hermantius*, &c. He is willing to acquieſce in it. To whom we may add *Labbe*[f], *Le Cointe*[g], *Cabaſſutius*,[h] *Pagi*,[i] *Tillemont*,[k] *Montfaucon*,[l] *Fabricius*,[m] *Harduin*,[n] and our learned Antiquary Mr. *Bingham*:[o] who all accept it as genuine, but upon *probable* perſwaſion, rather than *certain* Conviction. Neither do I pretend to propoſe it as clear and undoubted Evidence, but probable only, and ſuch as will be much confirm'd by other Evidences to be mention'd hereafter.

760 *Regino*, Abbot of *Prom* in *Germany*, an Author of the 9th, and 10th Century, has, among other Collections, ſome *Articles of Inquiry*, ſuppoſed *by Baluzius* the Editor to be as old, or very nearly, as the Age of *Boniface* Biſhop of *Mentz*, who died in the year 754. In thoſe Articles, there is one to this purpoſe: "Whe-"ther the Clergy have by Heart *Athanaſius's Tract upon The Faith* "*of the Trinity*, beginning with, *whoſoever will be ſaved*[p] &c. This Teſtimony I may venture to place about 760, a little after the Death of *Boniface*.

a Dupin. Eccl. Hiſt. Vol. 2. p. 35.
b Tentzel. Judic. Erud. p. 61. &c.
c Murator. Anecdot. Ambroſ. Tom. 2. p. 223.
d Caſim. Oudin. Vol. 1. p. 348.
e Queſnel. Diſſert. XIV. p. 731.
f Labb. Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. 2. p. 478.
g Le Cointe. Annal. Franc. ad Anno 663. n. 22.
h Cabaſſut. Notit Eccl. Diſſert. 19. p. 54.
i Pagi Crit. in Baron. Ann. 340 n. 6.
k Tillemont Memoires. Vol. 8. p. 668.
l Montfauc. Diatrib. p. 720.
m Fabric. Bibl. Græc. Vol. 5. p. 316.
n Harduin. Concil. Tom. 3. p. 1016.
o Bingham. Origin. Eccl. Vol. 4. p. 120.
p Si *Sermonem Athanaſii Epiſcopi de Fide Sanctæ Trinitatis*, cujus initium eſt, *Quicunque vult Salvus eſſe*. memoriter teneat. *Regin.* de Diſcipl. Eccleſiaſt. 1.

The

The Council of *Frankfort*, in *Germany*, in their 33d Canon 794
give orders, that "The *Catholick Faith of the holy Trinity*, and "*Lord's Prayer*, and *Creed* be ſet forth and delivered to all.[a]

Voſſius[b] underſtands the *Canon* of the Two Creeds *Nicene* and *Apoſtolical*. But I know not why the *Apoſtolical*, or *Roman*, Creed ſhould be emphatically called *Symbolum Fidei*, *The Creed*, in oppoſition to the *Nicene*; nor why the *Nicene* ſhould not be called *a Creed*, as well as the other, after the uſual way. Beſides, that *Fides Catholica* &c. has been more peculiarly the *Title* of the *Athanaſian* Creed: And it was no uncommon Thing, either before or after This Time, to recommend it in this manner together with the *Lord's Prayer*, and *Apoſtle's* Creed, juſt as we find here. And nothing could be at that Time of greater ſervice againſt the Hereſy of *Felix* and *Elipandus* (which occaſion'd the calling of the Council) than the *Athanaſian* Creed. For which reaſons, till I ſee better reaſons to the contrary, I muſt be of opinion that the Council of *Frankfort* in their 33d Canon intended the *Athanaſian* Creed, which *Charles* the *Great* had a particular reſpect for, and had preſented in Form to Pope *Adrian* I. above 20 years before; as we ſhall ſee in Another Chapter.

Theodulphus, Biſhop of *Orleans* in *France*, has a Treatiſe of the 809
Holy-Ghoſt, with a Preface to *Charles* the *Great*, written at a Time when the Diſpute about the *Proceſſion* began to make Diſturbance. He brings ſeveral Teſtimonies in favor of the Proceſſion *from the Son*, out of *Athanaſius*; and, among others, a pretty large part of the *Athanaſian* Creed, from the words, *The Father is made of none* &c. to, *He therefore that will be ſaved muſt thus think of the Trinity*,[c] incluſive.

An Anonymous Writer of the ſame Time, and in the ſame 809
Cauſe, and directing himſelf to the ſame Prince, makes the ſame uſe of the *Athanaſian* Creed, in the following words; "St. *Athanaſius*, in the *Expoſition of the Catholick Faith*, which "That great maſter wrote Himſelf, and which the Univerſal

a Ut *Fides Catholica Sanctæ Trinitatis*, & *Oratio Dominica*, atque *Symbolum Fidei* omnibus prædicetur, & tradatur. *Concil.* Francf. Can. 33.

b Voſſius de tribus Symb. Diſſert. 3. c. 52. p. 528.

c Item idem —— *Pater a nullo eſt factus* &c. uſque ad *Qui vult ergo Salvus eſſe* &c. Theodulph. apud Sirmondum. Oper. Tom. 2. p. 978.

"Church profeſſes, declares the Proceſſion of the Holy-Ghoſt "from the Father and Son, thus ſaying; *The Father is made* "*of none*[a] &c." This I cite upon the credit of *Sirmondus* in his Notes to *Theodulphus*.

809 It was in the ſame year that the *Latin* Monks of *Mount Olivet* wrote their apologetical Letter to Pope *Leo* III, juſtifying their Doctrine of the Proceſſion *from the Son*, againſt one *John* of *Jeruſalem*, a Monk too, of another Monaſtery, and of an Oppoſite perſwaſion. Among other Authorities, They appeal to *The Faith of Athanaſius*, that is, to *The Creed*, as we now call it. This I have from *Le Quien*, the learned Editor of *Damaſcen*, who had the Copy of that Letter from *Baluzius*, as He there ſignifies.[b]

820 Not long after, *Hatto* otherwiſe called *Hetto*, and *Ahyto*, Biſhop of *Baſil* in *France*, compoſed his *Capitular*, or Book of *Conſtitutions*, for the regulation of the Clergy of his Dioceſs. Amongſt other good Rules, This makes the 4th; "That They "ſhould have the *Faith of Athanaſius* by Heart, and recite it at "the *Prime* (that is, at 7 *a Clock in the Morning*) every Lord's Day.[c]

820 *Agobardus* of the ſame Time, Archbiſhop of *Lyons*, wrote againſt *Felix Orgelitanus*; where He occaſionally cites part of the *Athanaſian* Creed. His words are: "St. *Athanaſius* ſays, "that except a Man *doth keep* the Catholick Faith *whole and* "*undefiled, without doubt He ſhall periſh everlaſtingly.*[d]

852 In the ſame Age, flouriſhed the famous *Hincmar*, Arch-Biſhop of *Rheims*; who ſo often cites, or refers to the Creed we are ſpeaking of, as a ſtanding Rule of Faith, that it may be need-

a Incertus Autor quem diximus, hoc ipſo utens teſtimonio, *Beatus*, inquit, *Athanaſius, in Expoſitione Catholicæ Fidei*, quam ipſe egregius Doctor conſcripſit, & quam univerſalis confitetur Eccleſia, Proceſſionem Spiritus Sancti *a Patre & Filio* declarat, ita dicens: *Pater a nullo eſt factus* &c. Sirmond. Op. Tom. 2. p. 978. Conf. p. 967.

b In *Regula* Sancti *Benedicti* quam nobis dedit Filius veſter *Domnus Karolus*, quæ habet Fidem ſcriptam de Sancta & inſeparabili Trinitate; *Credo Spiritum Sanctum Deum verum ex Patre procedentem & Filio:* Et in Dialogo quem nobis veſtra Sanctitas dare dignata eſt ſimiliter dicit. Et in *Fide S. Athanaſii* eodem modo dicit. *Monachi* de Monte Oliv. apud *Le Quien* Diſſert. Damaſc. p. 7.

c IVto. Ut *Fides Sancti Athanaſii* a Sacerdotibus diſcatur, & ex corde, Die Dominico ad *Primam* recitetur. Baſil. Capitul. apud Harduin. Tom. IV. p. 1241.

d Beatus *Athanaſius* ait; Fidem Catholicam *niſi quis integram, inviolatamque ſervaverit; abſque dubio in æternum peribit.* Agobard. adv. Felic. c. 3. ed. Baluz.

Ieſs

leſs to produce the particular Paſſages. I ſhall content my ſelf with one only, more conſiderable than the reſt for the Uſe that is to be made of it hereafter. He directs his Presbyters, "to learn *Athanaſius*'s *Treatiſe of Faith* (beginning with *whoſo-* "*ever will be ſaved)* to commit it to memory, to underſtand its "meaning, and to be able to give it in *common* words; [a]that is, I ſuppoſe, in the *vulgar Tongue*. He at the ſame Time recommends the *Lord*'s *Prayer*, and (*Apoſtle*'s) *Creed*, [b]as I take it, without mentioning the *Nicene*: Which I particularly remark for a reaſon to be ſeen above. It is farther obſervable, that tho' *Hincmar* here gives the *Athanaſian* Formulary the name of a *Treatiſe of Faith*; yet He elſewhere[c] ſcruples not to call it (*Symbolum*) a *Creed*: And He is, probably, as *Sirmondus* obſerves,[d] the firſt Writer who gave it the name it bears at This Day. Which, I ſuppoſe, may have led *Oudin* into his miſtake, that *no writer before* Hincmar *ever made mention of this Creed*;[e] a miſtake, which, tho' taken notice of by *Tentzelius*[f] in the year 1687, He has neverthleſs again and again repeated in his laſt Edition, the Year before This. 864

About the ſame Time, and in the ſame Cauſe, *Ratram*, or *Bertram*, Monk of *Corbey* in *France*, made the like uſe of This Creed, calling it *A Treatiſe concerning the Faith*.[g] 865

In the ſame Age, lived *Anſcharius*, Monk alſo of *Corbey*; and afterwards Arch-Biſhop of *Hamburgh* and *Breme* in *Germany*. Among his dying Inſtructions to his Clergy, He left This for one; that they ſhould be careful to recite *The Ca-*

a Unuſquiſque Presbyterorum Expoſitionem *Symboli*, atque *Orationis Dominicæ*, juxta Traditionem Orthodoxorum Patrum plenius diſcat——Pſalmorum etiam verba, & Diſtinctiones regulariter, & ex corde, cum Canticis conſuetudinariis pronuntiare ſciat. Necnon & *Sermonem Athanaſii de Fide*, cujus initium eſt, *Quicunque vult Salvus eſſe*, memoriæ quiſque commendet, ſenſum illius intelligat, & verbis communibus enuntiare queat. Hincm. Capit. 1. Tom. 1. p. 710. ed. Sirmond.

b *Vid.* Hincm. Opuſc. ad Hincmar. Laudunenſem. Tom. 2. p. 473.

c *Athanaſius* in *Symbolo* dicens &c. de *Prædeſtin.* Tom. 1. p. 309.

d Sirmond. Not. in Theodulph. p. 978.

e Oudin. Commentar. Vol. 1. p. 345. 1322.

f Tentzel. judic. Eruditor. p. 144.

g Beatus *Athanaſius* Alexandrinus Epiſcopus, in *Libello de Fide* quem edidit, & omnibus Catholicis propoſuit tenendum, inter cætera ſic ait; *Pater a nullo eſt factus, nec creatus, nec genitus* &c. Ratram Contr. Græcor. Oppoſ. l. 2. c. 3.

tholick

tholick Faith compoſed by *Athanaſius*.[a] This is reported by *Rembertus*, the writer of his *Life*, and Succeſſor to Him in the ſame See; who had been likewiſe Monk of *Corbey*: ſo that we have here Two conſiderable Teſtimonies in one.

868 Contemporary with Theſe was *Æneas* Biſhop of *Paris*, who, in his Treatiſe againſt the *Greeks*, quotes the *Athanaſian* Creed under the name of *Fides Catholica*,[b] *Catholick Faith*, producing the ſame Paragraph of it which *Theodulphus* had done 60 years before.

871 *Adelbertus* of This Time, upon his nomination to a Biſhoprick in the Province of *Rheims*, was obliged to give in a Profeſſion of his Faith to Arch-Biſhop *Hincmar*. Among other Things, He profeſſes his great regard to the *Athanaſian* Creed (*Sermo Athanaſii*) as a Creed *received with great veneration by the Catholick Church*, or being of *cuſtomary and venerable uſe* in it.[c] This Teſtimony is conſiderable in regard to the *Reception* of This Creed; and not before taken notice of, ſo far as I know, by Thoſe that have treated of This Argument.

889 This Creed is again mention'd in the ſame Age by *Riculphus* Biſhop of *Soiſſons* in *France*, in his paſtoral Charge to the Clergy of his Dioceſs. He calls it, *a Treatiſe*, (or *Diſcourſe*) of *Catholick Faith*.[d] This I take from Father *Harduin*'s Councils, as alſo the former, with the Dates of Both.

960 *Ratherius*, Biſhop of *Verona* in *Italy* in the year 931, and afterwards of *Leige* in *Germany* in the year 953, and reſtor'd to his See of *Verona* in the year 955, did after This Time write Inſtructions to his Clergy of *Verona*; in which He makes mention of all the Three Creeds, *Apoſtolical*, *Nicene*, and *Athana-*

a Cum inſtaret obitus, præcepit ut Fratres canerent *Fidem Catholicam* a Beato *Athanaſio* compoſitam. *Anſchar.* Vit. apud Petr. Lambec. in Append. Lib. 1. Rerum Hamburg. p. 237.

b Sanctus *Athanaſius*, ſedis *Alexandrinæ* Epiſcopus &c.——Item, idem in *Fide Catholica*, quod Spiritus Sanctus a patre procedat & Filio, *Pater a nullo eſt factus* &c. Æneas Pariſ. adv. Græc. c. 19.

c In *Sermone Beati Athanaſii*, quem Eccleſia Catholica venerando uſu frequentare conſuevit, qui ita incipit; *Quicunque vult Salvus eſſe, ante omnia opus eſt ut teneat Catholicam Fidem.* Profeſſio Adelberti Epiſcopi Morinenſis futuri. *Harduin.* Concil. Tom. V. d. 1445.

d Item monemus, ut unuſquiſque veſtrum Pſalmos, & *Sermonem Fidei Catholicæ*, cujus initium, *Quicunque vult ſalvus eſſe*, & Canonem Miſſæ, & cantum, vel compotum, memoriter, & veraciter, & correcte tenere ſtudeat. Riculf. Conſt. Vth. Harduin. Concil. Tom. VI. p. 415.

ſian;

ſian; obliging his Clergy to have them all by Heart: Which ſhows that they were all of ſtanding uſe in his Time, in his Dioceſs, at leaſt.[a]

Near the Cloſe of this Century lived *Abbo*, or *Albo*, Abbot 997
of *Fleury*, or St. *Benedict* upon the *Loire* in *France*. Upon ſome Difference He had with *Arnulphus* Biſhop of *Orleans*, He wrote an *Apology* which He addreſs'd to the Two Kings of *France*, *Hugh* and *Robert*. In that Apology He has a paſſage relating to our purpoſe, running thus. "I thought proper, in the firſt "place, to ſpeak concerning *The Faith:* which I have heard va- "riouſly ſung in alternate Choirs, both in *France* and in the "Church of *England*. For ſome, I think, ſay, in the Athana- "ſian Form, *The Holy-Ghoſt is of the Father and of the Son, nei- "ther made, nor created, but proceeding*: Who while they leave "out, *nor begotten*, are perſwaded that They are the more con- "formable to *Gregory's Synodical Epiſtle*, wherein its written, "that the *Holy-Ghoſt is neither unbegotten, nor begotten, but proceed- "ing*."[b] I have taken the liberty of throwing in a word or two to make the ſentence run the clearer. What the Author intends, is, that ſome ſcrupulous Perſons both in *France* and *England*, recited the *Athanaſian* Creed with ſome Alteration, leaving out two words, to make it agree the better, as They imagined, with *Gregory*'s Synodical Inſtructions. As to their *Scruple* herein, and the ground of it, I ſhall ſay more of it in a proper place. All I am to obſerve at preſent is, that this Teſtimony is full for the Cuſtom of alternate ſinging the *Athanaſian* Creed, at this Time, in the *French* and *Engliſh* Churches. And indeed we ſhall meet with other as full, and withal earlier

a Ipſam Fidem, id eſt Credulitatem, Dei, trifarie parare memoriter feſtinetis: Hoc eſt, ſecundum *Symbolum*, id eſt, *Collationem* Apoſtolorum, ſicut in Pſalteriis correctis invenitur; & illam quæ *ad Miſſam* canitur; & illam Sancti *Athanaſii* quæ ita incipit; *Quicunque vult ſalvus eſſe*——— *Sermonem*, ut ſuperius dixi, *Athanaſii Epiſcopi de Fide Trinitatis*, cujus initium eſt, *Quicunque vult*, memoriter teneat. *Ratherii* Synod. Epiſt. Harduin. Con. Tom. VI. p. 787.

b Primitus de Fide dicendum credidi; quam alternantibus Choris & in *Francia*, & apud Anglorum Eccleſiam variari audivi. Alii enim dicunt, ut arbitror, ſecundum *Athanaſium*, *Spiritus Sanctus a Patre & Filio non factus, non creatus, ſed procedens:* Qui dum id quod eſt *non genitus* ſubtrahunt, Synodicum Domini *Gregorii* ſe ſequi credunt, ubi ita eſt ſcriptum; *Spiritus Sanctus nec ingenitus eſt, nec genitus ſed procedens.* Abbo Floriacenſ. Apol. ad Francor. Reges.

Evi-

Evidence of the ſame Cuſtom, when we come to treat of *Manuſcripts* in the following Chapters. To proceed with our antient Teſtimonies.

1050 In the next Century, we meet with *Gualdo*, a Monk of *Corbey*; who likewiſe wrote the Life of *Anſcharius*, but in *Verſe*, as *Rembertus* had before done in *Proſe*. He alſo takes ſome notice of our Creed, aſcribing it to *Athanaſius*.[a]

1130 In the Century following, *Honorius*, a Scholaſtick Divine of the Church of *Autun*, in his Book intituled *The Pearl of the Soul*, (which treats of the *Sacred*, or *Liturgick Offices*) reckons up the ſeveral Creeds of the Church, making in all *Four*: Namely, the *Apoſtolical*, the *Nicene*, the *Conſtantinopolitan*, and the *Athanaſian*. Of the laſt, He obſerves, that *it was daily* repeated at the *Prime*.[b] He aſcribes it to *Athanaſius* of *Alexandria* in the Time of *Theodoſius*: Where He is undoubtedly miſtaken in his Chronology. For, if He means the firſt *Athanaſius* of *Alexandria*, He is too early for either of the *Theodoſius*'s: And if He means it of the ſecond, He is as much too late. But a Slip in Chronology might be pardonable in That *Age*: nor does it at all affect the Truth of what He atteſts of his own Times.

1138 *Otho*, Biſhop of *Friſinghen* in *Bavaria*, may here be taken notice of, as being the firſt we have met with who pretends to name the *Place* where *Athanaſius* is ſuppoſed to have made this Creed; *Triers*, or *Treves*, in *Germany*.[c] I cite This Author on the credit of *Montfaucon*; who quotes from Him the words I have thrown into the margin.

1171 *Tentzelius* informs us of an Abbot of *Brunſwick*, who attending the Duke of *Brunſwick*, at This Time, in his journey into the *Eaſt*, had ſome Diſputes with the *Greeks* there, upon the Article of *Proceſſion*, and pleaded the uſual paſſage out of this Creed; as did alſo the *Duke* Himſelf whoſe words are to be

a *Catholicamque Fidem* quam compoſuiſſe beatus
Fertur *Athanaſius*——Gualdon. Vit. Anſch. apud Lambec.

b Quarto, Fidem *Quicunque vult*, quotidie ad *Primam* iterat, quam *Athanaſius Alexandrinus* Epiſcopus, rogatu *Theodoſii Imperatoris* edidit. *Honor. Auguſtod.* Gemm. Animæ. l. 2. c. 5. Bibl. PP. Tom. XX. p. 1086.

c *Athanaſius* manens in Eccleſia *Trevirorum*, ſub *Maximo* ejus Eccleſiæ Epiſcopo, *Quicunque vult* &c. a quibuſdam dicitur edidiſſe. Oth. Friſing. apud Montfauc. Diatrib. p. 721.

ſeen

ſeen in the Margin.[a] What is moſt to be noted is the Title of *Symbolum Fidei*, which now began to be common to this Form, as to the other Creeds.

Robertus Paululus, Presbyter of *Amiens*, in the Dioceſs of *Rheims*, 1178
ſpeaking of the *Offices* recited at the *Prime*, obſerves that the Piety of good Chriſtians had thereunto added the *Quicunque vult, that the Articles neceſſary to ſalvation might never be forgotten any hour of the Day.*[b]

Beleth, a celebrated *Paris* Divine, is the oldeſt Writer that 1190
takes notice of this Creed's being commonly aſcribed to *Anaſtaſius*; tho' He Himſelf aſcribes it to *Athanaſius*.[c] *Tentzelius*[d] marks ſome Differences between the *Prints* and the *Manuſcripts* of This Author, and betwixt one Manuſcript and Another. But as the difference, tho' in *words* conſiderable, is yet very little in the *ſenſe*, it is not material to our preſent purpoſe to be more particular about it.

I muſt not Omit *Nicolaus Hydruntinus*, a Native of *Otranto* in 1200
Italy, who ſided with the *Greeks*, and wrote in *Greek*, againſt the *Latins*. He underſtood Both Languages, and was often *Interpreter* between the *Greeks*, and *Latins*, in their Diſputes at *Conſtantinople*, *Athens*, and *Theſſalonica*.[e] He wrote ſeveral Tracts, out of which *Leo Allatius* has publiſh'd ſome Fragments. There is one relating to the *Athanaſian* Creed, which muſt here be taken notice of; being of uſe for the certifying us that this Creed was extant in *Greek* at and before his Time. It is This: "They (*the Greeks*) do not know who made the Addition to "*The Faith of Athanaſius*, ſtiled *Catholick*; ſince the words, *and* "*of the Son*, are not in the Greek (*Form*) nor in the Creed *(of Conſtantinople.)*[f]

a Unde *Athanaſius* in *Symbolo* Fidei dixit: *Spiritus Sanctus a Patre & Filio non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, ſed procedens.* Henric. Brunſuic. *apud* Tentzel. p. 89.

b His addidit Fidelium devotio, *Quicunque vult ſalvus eſſe*, ut Articulorum Fidei qui ſunt neceſſarii ad Salutem, nulla diei Hora obliviſcamur, *Rob. Paulul.* inter: Oper. *Hugon.* de S. *Victor.* de Offic. Eccl. l. 2. c. 1. p. 265.

c Quod ab *Athanaſio* Patriarcha *Alexandrino* compoſitum eſt; plerique eum *Anaſtaſium* fuiſſe falſo arbitrantur. *Joan. Beleth.* de Divin. Offic. c. 40. ed. Antverp.

d Tentzel. Judicia Erudit. p. 91.

e *Vid.* Fabric. Bibl. Græc. Vol. X. p. 393.

f Ὅτι δὲ αὐτὸ ἀγνοοῦσι, τὶς ὁ ποιήσας ἐν τῇ πίστει τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου, τῇ καθολικῇ λεγομένῃ ὡς ἐν τῷ ἑλληνικῷ ἐκεῖ τεῖται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, περιέχεται, ἔστι ἐν τῷ συμβόλῳ. Leo Allat. de Conſenſ. Eccl. Occident. &c. l. 3. c. 1. n. 5. p. 887.

From This paſſage we may learn, that there was a *Greek* Copy of the *Athanaſian* Creed at this Time; that it wanted the words, *of the Son*; that it was look'd upon as *Athanaſius*'s; and that the Title was, *The Catholick Faith of* St. *Athanaſius*; which is its moſt uſual Title in the *Latin* Copies. I may juſt hint to the Reader, that tho' both πίστις in the *Greek*, and *Fides* in the *Latin* might juſtly be rendred *Creed* in Engliſh, rather than *Faith*, whenever it ſtands for a *Formulary*, or *Confeſſion* of Faith, as it does here; yet becauſe I ſhould otherwiſe want another *Engliſh* word for σύμβολον, in the *Greek*, and *Symbolum* in the *Latin*, I therefore reſerve the word *Creed*, in this Caſe, for diſtinction ſake, to be the rendring of *Symbolum*, or σύμβολον, and nothing elſe. But to proceed.

1230 *Alexander* of *Hales*, in *Gloceſterſhire*, may here deſerve to be mention'd, as ſhewing what *Creeds* were then received in *England*. He reckons up *Three* only (not *Four*, as Thoſe that make the *Nicene* and *Conſtantinopolitan* to be Two) namely; The *Apoſtle*'s, The *Nicene* or *Conſtantinopolitan*, and The *Athanaſian*:[a] Where we may obſerve, that the *Athanaſian* has the name of a *Creed*, which yet was not its moſt uſual, or common Title in thoſe Times: only the *Schoolmen*, for order and method ſake, choſe to throw it under the Head of *Creeds*.

1233 I am next to take notice of the famed Legates of Pope *Gregory* the IXth (*Haymo*, *Radolphus*, *Petrus*, and *Hugo*) who produced This Creed in their Conferences with the *Greeks*, at *Conſtantinople*. They aſſerted it to be *Athanaſius*'s, and made by Him while an Exile in the Weſtern Parts, and penn'd in the *Latin* Tongue. They had not aſſurance enough, it ſeems, to pretend that it was a *Greek* Compoſition: There were too many, and too plain reaſons to the contrary.

1240 In This Age, *Walter de Cantilupe*, Biſhop of *Worceſter*, in his *Synodical* Conſtitutions, exhorts his Clergy to make themſelves competent Maſters of the *Pſalm* called *Quicunque vult*, and of

a Tria ſunt Symboli: primum *Apoſtolorum*, ſecundum patrum *Nicenorum*, quod canitur in *Miſſa*, tertium *Athanaſii*. Alexand. Alenſ. Par. 3 Q. 69. membr. 5.

b Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀθανάσιος ὅταν ἐν τῇ μέρισι τοῖς δυτικοῖς ἐξόρισος ἦν, ἐν τῇ ἐκθέσει τῆς πίστεως, ἣν τοῖς λατινικοῖς ῥήμασι διεπέρησεν ἅπας ἔφη· Ὁ πατὴρ ἀπ' ἐδενὸς ἐς &c Definit. Apocriſ. Greg. IX. Harduin, Tom. VII. p. 157.

the

the greater and ſmaller *Creed* (that is *Nicene*, and *Apoſtolical*) that They might be able to inſtruct their people.[a] From whence we may obſerve, that at This Time the *Athanaſian* Formulary was diſtinguiſh'd, here amongſt us, from the *Creeds* properly ſo called; being named a *Pſalm*, and ſometimes a *Hymn* (as we ſhall ſee from other Evidences to be produced hereafter) ſuitably to the Place it held in the *Pſalters* among the other *Hymns*, *Pſalms*, and *Canticles* of the Church, being alſo ſung[b] *alternately* in Churches, like the other.

We may here alſo take notice of a juſt Remark made by 1250
Thomas Aquinas of This Century; that *Athanaſius*, whom He ſuppoſes the Author of This Formulary, did not draw it up in the way of a *Creed*, but in a *Doctrinal Form*; which however was admitted by the Authority of the *Roman* See, as containing a compleat Syſtem of Chriſtian Faith.[c]

In a Synod of *Exeter*, in this Century alſo, we have mention 1287
again made of the *Athanaſian Creed*, but under the Name of a *Pſalm*, and as ſuch diſtinguiſh'd from the *Two Creeds*[d] properly ſo called.

William Durants, the elder, Biſhop of *Menda* in *France*, re- 1287
counting the *Creeds*, makes their Number *Three*; mentioning the *Athanaſian* in the ſecond place, between the *Apoſtles* and *Nicene*. He follows the ſame Tradition which *Otho Friſingenſis* did be-

a Habeat etiam ſaltem quilibet eorum ſimplicem intellectum ſecundum quod continetur in *Pſalmo* qui dicitur *Quicunque vult*, & tam in *majori* quam in *minori Symbolo*, ut in his plebem ſibi commiſſam noverint informare. *Walter. Wigorn.* Conſt. apud Harduin. Tom. VII. p. 337.

b In *John Wickliff*'s Comment on this Creed, I find the following words:

It is ſeid comunly that ther ben thre credis: the firſt is of Apoſtlis, *that Men knowen comunly: the tothir is the Crede of the Chirche, that declarith the former Crede: This thridde Crede is of the Trynyte, the which is Surgum as a Salm, and was maad in Greke Speche, of oon that is clepid* Attanaſie, *and aftir turnid to Latyn, and Sum del amendid, and ordeynid to be ſeid at the firſt our.* Wickl. MS. Bibl. Coll. Johan. Cant.

c *Athanaſius* non compoſuit *manifeſtationem Fidei* per modum *Symboli*, ſed magis per modum cujuſdam Doctrinæ: ſed quia integram Fidei veritatem ejus Doctrina breviter continebat, auctoritate ſummi Pontificis eſt recepta, ut quaſi *Fidei Regula* habeatur. *Thom. Aqu.* Secund. Secundæ Qu. 1. Art. 10. n. 3.

d Articulorum Fidei Chriſtianorum Saltem ſimplicem habeant intellectum, prout in *Pſalmo, Quicunque vult*, & in *utroque Symbolo* continentur. *Synod. Exon.* Harduin Concil. Tom. VII. p. 1096.

fore, that This Creed was made at *Triers*, or *Treves*.[a] It is ſcarce worth noting that ſome Copies here read *Anaſtaſius*, ſince the Circumſtances plainly ſhow that *Athanaſius* is the Man intended, and that *Anaſtaſius* can be nothing elſe but a corrupt reading.

1330 *Ludolphus Saxo*, the Carthuſian, is cited by *Voſſius*, as numbring Three Creeds, with very brief, but good Hints of their Uſes reſpectively: The *Apoſtles*, uſeful for a ſhort compendious *Inſtruction* in the Faith; The *Nicene* for fuller *Explication*; and the *Athanaſian*, for *Guard*, or *Defence*[b] againſt Hereſies.

1337 *William* of *Baldenſal*, or *Boldeſale*, a German Knight, ought here to be mention'd; as being the firſt Writer extant that aſcribes the Creed to *Euſebius* (of *Verceil*, in *Piedmont*) along with *Athanaſius*. The reaſon, I preſume, was, the better to account for the Creed's being originally *Latin*. *Baldenſal*'s Treatiſe, being the *Hiſtory of Piedmont*, wherein He makes the remark, is not yet publiſh'd, I ſuppoſe: But Cardinal *Bona* informs us that the Manuſcript was, in his Time, in the Library of the *Duke* of *Savoy* at *Turin*.[c]

1360 *Manuel Caleca*, a latinizing *Greek*, wrote a Treatiſe upon the *Principles of the Catholick Faith*, publiſh'd by *Combefis*, in his new *Auctarium* to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Tome the 2d. where we find ſome Paſſages to our preſent purpoſe; particularly This, that *Caleca* aſcribes the Creed to *Athanaſius*, and ſuppoſes it to have been preſented by Him to Pope *Julius*.[d] I know not

a Nota, quod triplex eſt Symbolum. Primum eſt Symbolum *Apoſtolorum*, quod vocatur Symbolum *minus*.——Secundum Symbolum eſt, *Quicunque vult ſalvus eſſe* &c. ab *Athanaſio*, Patriarcha Alexandrino, in civitate *Treviri* compoſitum——Tertium eſt *Nicænum* quod——vocatur *Symbolum majus*. Gul. Durant. Rational. Divin. Offic. lib. IV. c. 25.

b Tria ſunt Symbola: primum *Apoſtolorum*, ſecundum *Nicænum*, tertium *Athanaſii*. Primum factum eſt ad Fidei *Inſtructionem*, ſecundum ad Fidei *Explanationem*, tertium ad Fidei *Defenſionem*. Ludolph. Sax. de Vit. Chriſti. cap. 83. apud *Voſſium* de Trib. Symb. Diſſert. 1. cap. 1. p. 503.

c In hoc autem Symbolo, ſive componendo, ſive e Græco in Latinum traducendo, Adjutorem fuiſſe *Athanaſio Euſebium*, *Vercellenſem* Epiſcopum, refert *Gulielmus Baldeſanus* in Hiſtoria *Pedemontana*, quæ Manuſcripta *Taurini* aſſervatur in Bibliotheca Ducis *Sabaudiæ*, ex Tabulario *Vercellenſis* Eccleſiæ. Bona de Divin. Pſalm. c. 16. Sect. 18. p. 864.

d Ταύτην γὰρ ἐὰν μή τις πιστῶς πιστεύσῃ, σωθῆναι ἀδύνατον, ὡς ὁ μέγας Ἀθανάσιος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἰάλιον πάπαν Ῥώμης τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογίᾳ προσέθηκεν. Manuel. Calec. de Fid. c. 10. Confer Fund. Contr. Græc. l. 2. c. 20.

whether

whether He be not the firſt writer that mentions That Circumſtance, nor whether He reports it from others, or from his own invention.

About the ſame Time *Johannes Cypariſſiota*, Surnamed *the Wiſe*, wrote his *Decads*, which are publiſh'd in *Latin*, in the *Bibliotheques*, of *Turrianus*'s Verſion. What we are to obſerve from Him is, that He cites This Creed in the Name of *Athanaſius*, and as if it were made at the Council of *Nice*.[a] It ſeems, after it once paſs'd current that *Athanaſius* was the Author, there was great variety of Conjectures about the Place where, and the Time when, He compoſed, or preſented this Creed. 1360

I ſhall mention but one more, as late as the Council of *Florence*, or a little later; and That is *Johannes* (afterwards *Joſephus*) *Pluſiadenus*, a latinizing *Greek*, who wrote a *Dialogue* in defence of the *Latins*. What is obſervable in Him is, that He makes the Creed to have been preſented by *Athanaſius* to Pope *Liberius*, inſtead of *Julius*[b]. 1439

I have now come low enough with the *Antient* Teſtimonies, if I may be allowed ſo to call thoſe of the later Times. A few of the firſt and earlieſt might have ſufficed, had I no other Point in view but the meer *Antiquity* of the Creed: But, as my Deſign is to treat of its *Reception* alſo, in various Places, and at various Times, and to lay together ſeveral kind of Evidences which will require others, both early and late, to clear up and explain Them; it was, in a manner, neceſſary for me to bring my Accounts as low as I have here done. Beſides that ſeveral inferior, incidental Queſtions will fall in our way, for the reſolving of which, moſt of the Teſtimonies I have here cited will be ſerviceable in their Turn; as will appear more fully in the Sequel. I have omitted ſeveral Teſtimonies of the later Centuries, ſuch as I thought might conveniently be ſpared, either as containing nothing but what we had before from others more

a Magnus *Athanaſius*, in Expoſitione Fidei, in *prima Synodo*, ait *&c.* Joan. Cypariſſ. Decad. 9. c. 3. Bibl. PP. Tom XXI.

b Ὁ θεῖος τῷ ὄντι κῦ ἱερὸς Ἀθανάσιος, ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ πίστεως, ἣν ἐξέθετο πρὸς Λιβέριον Πάπαν, ἧς ἡ ἀρχή, ὅστις ἂν βέληται σωθῆναι, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, φησὶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ *&c.* Joan. Pluſiad. apud Combeſiſ. not. in Calec. p. 297.

antient

antient, or as being of no uſe for the clearing up any that we have, or for the ſettling any Point which will come to be diſcuſs'd in the following Sheets. The Rule I have ſet my ſelf in making the Collection, and which I have been moſt careful to obſerve, was to take in all thoſe, and none but thoſe which are either valuable for their *Antiquity*, or ſomething *new*, and *particular* upon the Subject, or may ſtrike ſome Light into any *doubtful Queſtion* thereunto relating.

I ſhall ſhut up this Chapter, as I did the former, with a *Table*, repreſenting in one view the Sum and Subſtance of what has been done in it. The ſeveral Columns will contain the *Year* of our *Lord*, the *Authors* here recited, the *Country* where They lived, and the *Title*, or *Titles* by Them given to the Creed. The *Titles* ought to appear in their *Original* Language wherein they were written; which my *Engliſh* Reader may the more eaſily excuſe, ſince they have moſt of them been given in *Engliſh* above, where it was more proper to do it. The uſe of ſuch a *Table* will be ſeen as often as a Reader has a mind to look back to This Chapter, or to compare ſeveral Evidences of different kinds, proving the ſame Thing, one with Another.

A Table

A. D.	Authors	Country	Title of the Creed.
670	Council of *Autun*	France	Fides Sancti Athanasii Præsulis.
760	Articles Inqu. *Regino*	Germany	Sermo Athanasii Episcopi de Fide.
794	Counc: *Franckfort*	Germany	Fides Catholica Sanctæ Trinitatis.
809	*Theodulphus*	France	
809	*Anonymus*	France	Expositio Catholicæ Fidei, Athanasii.
809	Monks of *M. Olivet*	Judea	Fides Sancti Athanasii.
820	*Hatto.* or *Hetto.*	France	Fides Sancti Athanasii
820	*Agobardus*	France	
852	*Hincmar*	France	Sermo Athanasii de Fide Athanasii Symbolum.
864	*Bertram*	France	Libellus Athanasii de Fide.
865	*Anscharius*	Germany	Athanasii Fides Catholica.
868	*Æneas Paris.*	France	Athanasii Fides Catholica.
871	*Adelbertus*	France	Sermo Beati Athanasii.
889	*Riculphus*	France	Sermo Fidei Catholicæ.
960	*Rathertus*	Italy	Sermo Athanasii Epi de Fide Trinitatis.
997	*Abbo, or Albo*	France	Fides secundum Athanasium.
1050	*Gualdo*	France	Fides Catholica Athanasio adscripta.
1130	*Honorius*	France	Fides *Quicunque vult.*
1138	*Otho*	Bavaria	Quicunque vult. *&c.*
1171	Duke of *Brunswick*	Germany	Athanasii Symbolum Fidei.
1178	*Robertus Paululus*	France	Quicunque vult. *&c.*
1190	*Beleth*	France	Athanasii Symbolum.
1200	*Nic. Hydruntinus*	Italy	Τὸ ἁγίε Ἀθανασιε πίστις ἡ Καθολικη.
1230	*Alexander Alens.*	England	Athanasii Symbolum.
1233	P. *Gregory's* Legates		Ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως.
1240	*Walter Cantilupe*	England	Psalmus *Quicunque &c.*
1250	*Thom. Aquinas*	Italy	Athanasii Manifestatio Fidei
1287	*Exon.* Synod	England	Psalmus *Quicunque &c.*
1287	*Durantus*	France	Athanasii Symbolum.
1330	*Ludolphus*	Saxony	Athanasii Symbolum.
1337	*Baldewin.*	Germany	Athanasii Symbolum.
1360	*Man. Caleca*	Greece	Ἡ τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογία τῦ Ἀθανασίε.
1360	*Joan. Cyparissiota*	Greece	Athanasii Expositio Fidei.
1439	*Joan. Plusiadenus*	Greece	Ἡ τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογία τοῦ Ἀθανασίε.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Antient *Commentators* and *Paraphrasts* upon the *Athanasian* Creed.

ANTIENT *Comments*, or *Paraphrases*, may be properly mention'd after antient *Testimonies*, being near akin to Them, and almost the same Thing with Them. I call none *antient* but such as were made before *Printing*; and therefore shall carry my Accounts no lower than that Time.

A. D. 570 The first *Comment* to be met with on this Creed, is one of the *Sixth* Century, composed by *Venantius Fortunatus*, an *Italian* by Birth, but one that travelled into *France* and *Germany*, became acquainted with the most eminent Scholars and Prelates all over the West, and was at length made Bishop of *Poictiers* in *France*. His Comment on this Creed has been publish'd from a Manuscript about 600 years old,[a] out of the *Ambrosian* Library at *Milan*, by *Muratorius* in his Second Tome of *Anecdota* in the year, 1698. There can be no reasonable doubt but that the Comment really belongs to the Man whose Name it bears. 1. Because in the same Book there is also a Comment upon the *Apostle*'s Creed[b] ascribed to *Fortunatus*, and which is known to belong to *Venantius Fortunatus*, and has been before printed among his other Works. 2. Because it appears highly probable from what *Venantius Fortunatus* has

a Est porro nobis in *Ambrosiana* Bibliotheca Membranaceus Codex annos abhinc ferme sexcentos manu descriptus; ut ex Characterum Forma, aliisque Conjecturis affirmari posse mihi videtur. Heic, præter alia opuscula multa, Tres Symboli expositiones habentur, quarum *unam* tantum nunc publici juris facio.

Prima ita inscribitur, *Expositio Fidei Catholicæ*. Alteri nullus Titulus præfixus est. *Postrema* vero hunc præ se fert; *Expositio Fidei Catholicæ Fortunati.*——*Fortunatus* autem, heic memoratus, alius a *Venantio Fortunato* non est, quem *Insulæ Pictavienses* Ecclesiæ, quem Christi innæ poetices ornamenta æternitate donarunt. *Murator.* Anecdot. Tom. 2. p. 228.

b Expositionem quoque continet (*Cod. Ambrosianus*) Apostolici Symboli, cum hac Inscriptione: *Incipit expositio a Fortunato Presbytero conscripta.* Eadem vero est ac Edita inter *Fortunati* Opera. Tum sequuntur geminæ ejusdem Symboli explicationes, Tres *Orationis Dominicæ*, & duæ *Athanasiani Symboli* expositiones incertis auctoribus scriptæ. Tandem, uti diximus, *Expositio Fidei Catholicæ Fortunati* legitur. Quocirco quin ad *Venantium* quoque *Fortunatum* Opusculum hoc sit referendum, nullus dubito. *Murator.* ibid. p. 231.

occa-

occaſionally dropp'd in his other undoubted Works,[a] that He was really acquainted with the *Athanaſian* Creed, and borrow'd Expreſſions from it. 3. Becauſe in the Expoſitions of the *Apoſtles* and *Athanaſian* Creeds, there is great ſimilitude of Style, Thoughts, and Expreſſions; which ſhows that Both are of the ſame Hand, and indeed, the other Circumſtances conſider'd, abundantly proves it. It would burden my Margin too much, otherwiſe it were eaſy to give at leaſt half a dozen plain Specimens, where either the Expreſſions, or Turn of Thought, or Both are exactly parallel. Such as think it of moment to examine, may eaſily be ſatisfied by comparing the Comment on the *Apoſtles* Creed, in the Xth Tome of the laſt *Bibliotheque*, with the Comment on the *Athanaſian*, in *Muratorius*. 4. I may add, that the Tenour of the whole Comment, and the ſimplicity of the Style, and Thoughts, are very ſuitable to That Age, and more ſo than to the Centuries following. Theſe reaſons intirely convince me that this Comment belongs to *Venantius Fortunatus*, compoſed by Him after his going into *France*, and before He was Biſhop of *Poictiers:* And ſo we may probably fix the Date of it about the year 570, or perhaps higher. There is an older Manuſcript Copy of this Comment (as I find by comparing) in the *Muſæum* at *Oxford*, among *Junius*'s Manuſcripts, Number 25.[b] I am obliged to the very worthy and learned Dr. *Haywood*, for ſending me a Tranſcript of it, with a Specimen of the *Character*. It is reaſonably judged to be above 700 years old. It wants, in the Beginning, about ten or a dozen Lines: In the other parts it agrees with *Murato-*

a Præclarum in primordio ponitur Cæleſtis Teſtimonii Fundamentum, quia *Salvus eſſe non poterit*, qui recte de Salute non crediderit: *Fortunat. Expoſ. Symb. Apoſt.* Bibl. PP. Tom. X.

Non Deus in Carnem verſus, Deus accipit Artus:
Non ſe permutans, ſed ſibi membra levans.
Unus in ambabus naturis, verus in ipſis
Æqualis matri hinc, *par Deitate Patri.*
Non ſua *confundens*, ſibi noſtra ſed omnia nectens.
. . . . . .
De *patre* natus habens *divina*, *humanaque matris*,
De patre ſublimis, de genetrice humilis.
Venant. Fortun. l. 8. Carm. 5. Bibl. P. Tom. X.

b The Title, *Expoſitio in Fide Catholica.*

rius's

rius's Copy, saving only such *Various Lections* as are to be expected in different Manuscripts not copied from each other. From the *two Copies* compared may be drawn out a much more correct *Comment* than That which *Muratorius* has given us from *One*: As perhaps I may shew at the end of This Work. The Reader will excuse my dwelling so long upon this truly *antient* Comment, which bears so considerable Testimony to the *Antiquity*, early *Reception*, and high *Value* of our Creed; as will appear more fully in the Sequel.

I intimated above, that *Muratorius* supposes This *Venantius Fortunatus* to be the Author, not of the *Comment* only, but *Creed* also. But his Reasons which plead strongly for the former, are of no Force at all in respect of the latter: which He is so sensible of Himself, that while He speaks with great Assurance of the one, He is very diffident of the other.[a] And indeed, not to mention several other considerations standing in the way of his conjecture, who can imagine *Venantius Fortunatus* to have been so *vain*, as, after commenting on the *Lord*'s *Prayer*, and *Apostles Creed*, to fall to commenting upon a Composition of his *own*?

This Comment of *Fortunatus* is a great Confirmation of what hath been above cited from the Council of *Autun*: For, if the Creed was noted enough to deserve a *Comment* upon it, so early as the year 570, no wonder if we find it strongly recommended by That Council in the year 670, a hundred years after. And it is observable that as That Council recommends the *Apostolical* and *Athanasian* Creeds, without saying a Word of the *Nicene*; so *Fortunatus*, before Them, comments upon Those Two only, taking no notice of the Third.

I cannot take leave of This Comment, without observing to the Reader, that in *Pareus*'s Notes on This Creed, I have met with a Passage which I am not well able to account for. He cites a *Comment* upon this Creed, under the name of *Euphronius Presbyter*,[b] does not say whether from a *Print*, or a

a Hujus *Symboli* Auctor esse potuit *Venantius Fortunatus:* Saltem fuit hujus *Expositionis* Auctor. *Murator.* p. 217.

Non ita meis conjecturis plaudo, ut facilius non arbitrer *Expositionem* potius quam *Symbolum* huic Auctori tribuendum. *Id.* p. 231.

b *Euphronius* Presbyter in expositione hujus Symboli Athanasii, *Fides*, inquit, *Catholica*, *Manu-*

Manuſcript: But the words He produces are in this very Comment of *Fortunatus*. Who this *Euphronius* is, I can no where find; nor whether an *antient*, or *modern* Writer. There was an *Euphronius Presbyter* (mention'd by *Greg.* of *Tours*) who lived in the 5th Century, and was at length Biſhop of *Autun:* But I never heard of any writings of his, more than an *Epiſtle* aſcribed to Him and *Lupus* of *Troyes*. I would not however omit the mentioning this *Note* of *Pareus*, becauſe a Hint may ſometimes lead to uſeful Diſcoveries; And others may be able to reſolve the Doubt, tho' I am not.

Our next *Commentator*, or rather *Paraphraſt*, is *Hincmar* of 852
Rheims: Not upon the whole Creed, but upon ſuch parts only as He had occaſion to cite. For, his way is to throw in ſeveral words of his own, as Explanatory Notes, ſo far as He quotes the Creed:[a] And He ſometimes does it more than He ought to have done, to ſerve a Cauſe againſt *Gotheſcalcus:* Which I may hint, in paſſing; to ſay more of it, would be foreign to our preſent purpoſe.

S. Bruno, Biſhop of *Wurtzburgh* in *Germany*, has a formal 1033
Comment, and much larger than *Fortunatus*'s, upon the *Athanaſian* Creed. It is at the end of his *Pſalter*, and has been ſeveral Times printed with it. Father *Le Long* reckons up ſix *Editions*,[b] in This order: 1, At *Nuremberg* in *Folio*, An. D. 1494. 2. By *Antonius Koburger* in 4to, A. D. 1497. 3. By *Cochleus* at *Wurtzburgh*, in 4to. A. D. 1531. 4*thly* At *Leipſick*, in 4to, 1533. 5*thly* In the *Cologne Bibliotheque* A. D. 1618. Tom. XI. 6*thly* in the *Lyons* Bibl. PP. A. D. 1677. Tom. XVIII. The *Old* Editions are ſcarce, and not eaſy to be met with. I have ſeen Two of them in our Publick Library at *Cambridge*, Thoſe of 1494, and 1533. There is an elegant one of the former (as I conceive by the deſcription ſent me by a

ſeu univerſalis, dicitur: Hoc eſt, recta, quam Eccleſia Univerſa tenere debet. David. Pareï not. ad Symb. Athan. p. 118.

a Vid. *Hincmari* Oper. Tom. 1. p. 452. 464. 469. 552. 553.

b Commentarii in totum Pſalterium & in Cantica Vet. & N. Teſtamenti, In fol. *Norembergæ*. 1494. In 4to per *Antonium Koburger* 1497. Idem a *Joan. Cochleo* reſtitutum in 4to *Herbipoli* 1531. *Lipſiæ*. 1533. Bibl. PP. Colonienſis & Lugdunenſis. *Le Long*. Bibl. Bibl. Tom. 2. p. 654.

learned Gentleman) in the *Bodleian*, at *Oxford*. It is in *Vellum*, in a black, and red Letter, reſerved among the Manuſcripts, and mark'd *Laud* E. 81. The Two Editions of 1497, and 1531, I never ſaw: yet Biſhop *Uſher* makes mention of an Edition in 1531,[a] and ſeems to have known of none older. I ſhould have ſuſpected 1531 to be a falſe print for 1533, had not *Le Long* confirmed it that there is ſuch an Edition as 1531, and named the *Place* where it was printed: Tho' I cannot but obſerve that He makes a *Folio* of it in his firſt Tome,[b] and a *Quarto* in the ſecond; which is to me an argument that He had never ſeen it, but perhaps took the Hint from *Uſher*. Dr. *Grabe*, tho' deſirous of it, had never ſeen either That of 1531, or That of 1533.[c] But leaving the *printed* Editions of This *Comment* of *Bruno*'s, let us next ſay ſomething of the *Manuſcripts* of it, and their Differences from the *Prints*, or from each other. There are many Manuſcript Copies, which I ſhall mention in order.

1. The firſt and moſt valuable Manuſcript is in the Library of *Wurtzburgh*, as old as the Author, left by Him as a Legacy to That Church. The firſt printed Edition (if I miſtake not) was taken from That very *Original* Manuſcript;[d] which at the loweſt computation muſt be 680 years old. The Title of the Creed; *Fides Catholica S. Athanaſii Epiſcopi.*

2. There is a *ſecond*, which I have ſeen in *Trinity-College* in *Cambridge*, annex'd to a *Pſalter* deſcribed at large by the learned Mr. *Wanley* in his Catalogue,[e] and judged by Him to have been

a Pſalterii editio vulgata latina, obelis & Aſteriſcis diſtincta, cum *Brunonis Herbipolenſis* Epiſcopi Commentariis, Anno 1531. a *Johanne Cochleo* in lucem eſt emiſſa. *Uſſer.* de Editione LXX Interpr. p. 104.

b Pſalterium vetus obelis & Aſteriſcis diſtinctum, cum Commentariis *S. Brunonis*, ſtudio *Joannis Cochlæi* Editum, in fol. *Herbipoli*, 1531. in 4to Lipſiæ 1533. *Le Long.* Tom. 1. p. 274.

c *Grabe* Prolegom. ad *Pſalter. Alexandr.* c. 3.

d Poſteris Filiis ſuis (*S. Bruno*) memorabilem & ſanctum Pſalmorum Librum, *ex quo ille impreſſus eſt*, ſumptuoſe ſcriptum, quaſi hæreditatis ſpiritualis non minimam portionem reliquit. *Prolog.* ad Editionem Anni 1494.

Precioſum iſtum Theſaurum poſteritati poſt ſe reliquit, & quidem inſigni ſcriptura ſumptuoſe deſcriptum ——— extat Donum illud memorabile & conſpicuum in locuplete antiquorum Voluminum Bibliotheca *Herbipolenſis* Eccleſiæ: Quod ſane religioſa pietate, velut Hæreditas quædam hujus Sancti Patris Cuſtoditur. *Joan. Cochl.* prolog. ad Edit. An. 1533

e *Wanleii* Catalog. Mſſ. Septentr. p. 168.

written

written about the Time of King *Stephen*. So that This is about a hundred years later than the former, or about 580 years old; no *Title* to the Creed.

3. There is a *Third*, of much the ſame Age with the former, or ſome years older, in the *Bodleian* at *Oxford*, marked *Laud.* H. 61. the Title of the Creed, *Fides Catholica Sancti Athanaſii Epiſcopi.*

4. A *Fourth* I have ſeen in the *Cathedral* Library at *York*, which may be 500 years old. No Title.

5. There are, as I conceive, Three more, which *Tentzelius*[a] gives us ſome Hints of, in the *Baſil*, *Gotha*, and *Leipſick* Libraries: Tho' I have nothing to ground my Conjecture upon but This, that the firſt words, recited by *Tentzelius*, agree with *Bruno*'s Comment. The Copiſt has added another Comment upon the ſame Creed together with *Bruno*'s; one running down in a Column on the right Hand, the other on the Left, as I imagine. The *Leipſick* Copy is judged to be above 500 years old; The Title, *Fides Anaſtaſii Papæ.*

6. There is another, in the Library of St. *German de Prez*, about 500 years old. *Montfaucon*, having met with it, publiſh'd it[b] as an *Anecdoton*; not knowing that it was *Bruno*'s Comment, or that it had ever been before printed. It is not indeed quite ſo *full*, nor any thing near ſo *correct* as the printed Copies: But ſtill it is plainly *Bruno*'s Comment. The Title; *Tractatus de Fide Catholica.*

7. There is alſo, in my Lord *Harley*'s Library, a modern Manuſcript of this Comment, written at *Augsburg*, in the year 1547. (by *Charles Peutenger*, Son to the famous *Conrad*) where the Title is, *Fides Catholica Sancti Anaſtaſii Epiſcopi.* The miſtake of *Anaſtaſii* for *Athanaſii*, we find, had crept into the *German* Copies ſome Centuries before: wherefore This is not to be wonder'd at. All the older Copies, as well as the *Original* Manuſcript, have *Athanaſii*, in the *Title*, where there is a *Title*, and *Athanaſius* in the Beginning of the Comment.

a *Tentzelii*: Jud. Eruditor. p. 224. and *Preface.*
b *Montfaucon.* Athanaſ. Oper. Tom 2. p. 735.

The

The Manuſcripts which I have here recited, all but the firſt, ſeem now to be of no great uſe; if it be true, as I ſuppoſe, that the firſt prints were taken from the very *Original* at *Wurtzburgh*. It is certain that They are very imperfect, and uncorrect (I have collated Three of them) in compariſon of the *printed* Copies: Nor could I obſerve above two or three places, and thoſe not very material, where the printed Copies ſeem to have followed a falſe reading, or may be corrected by thoſe Manuſcripts. One Thing I a little wonder'd at, that the three Manuſcripts, of St. *Germans*, *Trinity College*, and *York*, ſhould all leave out ſome Paragraphs which appear in the *printed* Copies, and the ſame Paragraphs. But I have ſince found, that Thoſe very Paragraphs were taken out of *Fortunatus*'s Comment, and belong not properly to *Bruno*'s. This, I preſume, the firſt Copiers underſtood, and therefore omitted them. Probably, *Bruno*'s own Copy might at firſt want them, (tho' they muſt have been added ſoon after) or if *Bruno* Himſelf inſerted them, yet He had left ſome mark of diſtinction, which was underſtood at That Time; tho' not by the *Editors* of this Comment, ſo many years after. But to proceed.

1120 In the next Age, the famous *Peter Abelard* wrote Comments upon this Creed: which are printed amongſt his other Works. The Title in the Prints, is, *Petri Abaëlardi Expoſitio Fidei, in Symbolum Athanaſii.* I ſuſpect that the Editor has added the latter part, *in Symbolum Athanaſii*, as a Hint to the Reader. The *Comment* is a very ſhort one, ſcarce three Pages in 4to, and, for the Age it was wrote in, a pretty good one; tho', as I conceive, from ſome Flaws in it, printed from a Copy not very *Correct*.

1170 Of the ſame Century is *Hildegarde*, the celebrated Abbeſs of St. *Rupert*'s mount, near *Binghen* on the *Rhine*. She wrote Explications of St. *Benedict*'s *Rule*, and of the *Athanaſian* Creed: Which may be ſeen. Bibl. PP. Tom. XXIII. p. 596.

1210 *Simon Tornacenſis*, Prieſt of *Tournay*, in the beginning of the thirteenth Century, taught Divinity at *Paris*, with great Reputation. His Manuſcript Works are in many Libraries; and, among his other Writings, there is *an Expoſition of the Athanaſian*

ſian Creed.[a] *Oudin* reckons up four Manuſcript Copies of it, in as many diſtinct Libraries, and acquaints us where They are to be found, and of what Age they probably are.

Contemporary with the former, is *Alexander Neckham*, an *Engliſhman*, Abbot of *Exeter*. He wrote a Comment on the *Athanaſian* Creed, which is extant in Manuſcript, in the *Bodleian*, at *Oxford* (mark'd N. E. 7. 8.) coeval probably with the Author. 1220

There is another Commentary upon this Creed written by *Richardus Hampolus*, *Richard Rolle* of *Hampole*, a Native of *Yorkſhire*, and a Monk of the Order of St. *Auſtin*. It contains, in a manner, *Bruno*'s Comment intire, with ſeveral Additions, and Inſertions either of the Author's own, or ſuch as He had borrowed elſewhere. It has been twice printed, firſt at *Cologne* in the year 1536, and afterwards in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Lugdun. Tom. XXVI. p. 624. 1340

To the *Latin* Comments here mention'd I may add an *Engliſh* one, which I ſuppoſe to be *Wickliff*'s, and which I have above quoted as his. If it be not his, yet certainly it is of his Time, and not far from the middle of the XIVth Century. I will firſt give ſome Account of this Engliſh Comment, and then ſhow both why I aſcribe it to *Wickliff*, and why I do it not with full Aſſurance, but with ſome degree of Diffidence. I firſt met with it in a Manuſcript Volume (in 12°) belonging to the Library of St. *John*'s College in *Cambridge*. The Volume contains an *Engliſh* Verſion of the *Pſalms*, and *Hymns* of the Church, with the *Athanaſian* Creed, produced, Paragraph by Paragraph, in *Latin*, interſperſed with an *Engliſh* Verſion of each Paragraph, and commented upon quite through, Part by Part. After the Comment, follow *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, *Song of Songs*, *Wiſdom*, and *Eccleſiaſticus*, all in old *Engliſh*, without Gloſs or Comment. Now, the Reaſons why I incline to aſcribe the Comment to *Wickliff*, are theſe. 1380

a *Expoſitio Symboli*, per *Simonem* Tornacenſis Eccleſiæ Canonicum, & Pariſienſem Doctorem, *quæ ſic incipit*; Apud *Ariſtotelem* Argumentum eſt Ratio faciens Fidem, ſed apud *Chriſtum* argumentum eſt Fides faciens Rationem. *Oudin.* Tom. 3. p. 30.

1 Dr. *Langbaine*, of *Queen's* College in *Oxford*, in a Letter to Biſhop *Uſher*, bearing Date A. D. 1647, teſtifies that He had ſeen ſuch a Comment, and that He found it to be *Wickliff's*, by comparing the Beginning of it with *Bale*.[a] This, very probably, is the ſame Comment; tho' there is no ſuch Manuſcript now in *Magdalen* College *Oxon*, as was in Dr. *Langbaine's* Time.

2. All thoſe Parts of Scripture which go before and after this Comment, in the ſame Volume, are of the *ſame Verſion* with That of *Wickliff's* Bible in the Library of *Emanuel* College, without any difference, (except that St. *John's* Copy, being older, retains the more antient ſpelling) as I am well aſſured by comparing them together: So that if thoſe Parts be *Wickliff's*, it may appear very probable that the *Comment* is his too. Indeed, our very learned *Wharton* was of opinion that the Verſion commonly aſcribed to *Wickliff*,[b] was really *John Treviſa's* who was a Contemporary of *Wickliff's*, and Vicar of *Berkely* in *Cornwall*. But his Reaſons for it have appear'd to Others not ſatisfactory,[c] and have in part been confuted.[d] I ſhall not enter far into That Diſpute, being almoſt foreign to my purpoſe: And it is not very material whether *Wickliff*, or *Treviſa* (if Either) be judged the Author of the Comment. This only I may obſerve, by the way, that Mr. *Wharton's* Argument drawn from the *Norfolk* Manuſcript of the Goſpels (Cod. 254) which He is poſitive belongs to *Wickliff*, appears to be of ſome weight, ſo far as concerns the *New-Teſtament*; and the Inference may reach to ſeveral parts of the *Old-Teſtament* alſo. Either Mr. *Wharton* muſt have been miſtaken in aſcribing the *Norfolk* Copy to *Wickliff*, or elſe, for any thing I ſee, his Argument will ſtand good. The *Characteriſtick* which He lays down whereby to diſtinguiſh *Wick-*

a *While I was there (in* Magd. College Library) *tumbling amongſt their Books, I light upon an old Engliſh Comment upon the Pſalms, the* Hymns *of the Church, and* Athanaſius's *Creed; which I preſently Conjectured (tho' there be no name to it) to be* Wickliff's. *And comparing the Beginning with* Bale, *found that I had not erred in the Conjecture.* Langbaine. *among* Uſher's *Letters.* p. 513.

b *Wharton.* Auctarium *Hiſtor.* Dogmat. p. 425. 426.

c *Oudin.* Comment. de Script. Eccleſ. Vol. 3. p. 1044.

d *Vid.* Le Long *Bibl. Bibl.* Vol. 1. p. 426.

liff's

liff's Verſion (namely, the frequent inſertion of *Synonymous* words) will by no means agree with the common Verſion: And then the *Specimen* He gives of the two different rendrings of *Luke* 2. 7. is directly contrary.[a] But a fuller Diſcuſſion of that Point may be left with Thoſe who have more leiſure, and have more particularly ſtudied it. I am content to ſuppoſe that the common Verſion aſcribed to *Wickliff* is really his: Perhaps He might give two Editions of it;[b] or elſe *Treviſa*'s may be little more than *Wickliff*'s Verſion, corrected, and poliſh'd, with great Liberty, both as to Senſe and Expreſſion, where it appear'd needful. To proceed.

3. A third Reaſon I have for the aſcribing The Comment to *Wickliff*, is, that ſome parts of it ſeem to ſuit exactly with his Humour, and Manner, and Way of thinking; particularly the Gird upon *Popes*, and *Cardinals* in the Cloſe.[c]

Nevertheleſs, I am far from being poſitive in This matter: Much may be offer'd to take off the Force of theſe Reaſons, or to counter-ballance them. 1. This very Comment is annex'd to a manuſcript *Commentary*, upon the *Pſalms* and *Hymns* of the Church, now in *Trinity-College* Library in *Cambridge:* which Commentary appears not to be *Wickliff*'s, tho' ſuppoſed to be his by Mr. *Wharton*.[d] The *Engliſh* Verſion of the Pſalms going a-

a Wicklefus ſic reddit: *And puttide Him in a Cratche; for place was not to Him in the comyn Stable.*

Alter interpres ſic: *And leide Him in a Cratche; for there was no place to Him in no Chaumbre.* Wharton. p. 426.

I have a Manuſcript of the New Teſtament entire, belonging to our College Library, which reads Luke 2. 7. *according to the firſt reading, and which has many Inſtances of* Synonymous *Inſertions every where. It is a different Verſion from That which is commonly aſcribed to* Wickliff.

b Patet, aut antiquiorem fuiſſe quandam S. Scripturæ Tranſlationem *Anglicam*, aut duplicem fuiſſe Tranſlationis *Wicleviana* Editionem. *Wharton*. Auctor. Hiſt. Dogm, p. 436.

c *And algif this Crede accorde unto Preſtis, netheles the higher Prelatis, as* Popis *and* Cardynals, *and* Biſſhopis *ſhulden more ſpecially Kunne this Crede, and teche it to Men undir hem.* Comm. on the Athan. Creed.

Compare ſome words of Wickliff's Bileve.

I ſuppoſe, over this, that the Pope *be moſt obliſhid to the keping of the Goſpel among all Men that liven here; for the* Pope *is higheſt Vicar that Chriſt has here in Erth.* Collier. Eccl. Hiſt. Vol. 1. p. 728.

d *Commentarius in Pſalmos, alioſque Sacræ Scripturæ ac Liturgiæ Eccleſiaſticæ Hymnos.* MS. in Collegio *S. Trinitatis Cantab.* F. Commentarius in priores 89 Pſalmos habetur MS. in Bibliotheca Lambethana. *Wharton* ſub *Wickleſ.* Append. ad Cav. H. L. p. 54.

long with That Commentary, is not the ſame with that of *Wickliff*'s Bible: I have compared them. The *Commentary*, and *Verſion* too are reaſonably judged to be *Hampole*'s. I find by a Note left in a Blank Page at the Beginning (ſign'd *J. Ruſſel*) that there is a Copy of this *Commentary* in the *Royal* Library, (E. 15. 12.) but imperfect; the *Prologue* the very ſame, and expreſsly aſcribed to *Richard* of *Hampole*: From whence it may be juſtly ſuſpected that the Comment upon the *Athanaſian* Creed at the end, appearing in part (for, two Leaves are cut out) is *Hampole*'s, as well as the reſt. There is in *Bennet* Library, in *Cambridge*, another manuſcript Copy of the ſame Commentary (Mark'd, 1—1. Catal. p. 69.) with the *Comment* upon the *Creed* entire. The *Prologue* I found to be ſame as in the other, as alſo the Comment on the *firſt* Pſalm; by which I judge of the reſt.[a] The Comment on the *Canticles*, at the end is likewiſe the ſame; only the *Canticles* are not all placed in the ſame *Order*. At the Bottom of the Second Leaf of the Commentary, there is left this *Note*, by an unknown Hand: *Author hujus Libri, Richardus, Heremita de Hampole*. Now, if this Commentary really be *Hampole*'s, of which I can ſcarce make any queſtion, it will appear highly probable that the *Comment* on the *Creed* is his too. 2. What favors the Suſpicion is, that here the *Comment* is annexed to other *Comments* in like Form with it ſelf, and not to meer *Verſions* as in the Manuſcript of St. *John*'s Library. Nay further, This Comment on the *Creed*, as it appears in St. *John*'s Copy, has the ſeveral parts of the Creed in *Latin*, and in *red* Letter, prefix'd to the reſpective Verſion and Comment; juſt as we find, in *Hampole*, the ſeveral parts of each Pſalm exhibited firſt in *Latin*, and in *red* Letter: Which Circumſtance is of ſome weight. 3. Add to this, that there are ſome Expreſſions in the Comment on the Creed very like to thoſe which are familiar with the Author of that *Commentary* on the *Pſalms*: Such as theſe; *it is ſeid comunly, that ther ben* &c. *Clerkis ſein* thus, and thus; ſo that from ſimilitude of Style an

a Q. *Whether there be not one, or two more Copies of the ſame, in The* Bodleian. *See the* Bodleian *Manuſcripts, in the General* Catalogue. *N.* 2438. 3085.

Argument

Argument may be drawn in favor of *Hampole*, as well as for *Wickliff*. Theſe Conſiderations ſuffer me not to be poſitive on the other Side. The Comment may be *Hampole*'s; or it may be *Wickliff*'s; which latter Opinion I the rather incline to for the Reaſons before given, appearing to me ſomething more forcible than the other, tho' not much. However it be, the Comment may be uſeful: and if it be *Hampole*'s, it muſt be ſet 40 years higher than I have here placed it. The diſtance of 30, or 40 years makes no great Alteration in any Language: So that meerly from the *Language*, eſpecially in ſo ſmall a Tract, we can draw no Conſequence to the *Author*; excepting ſuch peculiarities as may have been rather proper to this or that *Man*, than to this or that *Time*.

Theſe are all the *antient* Comments upon the *Athanaſian* Creed that I have hitherto met with, or heard of; excepting only ſuch as have no certain *Author*, or none mention'd.

Muratorius informs us of Two Comments without Names, which are in manuſcript, in the *Ambroſian* Library, near 600 years old. One of them bears for its Title, *Expoſitio Fidei Catholicæ*; The Other has no Title. By the Age of the Manuſcripts (if *Muratorius* judges rightly thereof) one may be aſſured that That They are diſtinct and different from any of the *Comments* below *Abelard*: And that They are neither of them the ſame with *Bruno*'s, or *Fortunatus*'s may reaſonably be concluded, becauſe *Muratorius* was well acquainted with Both, and would eaſily have diſcover'd it. Whether either of them may prove to be *Abelard*'s, which has for its Title *Expoſitio Fidei*, and may ſuit well with the Age of the Manuſcripts, I know not. *Muratorius*, while He makes mention of *Bruno*, and *Hildegardis*, whoſe Comments He had ſeen, ſays nothing of *Abelard*'s: So that poſſibly one of his manuſcript Comments may prove the ſame with That. But if Neither of them be the ſame with *Abelard*'s, nor with each other, They muſt be allowed to paſs for Two diſtinct Comments, whoſe *Authors* are not yet known.

Tentzelius informs us of a nameleſs Comment (whereof there are three manuſcript Copies, one at *Gotha*, a ſecond at *Baſil*, a third at *Leipſick*) which runs parallel with *Bruno*'s Comments along with the *Athanaſian* Creed. He gives us a pretty large

Paragraph, with which it begins;[a] and which I have tranſcribed into the Margin. The *Leipſick* Manuſcript is above 500 years old. Whether This Comment be a diſtinct one by it ſelf, or may fall in with ſome or other of Thoſe before mention'd, cannot certainly be known, unleſs we had Them all to compare. It is obſervable that The Paragraph, in the Margin, with very little alteration, occurs in *Hampole*'s Latin Comment: Which begins alſo as *Bruno*'s does, with *Hic Beatus Athanaſius Liberum arbitrium poſuit.* From whence I ſhould imagine that the Copies *Tentzelius* refers to are nothing elſe but ſo many Copies of *Hampole*'s, were it not that one of them is confidently averr'd to be above 500 years old. If That be really ſo, then *Rich. Hampole* muſt be ſaid to have gather'd up his Comment out of *Bruno*'s and the other, with little or perhaps nothing of his own: And ſo *Tentzelius*'s will be a diſtinct Comment, older than *Hampole*'s. I very much ſuſpect, that *Hampole*'s is really nothing elſe but a Collection from older Comments, without a Syllable of his own: And ſo much the rather, if what I call *Wickliff*'s ſhould prove to be *Hampole*'s. For, That *Engliſh* Comment has no reſemblance at all with *Hampole*'s ſuppoſed *Latin* One.

Nothing now remains, but to cloſe This Chapter with a *Table*, as I have the former, repreſenting in one view a Summary of what is contain'd in it.

a *In dextro primæ paginæ hæc legi.*

Hæc ratio Fidei Catholicæ traditur in veteribus Codicibus a beato *Anaſtaſio Alexandrino* ſcripta. Et puto quod idcirco tam pleno & brevi ſermone tradita fuerit, ut omnibus Catholicis & minus eruditis tutam defenſionem præſtaret adverſus illam Tempeſtatem quam contrarius ventus (id eſt) Diabolus excitavit per *Arrium:* quam Tempeſtatem qui legere deſiderat, hanc Fidei veritatem integre & inviolabiliter teneat. *Tentzel.* p. 225.

A Table

A Table of the ANTIENT COMMENTS.

A.D.	Commentators	Country	Title of the Creed.
570	*Venant. Fortunatus*	Poictiers	*Fides Catholica.*
852	*Hincmar*	Rheims	*Symbolum Athanaſii.*
1033	*Bruno*	Wurtzburgh	*Fides Catholica Sancti Athanaſii Epiſcopi.*
1110	MS. *Ambroſian.*	Italy	*Fides Catholica.*
1110	MS. alter *Ambroſ.*	Italy	
1120	*Pet. Abaelardus*	France	*Symbolum Athanaſii.*
1170	*S. Hildegardis*	France	
1180	MS. *Lipſienſ.*	Germany	*Fides Anaſtaſii Papæ.*
1210	*Simon Tornacenſis*	France	*Symbolum Athanaſii.*
1220	*Alex. Neckham.*	England	
1340	*Rich. Hampolus*	England	*Athanaſii Symbolum.*
1380	*John Wickliff*	England	*Crede*, or Salm, of *Attanaſie.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Latin Manuſcripts of the Athanaſian Creed.

I Confine my ſelf in this Chapter to the *Latin* Manuſcripts, ſince the Creed was undoubtedly written originally in *Latin*; and therefore the Manuſcripts in any other Languages will be more properly treated of in another Chapter, among the *Verſions*. None of the *Learned* at this Day make any queſtion but that the Creed was originally a *Latin* Compoſure. This They pretend to be *certain* of, and unanimouſly agree in; however doubtfully they may ſpeak of other Things, or however They may differ in their Opinions about the *Age*, or *Author*. Even Thoſe, many of them, who have aſcribed the Creed to *Athanaſius*, have yet been obliged by plain and irreſiſtible Evidence to acknowledge, with the Legates of P. *Gregory* IXth, that it was originally *Latin*. The *Style* and *Phraſeology* of the Creed; its early Reception among the *Latins*, while unknown to the *Greeks*; the *Antiquity*, and *Number* of the *Latin* Manuſcripts, and their *Agreement* (for the moſt part) with each other, compared with the *Lateneſs*, the *Scarceneſs*, and the *Diſagreement* of the *Greek* Copies, all concur to demonſtrate that this Creed was originally a *Latin* compoſure, rather than a *Greek* one: And as to any other Language beſides theſe two, none is pretended.

I proceed then to recount the *Latin* Manuſcripts as high as we can find any extant, or as have been known to have been extant; and as low as may be neceſſary, or uſeful to our main Deſign.

A. D. 600 The oldeſt we have heard of is one mention'd by Biſhop *Uſher*, which He had ſeen in the *Cotton* Library, and which He judged to come up to the *Age* of *Gregory* the *Great*.[a] This Manuſcript

a *Latino-gallicum* illud Pſalterium in Bibliotheca *Cottoniana* vidimus: ſicut & alia *latina duo*, longe majoris antiquitatis; in quibus, præter Hymnum Hunc (*Sc. Te Deum*) ſine ullo Autoris nomine, *Hymni ad matutinas*, titulo inſcriptum, & *Athanaſianum* habebatur Symbolum, & *Apoſtolicum* totidem omnino quot hodiernum noſtrum continens Capitula. In priore, quod *Gregorii* I Tempore non fuiſſe recentius, tum ex antiquo Picturæ genere has

has often been appealed to since *Usher*'s Time, and upon the credit of *Usher*, by the Learned on this Subject: As particularly by *Comber*, *L'Estrange*, *Tentzelius*, *Tillemont*, *Le Quien*, *Muratorius*, *Natalis Alexander*, and perhaps several more. *Montfaucon* takes notice of *Usher*'s Manuscript; but observes that *Usher* Himself allowed the *Character to be much later* than the Time of *Gregory*:[a] Which would have been a strange inconsistency in *Usher*, who forms his Argument for the Antiquity of the Manuscript from the *Character* it self, and from the *antient* kind of *Picture*. But *Montfaucon* is plainly mistaken, confounding what *Usher* had said of Another Manuscript, in *Bennet* Library at *Cambridge*,[b] with what He had said of the *Cotton* Manuscript at *Westminster*. The Two Manuscripts are very distinct, and different as possible; nor has the Latter any *Athanasian* Creed in it: Only, its being called *Gregory*'s *Psalter*, occasion'd, I suppose, the mistake of making it the same with the other. *Tentzelius*[c] seems first to have confounded them together: And probably *Montfaucon* followed Him implicitely, not having *Usher* at hand to consult; which would immediately have discovered the Fallacy. Were there no other Objection against *Usher*'s Manuscript beside what hath been mention'd, all would be well. But it is of greater weight to observe, that there is not, at This Day, in the *Cotton* Library any such manuscript Copy of the *Athanasian* Creed; nor indeed any *Latin* Psalter that can come up to the Age of *Gregory*, or near it. There is an *antient Psalter* (mark'd *Vespasian* A) wrote in *Capitals*, and *illuminated*; and which might, by the *Character*, be as old as the Time of *Gregory* the *Great*; were it not certain, from a Charter of K. *Ethelbald*,

colligitur, tum ex Literarum Forma Grandiuscula, *Athanasianum* quidem, *Fidei Catholicæ*, ——— alterum vero *Symboli Apostolorum* præfert Titulum. In posteriore, quod Regis *Æthelstani* aliquando fuit, *Apostolicum*, vice versa, *Symbolum* simpliciter, alterum autem *Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini* nuncupatur. *Usser.* de Symb. Præf. p. 2, 3.

a Codicum omnium qui hactenus visi memoratique sunt, antiquissimus ille est qui ab *Usserio* laudatur, ævo *Gregorii Magni* conscriptus; si tamen ea vere sit ejus MS. ætas: nam addit *Usserius*, scripturam *ævo Gregorii longe esse posteriorem*. Montf. Diatr. p. 721.

b In Psalterio Græco Papæ *Gregorii*, ut præfert Titulus (scriptura enim ævo *Gregorii* longe est posterior) Psalterio videlicet Græco & Romano, latinis utroque literis descripto, quod in *Benedictini*, apud *Cantabrigienses*, Collegii Bibliotheca est reconditum. *Usser.* de Symb. p. 9.

c *Tentzelii* Judic. Eruditor. p. 49. *Et* Exercit. Select. p. 29.

written

written in the ſame Hand, and at the ſame Time, and formerly belonging to it,[a] that it cannot be ſet higher than the year 719 when *Ethelbald* began to reign.

This *Pſalter* has the *Te Deum*, with the Title of *Hymnus ad Matutinum*, *as Uſher*'s had; and alſo the *Athanaſian* Creed with the Title of *Fides Catholica*; but Both in a very different and much later Hand than That of the *Pſalter* it Self; later by ſeveral Centuries, as the very learned Mr. *Wanley*[b] judges, who ſets the Age of the *Pſalter* about 1000 years, but of the *Athanaſian* Creed, *&c.* at the Time of the *Norman* Conqueſt. A Suſpicion, however, may from hence ariſe, that This very *Pſalter*, with what belongs to it, might be the *Pſalter* &c. which *Uſher* ſpake of; eſpecially ſince there is none other in the *Cotton* Library at all like it. But, on the contrary, it is to be conſider'd, that This *Pſalter* has no *Apoſtolical* Creed at all in it, which *Uſher* affirms his to have had: Nor has it the *Hymnus Matutinus*, beginning with, *Gloria in excelſis Deo*, which *Uſher*'s alſo had.[c] Neither is it at all probable that, if *Uſher* had intended the *Pſalter* now extant in the *Cotton*, He ſhould give no hint of the *Saxon* Verſion going along with it; eſpecially conſidering that it might be made an Objection to its Antiquity. Nor do I think that ſo inquiſitive a Man as *Uſher* could either have being ignorant of the Age of *Ethelbald*, or of his *Charter* having been once a part of That Manuſcript. In his *Hiſtoria Dogmatica*,[d] He takes notice of this very *Pſalter* (now

a Conſtat vero ex *Hiſtoria* & *Synopſi* Biblioth *Cottonianæ*, quam in ingens Reip. literariæ Beneficium edidit, amplificandis bonis Literis natus, doctiſſimus *Thomas Smithus* noſter, & *indiculo* Pſalterii latini in majuſculis ſcripti cum Verſione *Saxonica* interlineari, quod notatur *Veſpaſian.* A. I. Chartam hanc (*Æthelbaldi R. Auſtralium Saxonum*) ex iſto MS. exſciſſam eſſe. Quod etiam illius quum menſura quæ cum Foliis illius MS. quadrat, tum etiam *Manus* in utroque prorſus *eadem*, tum denique *Locus* MSS, unde ſciſſa eſt, inter Folia X, & XI, codicem vertentibus oſtendit. *Hickeſ. Diſſert. Epiſt. in Lingu. Septentr. Theſaur.* p. 67.

b Vid. *Wanleii* Catal. MSS. Septentrion. p. 222.

c Ad Finem veterum Pſalteriorum Latinorum, cum *Apoſtolico* & *Athanaſiano* Symbolo, etiam Hymnus iſte (*Sc. Gloria* &c.) habetur adjectus. In antiquiſſimo *Cottoniano* ἀντιγράφῳ eſt: in *Æthelſtaniano* proximo, *Hymnus in die Dominico ad Matutinas*, inſcribitur. *Uſſer.* de Symbol. p. 33.

d In Bibliotheca D. *Roberti Cotton* extat Pſalterium Romanum vetuſtiſſimum, cum verſione interlineari *Saxonica:* Character idem cum chartâ *Æthilbaldi* Anglorum Regis, anno 736 datâ. *Uſſer Hiſto. Dogmat.* p. 104.

marked

marked, *Veſpaſian* A) and of the *Saxon Verſion* in it, and likewiſe of its being in the *ſame Hand* with *Ethelbald*'s Charter: And there He ſets the Age of it no higher than the year 736, (that is, above 130 years later than *Gregory* I.) without the leaſt Hint that He had ever miſtaken the Age of it before, or had thought otherwiſe of it than He did at the Time of his writing this later Treatiſe. Theſe Conſiderations convince me that Biſhop *Uſher* had ſeen ſome other Manuſcript, which has ſince That Time, like many more,[a] been loſt, or ſtollen from the *Cotton* Library. He that was ſo accurate in every Tittle of what he ſays of K. *Athelſtan*'s Pſalter, (mention'd at the ſame Time) could never have been ſo negligent, or rather plainly careleſs, in reſpect of the other. I conclude therefore, that there really was ſuch a *Pſalter* as *Uſher* deſcribes, with the *Athanaſian* Creed in it; ſuch as He judged to be of the *Age* of *Gregory* I, from more Marks than one: And how good a Judge He was in Thoſe Matters, is well known to as many as know any thing of That Great Man, one of the brighteſt Ornaments of his Age, and thoroughly vers'd in all kinds of Literature.

Next to This of *Biſhop Uſher* we may place the famous Manuſcript of *Treves*, from which the *Colbert* Manuſcript (to be mention'd hereafter in its place) was copied. Mr. *Anthelmi* ſets it as high as the year 450, upon a preſumption that the *Colbert* Manuſcript is as old as the year 600, and that 150 years may reaſonably be allow'd between the *Colbertine* Copy and That from which it was Copied. *Tillemont*, ſuppoſing, or admitting the *Colbertine* to be near the Age that *Anthelmi* mentions, yet thinks 50 years difference might be ſufficient; and that therefore the Age of the *Treves* Manuſcript might be fix'd at 550, or thereabout.[b] But, ſince the *Colbert* Manuſcript cannot reaſonably be ſet much higher than 760, as we ſhall ſee in its proper place; I ſhall not pretend to ſet the *Treves* Manuſcript above 660; and that only under the favourable Allowance of a probable Conjecture. The Authority of this Manuſcript of *Treves* ſtands upon the Credit of a Paſſage preſix'd 660

a Vid. *Tho. Smithi* Præfationem ad Catalog. MSS. Bibl. Cotton.
b *Tillemont* Memoires. Tom. 8. p. 670.

to the *Colbertine* Copy,[a] which declares that the latter was copied from a Manuſcript found at *Treves*. It was not a Copy of the *intire* Creed, but began at the Second Part which relates to the *Incarnation*. For, after the Words, *believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, (being only part of the foregoing Sentence) follows; *For, the right Faith is, that we believe*, and ſo on to the end of the Creed. This remaining part of the Creed is very different from the common Copies, and ſeems to have been ſo contrived with deſign, as I ſhall have occaſion to obſerve more at large in the Sequel. And it is to me an Argument that the Manuſcript was written while the *Eutychian* Controverſy was at the Height, about the End of the 5th Century, or Beginning of the *Sixth*; tho' I here ſet it a great deal lower, becauſe This is not the Place to explain that matter fully, nor would I too far indulge a bare *Conjecture*. It is ſufficient to ſuppoſe it written in the VIIth Century, as it was undoubtedly copied from, as early if not earlier than the VIIIth.

700 After the Manuſcript of *Treves*, may juſtly follow the *Ambroſian* Manuſcript, which is in the *Ambroſian* Library at *Milan*; a Copy of which has been publiſh'd by *Muratorius*, in his Second Tome of *Anecdota*. It was brought thither from the famous *Monaſtery* of *Bobbio* (of *High-Lombardy*, in the *Milaneſe*) founded by *Columbanus*, A. D. 613. The *Character* of the Manuſcript is *Langobardick*; and it is judged by *Muratorius* (who has more particularly examin'd it) to be above 1000 years old.[b] By his Account then, who wrote in the year 1698, we ought to ſet the Age of This Manuſcript higher than 698. Yet, becauſe *Montfaucon*, who in his Travels through *Italy* had alſo ſeen it, puts it no higher than the VIIIth Century,[c] we ſhall be content to place

a Hæc inveni *Treviris* in uno Libro ſcriptum, ſic incipiente, *Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti & reliqua. Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti fideliter credat.* Apud *Montf.* Diatrib. p. 728.

b In alio etiam vetuſtiſſimo Ambroſianæ Bibliothecæ Codice *ante mille & plures annos* ſcripto, *Symbolum* idem ſum nactus. *Murator.* Tom. 1. p. 16.

Cæterum opuſculum Hoc (*Bachiarii Fides*) mihi depromptum eſt ex antiquiſſimo *Ambroſiana* Bibliothecæ Codice, quem *ante Annos minimum mille* conſcriptum, Characterum Forma non dubitanter teſtatur. Fuit autem olim celebris Monaſterii *Bobienſis*, & ex illo in *Ambroſianam* tranſlatus a magno Card. *Frederico Borromeo* &c. *Murator.* Tom. 2. p. 8. item p. 224.

c Codex VIII. Sæculi, Characte*re Langobardico*, in quo *Gennadii* liber de Eccleſiaſticis

it

it between the VIIth and VIIIth, or in the year 700, to make it a round Number. There are in this Manuſcript ſome *Readings* different from the common Copies; which ſhall be carefully noted hereafter. It is without any *Title*.

We may next ſet down K. *Athelſtan*'s Pſalter, of which Biſhop *Uſher* had taken Notice, making it next in Age to the other moſt antient one of the Age of *Gregory* I. He and Dr. *Grabe* Both fix the Date of it to the year 703, from the *Rule* of the *Calendar* found in it.[a] Dr. *Smith*, in his Catalogue of the *Cotton* Manuſcripts, inclines to think that the Manuſcript is later than That Time, but taken from one that was really as early as the year 703; the later Copiſt tranſcribing (as ſometimes has been) the Book and the Rule word for word, as He found Them.[b] Allowing This to have been the Caſe here (tho' it be only Conjecture) it will ſtill be true that there was a Manuſcript of the Age of 703, with This Creed in it; from whence the later One, now extant, was copied: which ſerves our purpoſe as well; and the reſt is not material. I have nothing farther to obſerve, but that the *Pſalter* wherein This Creed is, is the *Gallican* Pſalter, not the *Roman*; and the Title is, *Fides Sancti Athanaſii Alexandrini, The Faith of St. Athanaſius of Alexandria*: The oldeſt Monument, of any we have extant, aſcribing this Creed to *Athanaſius*; excepting only the Council of *Autun* in 670, if we may depend upon the *Canon* aſcribed to it. 703

Dogmatibus, *Bachiarii* Fides, *Symbolum Athanaſii*, omnia eadem manu. *Montfauc.* Diar. Ital. p. 18.

a Pſalterium illud anno æræ noſtræ Chriſtianæ 703, longe ante *Æthelſtani* regnantis Tempora, ex Regulis *Kalendario* in libri initio ſubjunctis ſcriptum fuiſſe deprehendi. *Uſſer.* de Symb p. 6.

Quod Regis *Æthelſtani* fuiſſe dicitur, atque Anno 703 Scriptum eſt. *Grabii* Prologom. in Pſalt. Alexandr. c. 3.

b Hic vero venerandæ Antiquitatis Liber fere ante mille Annos deſcriptus; ut Quibuſdam ex *Calendario*, quod Annum Chriſti 703, certo deſignat, illic præfixo videtur. Sed cum Librarios eandem Temporis adnotationem, quæ ad vetuſtiſſimos Codices proprie & peculiariter Spectat, ſuis exemplaribus appoſuiſſe ſæpiſſime obſervaverim ——— an ſit ille ipſe Codex autographus qui tantam præ ſe ferat ætatem, vel annon potius ſæculo, aut circiter, ante Tempora *Æthelſtani* deſcriptus, vix pro certo præſtarem; ad poſteriorem ſententiam faventiori animo inclinaturus. *Smith.* Bibl. *Cotton.* Hiſtor. p. 44.

760 We may now take in the *Colbertine* Copy, of which I have before ſpoken, referring the Date of it to the year 760, or thereabout. *Montfaucon* ſets it above the Age of *Charles* the *Great*,[a] allowing it to have been written about the Time of *Pepin*, who began to reign in the year 752. So that I cannot be much out of Time in placing it as I have done. It is written in *Saxon* Character, and is imperfect; wanting the firſt Part, above one Half of the Creed, juſt as the Manuſcript of *Treves* from which it was copied.

760 The Manuſcript of St. *Germans*, at *Paris*, is intire, and of the ſame Age with the former.[b] It is mark'd, num. 257, and written in a *Saxon Letter*, as well as the other. The Title, *Fides Sancti Athanaſii Epiſcopi Alexandriæ*. It differs in ſome places from the common Copies (as ſhall be noted hereafter) tho' not near ſo much as the *Colbert* Manuſcript before mention'd.

772 Next to theſe is the famous Manuſcript of *Charles* the *Great*, at the end of a *Gallican* Pſalter, written in Letters of Gold, and preſented by *Charlemagne*, while only King of *France*, to Pope *Adrian* I, at his firſt Entrance upon the Pontificate, in the year 772. *Lambecius* in his Catalogue of the *Emperor*'s Library at *Vienna*, where This Manuſcript is, gives a large Account of it.[c] The Title is; *Fides Sancti Athanaſii Epiſcopi Alexandrini*,

800 There is Another Manuſcript in the *Royal* Library at *Paris*,

a Nongentos ſuperat Annos *Colbertinus* codex 784. Saxonicis deſcriptus literis, &, mea quidem ſententia, ante ætatem *Caroli Magni* editus ——— Sunt qui Codicem illum 1100 annorum eſſe adfirmarunt: Verum periti quique ævo circiter *Pipini* exaratum arbitrantur. *Montf.* Diatr. p. 721.

Nec tamen Codicis *Colbertini* Auctoritate nititur Hæc Sententia, quam arbitratur *Anthelmius* 1100 annorum. Etenim (quod pace viri eruditiſſimi, mihique amiciſſimi dicatur) multo minoris ætatis Codex eſſe comprobatur; nemo enim peritus cui Librum exhibuerim, Octavo eum Sæculo antiquiorem æſtimavit. *Montfauc.* ibid. p. 724.

b Paris Saltem Antiquitatis eſt *Sangermanenſis* noſter, num. 257. *Saxonicis* pariter literis exaratus, qui Titulum habet, *Fides Sancti Athanaſii Epiſcopi Alexandrinæ*. Montf. p. 721.

c *Lambecii* Catal. Biblioth. Vindobonenſ. l. 2. c. 5. p. 261. 296. &c. *Carolus Magnus* proprio carmine ſuo teſtatur ſe illum Codicem ſummo Pontifici *Hadriano* I. dono miſiſſe; & quidem, ut ego arbitror, illo ipſo Anno 772. cujus die decimo Februarii jam memoratus *Hadrianus* in ſummum Pontificem electus eſt. *Lambec.* ibid.

mark'd

mark'd 4908, which *Montfaucon* judges to be near 900 years old.[a] He wrote in the year 1698. So if we place it in the year 800, we ſhall want a little of 900 years, from That Time. He ſuppoſes it of very near the ſame Age with the *Vienna* Manuſcript. It bears no *Title*, nor any Name, or Note of the *Author*.

I may here place a Manuſcript of *Benet* College Library in *Cambridge*, whoſe Age I cannot certainly fix to a year; But by all Circumſtances it cannot well be ſuppoſed later than This Time. It is at the end of a *Pſalter*, which by comparing I find to be a *Gallican* Pſalter. It ſeems by the *Names* of *Saints*, and other marks, to have been written in *England*. Biſhop *Parker* left a Remark in it about it's being in the poſſeſſion firſt of one of the Arch-biſhops of *Canterbury*, and at length conveyed down to the Hands of *Becket*,[b] who was Arch-biſhop of *Canterbury* in the year 1162. The great Antiquity of the Manuſcript appears from the *Martyrs*, *Confeſſors*, and *Virgins* addreſs'd to in it; all of the early Times.[c] There are ſome few Variations in This Copy, ſuch as are alſo found in the moſt antient Manuſcripts of this Creed; particularly the word, *Et*, frequently inſerted before *Spiritus Sanctus*, which has been ſince eras'd by ſome officious Hand. The Title is obſervable; *Fides Sancti Anaſthaſii Epiſcopi. Anaſthaſii*, for *Athanaſii*, by a Tranſpoſition of Syllables.

Montfaucon informs us of a Manuſcript in the *Colbert* Library, Num. 1339, which once belong'd to *Charles* the *Bald*,[d] who died in the year 877; began to reign 840. It cannot therefore

a Regius Codex, num. 4908 annorum pene nongentorum, nullum habet *Titulum*, nullumque *Auctoris* nomen. Æqualis ipſi eſt, qui memoratur a *Lambecio* &c. *Montf.* ibid. p. 721.

b Hoc Pſalterium [N. X.] laminis argenteis decauratum, & gemmis ornatum, quondam fuit N. Cantuar. Archiep. tandem venit in manus *Thomæ Becket* quondam Cant. Archiep. Quod teſtatum eſt in veteri ſcripto. *Matth. Cant.* Vid. Catal. MSS. C. C. C. C. p. 43.

c In Litaniis, Orate pro nobis, Sancte *Conteſtor*, Sancte *Heraſme*, Sancte *Oswolde* &c. Martyres. Sancte *Cuthberte*, Sancte *Germane*, Sancte *Placide*, Sancte *Columbane*, Sancte *Cantentine* &c. Confeſſores. Sancta *Brigida*, Sancta *Eugenia*, Sancta *Eulalia*, Sancta *Petronella*, &c. Virgines. Et non ſunt hiſce recentiores. Catal. MSS. Bibl. C.C. C.C. p. 43.

d Colbertinus N. 1339. Qui fuit *Karoli Calvi* imperatoris, inſcribitur; *Fides Athanaſii*. Montfauc. Diatrib. p. 721.

be

be much amiſs to fix upon 860 for the Date of it. The Title it bears is *Fides Athanaſii.*

883 There is a *Second* Manuſcript Copy of the *Athanaſian* Creed, in the Library of *Benet* (or *Corpus Chriſti*) College, mark'd N. O. V. It is at the end of a *Gallican* Pſalter, in the ſame hand, and carrying its certain Date with it. It was written in *France*, by Order of Count *Amadeus*, or *Achadeus*;[a] and in the year 883, as appears from the *Litany*.[b] The Title is, *Fides Catholica.*

930 Mr. *Wanley* gives us an Account of a *Roman* Pſalter in the *Royal* Library, (formerly of St. *James*'s) with an interlinear *Saxon* Verſion to it, written about the Time of King *Athelſtan*.[c] Among the Canticles at the End, there is alſo This Creed, under the Title of *Hymnus Athanaſii:* A Title which ſeems to have been then cuſtomary in *England*, as may be probably argued from a *Saxon* Verſion (to be hereafter mention'd) of the ſame Age, or very near, and bearing the like Title.[d] I muſt be ſo juſt to my Reader as to acquaint Him, that after diligent, and repeated Search into the *King*'s Library, This Manuſcript could not be found: So that I cannot be abſolutely certain that *Hymnus Athanaſii* means this Creed. But yet I can ſcarce make any doubt of it, conſidering the *Place* it has among the *Canticles*, and that This very *Title* uſed to be given to the Creed.

957 In the Arch-biſhop's Library, at *Lambeth*, there is a *Gallican* Pſalter, written, according to Mr. *Wanley*,[e] in the Time of King *Edgar*, or a little before. At the End, there is the *Athanaſian* Creed in the ſame antient Hand, with an interli-

a Ad Finem Pſalterii, *Achadeus, miſericordia Dei comes hunc Pſalterium ſcribere juſſit.* Vid. *Catal.* MSS. p. 46.

b Oratur, *ut Marinum Apoſtolicum in Sancta religione conſervare digneris, ut Karlomannum Regem perpetua proſperitate conſervare digneris: ut Reginam conſervare digneris: ut Fulconem Epiſcopum cum omni grege ſibi commiſſo in tuo apto ſervitio conſervare digneris.* Vid. *Catalog.* MSS. C. C. C. C. p. 47.

c *Wanleii* Catal. MS. Septentr. p. 182.

d *Hymnus Athanaſii* de Fide Trinitatis. *Vid.* Wootoni *conſpectum Brevem operis Hickeſiani.* p. 77.

e *Wanleii* Catal. p. 269. *Eadgari* Regis *Angloſaxonum* Temporibus, aut paulo ante, ut videtur, exaratus.

Wharton. Auctarium Hiſtoriæ Dogmaticæ. p. 374. *Alfredo* parum recentior videtur.

near

near *Saxon* Verſion. The Title, *Fides Catholica Sancti Athanaſii Epiſcopi.*

There is another Manuſcript Copy of this Creed, much of the ſame Age with the former, in my Lord *Harley*'s elegant Library, richly furniſh'd with all kinds of curious, and valuable Manuſcripts. This Creed is at the End of a *Gallican* Pſalter, and has an interlinear *Saxon* Verſion to it. Mr. *Wanley* who was ſo kind as to acquaint me with it, and to favor me with a ſight of it, refers it to the Time of King *Edgar*; who began his Reign in 957, and died in 973. The Title is, *Fides Catholica Athanaſii Alexandrini Epiſcopi.* 970

In the *Cotton* Library, there is a *Gallican* Pſalter, with *Saxon* interlined (mark'd *Vitellius.* E. 18.) which Mr. *Wanley* refers to the year 1031.[a] The *Athanaſian* Creed at the End, as uſual, among the other Canticles, bears the Title of *Fides Catholica Athanaſii Epiſcopi Alexandrini.* 1031

In the *Norfolk* Library, there is alſo a *Gallican* Pſalter, whoſe Age is fix'd by Mr. *Wanley*[b] to the Time of *Edward* the *Confeſſor.* The Creed is in it, and has an interlinear *Saxon* Verſion running along with it. The Title, *Fides Catholica Athanaſii Alex.* 1050

In *Benet* College Library is a manuſcript Copy of this Creed without any Title. The *Pſalter* wherein it is, is called *Portiforium Oſwaldi*, and is mark'd, K. 10. An Account of the Book may be ſeen in Mr. *Wanley*, and in the *Catalogue.* 1064

I may here place the *Cotton* Manuſcript before mention'd, bound up with the antient *Roman* Pſalter mark'd, *Veſpaſian A*; tho' of a very different, and much later Hand. The Creed has an interlinear *Saxon* Verſion, as uſual; and its Title is, *Fides Catholica.* Mr. *Wanley* judges it to be as old as the coming in of the *Normans.*[c] 1066

Of the ſame Age[d] is the *Roman* Pſalter in our Publick Library at *Cambridge*, with the *Latin* Text in *black* Letter, a *Saxon* Verſion in *red*, and the Titles in *green.* The Creed is inter- 1066

a *Wanleii* Catal. p. 222. 224. *Smith.* Catal. Cotton. p. 101.
b *Wanleii* Catal. MSS. Septentr. p. 291.
c *Wanleii* Catal. p. 222. *Smith.* Bibl. Cotton. Hiſtor. p. 35.
d *Wanleii* Catal. p. 152.

lined

lined with *Saxon*, as well as the *Pſalter*, but has no *Title*: For, from this Time, I conceive, The *Title* began to be left out in ſome Copies, for Brevity ſake, or becauſe it was thought ſuperfluous.

It will be needleſs to take notice of any Manuſcripts below this Time, excepting only ſuch as contain ſomething *particular*.

1090 *Queſnel*,[a] and after Him *Pagi*,[b] ſpeaks of a manuſcript Copy of this Creed in a *Breviary* and *Pſalter* for the uſe of the Monks of Mount *Caſſin*, judged to be about 600 years old. I ſuppoſe, This may be the ſame *Breviary* that *Queſnel* has made Obſervations upon, in another Work, which I have not ſeen, but find referr'd to by Father *Le Long*:[c] And there *Queſnel* fixes the Age a little below 1086; *paulo poſt Annum* 1086. The Title of the Creed is, *Fides Sti Athanaſii Epiſcopi:* The Letter, *Langobardick*.

1120 In my Lord *Harley*'s Library I had a ſight of a Manuſcript written in *Germany* about 600 years ago, for the uſe of the Church of *Augsburg*; which bears for its Title; *Fides Anaſtaſii Epiſcopi*.

1240 *Uſher* takes notice of a Copy of This Creed then in the *Royal* Library at St. *James*'s (formerly belonging to *Lewis* the IX) the Title, *Fides Catholica*.

1300 *Montfaucon* informs us of a *Latin* and a *French* Copy of this Creed found in a Manuſcript about 400 years old; placed in oppoſite Columns. What is remarkable is, that the Latin has for its Title *Canticum Bonifacii*, and the *French* over againſt the other, *Ce chant St. Anaiſtaiſe qui Apoſtoilles de Rome*.[d]

1400 In the *Bodleian* at *Oxford*, there is a manuſcript Copy of this Creed (num. 1204) which has for its Title, *Anaſtaſii Expoſitio Symboli Apoſtolorum*. It is about 300 years old, and belong'd once to the *Carthuſian* Monks at *Mentz*. The *Carthuſians* are particularly noted for their more than common Veneration for this Creed, reciting it every day at the *Prime*, as

a *Queſnel*. Differt. XIV. ad Leon. Oper. p. 732.
b *Pagi* Critic. in Baron. Vol. 1. p. 441.
c *Le Long* Bibl. Bibl. Vol. 1. p. 244.
d *Montfaucon*. Diatrib. p. 722. 727.

Cardinal

Cardinal *Bona* teſtifies, both of Them and the *Ambroſians*;[a] which I remark by the way. I obſerve, that the *German* Copies of this Creed, for 5, or 6 hundred years upwards, have moſt commonly *Anaſtaſius* inſtead of *Athanaſius*. I make no queſtion but that This firſt aroſe from a Miſtake of the Copiſts, and not out of any Deſign. One may perceive, that *Anaſtaſius* is ſometimes written where *Athanaſius* of *Alexandria* muſt have been intended, and none elſe. I ſuppoſe, at firſt, ſome Copies had accidentally *Anaſthaſius* for *Athanaſius* (as one in *Benet* College Library mention'd above) by a tranſpoſition of letters or ſyllables; as eaſily happens in writing, or ſpeaking. Thus *Phrunutus* for *Phurnutus*, *Marivadus* for *Varimadus*, and the like. Now, when the Copiſts had thus introduced *Anaſthaſius*, (*Anaſ-tha*, for *Atha-naſ:*) Thoſe that came after left out the *h*, to make it *Anaſtaſius*, That being a common Name, which the other was not. This I thought proper to hint that it may appear how little reaſon there is for aſcribing this Creed to *Anaſtaſius*, whether of *Rome*, or of *Antioch*, or Any Other.

I have now run through the Manuſcripts of greateſt note, or uſe, either for *Antiquity*, or for any thing *particular*, to give light to our further Inquiries. Two only I have omitted, which have been thought conſiderable; not ſo much in themſelves, as upon account of the other Tracts They were found to be join'd with. I would have taken notice of them in their place, had I certainly known what Time to refer them to. The one is the Manuſcript found in the Library of *Thuanus (Codex Thuaneus)* annex'd to ſome Tracts which were once ſuppoſed to belong to *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, tho' now certainly known to be none of his. *Queſnel* was much pleas'd with the Diſcovery of this Manuſcript, as favouring his Hypotheſis about *Vigilius Tapſenſis*:[b] And

a *Bona* de Divin. Pſalmod. c. 18. p. 897. 900.

b Abſoluta Diſſertationum noſtrarum Editione, inveni *Codicem Thuaneum*, in quo Dialogus *Vigilii Tapſenſis* adverſus *Arianos*, *Sabellianos*, & *Photinianos* legitur, ſub hoc Titulo: *Incipit Altercatio Athanaſii cum Hæreſibus.* Poſt hunc Tractatum habetur *Symbolum Nicænum*, & Formula Fidei *Ariminenſis* Concilii, quam proxime ſequitur *Symbolum Athanaſianum* cum hoc Epigraphe: *Fides dicta a Sancto Athanaſio Epiſcopo.* Porro, Conjecturæ noſtræ de *Auctore* hujus *Symboli* non parum ſuffragatur, quod in *antiquiſſimo* Codice illigatum reperiatur Opuſculo cui nomen *Athanaſii* pariter præfixum legitur, ſed quod *Vigilii Tapſenſis* eſſe indubitatum habetur &c. *Queſnel* in Addend. p. 913.

Anthelmius has taken ſome pains in confuting Him; ſhowing that the ſuppoſed Works of *Vigilius* are none of his,[a] and that if they were, yet no certain Argument could be drawn from thence to make *Vigilius* Author of the Creed; ſince it is a common Thing for Tracts of ſeveral Authors, eſpecially if They relate to the ſame Subject, to be tack'd to each other.

The *Second* Manuſcript is one that was found annexed to the Fragments of *Hilary* of *Poictiers*;[b] which Circumſtance was thought a reaſon for aſcribing this Creed to *Hilary*. *Voſſius* firſt, and after Him many Others throw it off as a very ſlight Argument, ſince the Manuſcript pretended is very *modern*, nor is the Creed aſcrib'd to *Hilary* in that Manuſcript, but only bound up with his *Fragments*, as any other Work might be, however little akin to them. *Montfaucon* takes notice of This matter, in few words,[c] *Tentzelius* more at large.[d] It is ſufficient for me juſt to have hinted it.

Having now given as particular Account as was needful of the more antient *Latin* Manuſcripts of this Creed, I may juſt obſerve that as to *Modern* ones, they are innumerable, there being ſcarce any manuſcript *latin* Pſalter of modern Date but what has the Creed in it, and generally without a *Title*. I may next ſubjoin a *Table* of the Manuſcripts here recited, repreſenting in one View the *Age*, the *Title*, the *Country* where written, and the kind of *Pſalter* wherein found: All which Circumſtances will be of uſe to us in our following Inquiries. Particularly, as to the *Pſalters*, it will be of moment to obſerve whether They be *Roman*, or *Gallican*; becauſe from thence we may be able to diſcover in what Places, or Countries, this Creed was firſt *received*, according to their uſe of This, or That

a *Vid.* Montfauc. Athan. Op. Tom. 2. p. 603. 724.

b Invenitur id ſimiliter in Fragmentis *Hilarii* hiſtoricis in Cod. veteri part. 2. Sub Finem. *Feleknan.* Var. Lect, Oper. Athan. p. 83.

c *Hilario* nonnulli adſcriptum voluerunt, quia nimirum in Codice quodam exſtat poſt *Hilarii* Fragmenta. Quaſi vero id non vulgo & in pleriſque Codicibus obſervetur, ut multa diverſorum opera conſequenter in manuſcriptis deſcribentur. Cum autem in ejuſmodi Codice poſt *Hilariana* opera, nullo præmiſſo Auctoris nomine compareat; hinc, uti jam ſupra diximus, inferendum, tum exaratum fuiſſe cum pro *Athanaſiano* nondum vulgo haberetur. *Montf.* Diatrib. p. 723.

d *Tentzel.* Judic. Erud. p. 2, 3. *&c.*

Pſalter.

Pſalter. But becauſe, perhaps, ſome Readers may be at a loſs to know what we mean by thoſe different Names of *Roman*, and *Gallican* Pſalters; it may not be improper here to throw in a few previous Inſtructions relating to the different kinds of *Latin* Pſalters, and the *Names* they have gone under.

There are four kinds, or ſorts, of *Latin* Pſalters; which have paſs'd under the Names of *Italick*, *Roman*, *Gallican*, and *Hebraick*. One of them was before *Jerom*'s Time: the Three laſt are all *Jerom*'s; as He had a Hand, more or leſs, in every one of them. I ſhall treat of them diſtinctly, in their Order, as follows.

I. The *Italick* Latin Pſalter, is of the old Tranſlation, or Verſion, ſuch as it was before *Jerom*'s Time. I ſhall not enter into the Diſpute whether it were *one* Verſion, or *many*. The common Opinion is, that there were ſeveral *Latin* Verſions before *Jerom*,[a] but one more Eminent than the reſt called *Italick*,[b] as being received into common uſe in *Italy*.[c] However that be, it is become cuſtomary with ſuch as treat of this Subject, to ſpeak of all that was extant before *Jerom*, as of *One Verſion*, under the Name of *Vetus Vulgata*, or *Verſio Italica*. There are *intire Pſalters* of this old Verſion, *printed*, and *manuſcript*;[d] tho' now no where in uſe in Divine Offices, except ſuch parcels of it as, having been antiently taken into the *Roman Miſſals*, or other old *Liturgies*, remain there ſtill, the People being accuſtom'd to them, and there being no great neceſſity for changing them. But all the *intire* Pſalters in uſe are of another kind. *Martianay*, in his Edition of *Jerom*'s Works, once intended to give us an intire and correct *Pſalter* (with ſome other of the Sacred Books) of the old *Italick* Verſion. But the *Various*

a Qui enim Scripturas ex Hebræa Lingua in Linguam *Græcam* verterunt numerari poſſunt, *Latini* autem interpretes nullo modo: ut enim Cuique primis Fidei Temporibus in manus venit Codex, & aliquantulum facultatis ſibi utriuſque Linguæ habere videbatur, auſus eſt interpretari. *Auguſt.* de Doctr. Chriſtian. l. 2. c. 11. p. 25. Tom. 3.

b In ipſis autem interpretationibus *Itala* cæteris præferatur: nam eſt verborum tenacior cum perſpicuitate ſententiæ. *Auguſt.* ibid. p. 27.

c Eccleſia latina a principio, vel ferme a principio, uſa eſt verſione latina Teſtamenti Vet. ex Græca τῶν ο tranſlatione facta, quæ *Itala* vulgo dicebatur, quoniam in *Italia* prius uſitata in alias inde latinorum Eccleſias recipiebatur. *Humphr. Hodius.* De Biblior. Text. Origin. p. 342.

d *Le Long* Biblioth. Bibl. Vol. 1. p. 243.

Lections were ſo many, and ſo different, that the Work appear'd too laborious and difficult for Him; for which reaſon He then laid it aſide.[a] This Verſion, or Verſions, is what all the *Latins* uſed before *Jerom*; and many alſo after Him, the *Africans* eſpecially, down to the VIth Century at leaſt, or beginning of the VIIth.

2. The *Roman* Pſalter is not very different from the Old *Italick*. It is nothing elſe but That Old Verſion curſorily, and in part, corrected by *Jerom*, in the Time of Pope *Damaſus*, A. D. 383. It has had the Name of *Roman*, becauſe the Uſe of it began the ſooneſt, and continued the longeſt in the *Roman* Offices. It obtain'd in *Gaul* near as ſoon as at *Rome*, but was laid aſide in the VIth Century, when *Gregory* of *Tours*[b] introduced the other Pſalter, ſince called *Gallican*. The *Roman* Pſalter however ſtill obtain'd at *Rome* till the Time of Pope *Pius*[c] the Vth: And it is ſtill uſed in the *Vatican* Church, and ſome few Churches beſides.

3 The *Gallican* Pſalter is *Jerom*'s more correct latin Tranſlation made from *Origen*'s *Hexaplar*, or moſt correct Edition of the Greek *Septuagint*, fill'd up, where that was deficient, from the *Hebrew*; diſtinguiſh'd with *Obelisks*, and *Aſterisks*, denoting the common *Greek* Verſion in thoſe places to be either redundant, or deficient. Many of the old Manuſcripts[d] ſtill retain thoſe

a Appendicem Sacrorum aliquot Voluminum, juxta *Veterem Vulgatam* uſu receptam ante *Hieronymum*, hoc loco edendam ſtatueramus: Sed quum Operi manus jamjam accederet, tantam inter MSS. Codices *hujus verſionis latinæ* deprehendimus diſſonantiam, ut impoſſibile eſſet vel ſolas variantes horum Codicum Lectiones adnotaſſe niſi maximo Temporis intervallo. Quare ne in ſequentem annum differretur Editio hujus *Divinæ Bibliothecæ*, Appendicem prædictam latiori Operi, ac majori Otio reſervavimus. *Martian.* Not. ad *Hieronym.* Vol. 1. p. 1419.

b Pſalmos autem cum ſecundum LXX. Interpretes *Romani* adhuc habeant; *Galli* & *Germanorum* Aliqui ſecundum *Emendationem*, quam *Hieronymus* Pater de LXX. Editione compoſuit, Pſalterium cantant: quam *Gregorius, Turonenſis* Epiſcopus, a partibus Romanis mutuatam, in *Galliarum* dicitur Eccleſias tranſtuliſſe. *Walafrid.* Strab. de Reb. Eccleſ. c. 25.

c Vid. *Card. Bona* rerum Liturgic. l. 2. c. 3. *Humphr. Hod.* p. 383. *Mabillon.* de Curſ. Gallican. p. 398.

d *The* Cotton *Manuſcript of* 703, *and the* Benet *of* 883, Lambeth *of* 957, *and* Bruno's *own Manuſcript of* 1033. *Beſides many more in* France. Quanta porro fuerit diligentia Noſtratium in deſcribendo hocce Pſalterio, cum Afteriſcis & obelis, non aliunde teſtatum volumus quam ex infinita copia Codicum MSS. qui cum talibus diſtinctionibus, ſuperſunt in Gallicanis Bibliothecis. Martin. *Hieronym.* Op. Vol. 1. Prolegom. 2. c. 5.

Marks:

Marks: But more have left them out, I ſuppoſe, to ſave Trouble. This more correct Pſalter was drawn up by *Jerom* in the year 389, and obtain'd firſt in *Gaul* about the year 580; or however not later than 595: From which Circumſtance it came to have the name of *Gallican*, in contradiſtinction to the *Roman*. From *Gaul*, or *France*, it paſs'd over into *England* before the year 597, and into *Germany*, and *Spain*, and other Countries. The Popes of *Rome*, tho' they Themſelves uſed the other Pſalter, yet patiently connived at the uſe of This, in the *Weſtern* Churches, and even in *Italy* it ſelf, and ſometimes privately authorized the uſe of it in Churches and Monaſteries;[a] till at length it was publickly authorized in the Council of *Trent*, and introduced a while after into *Rome* it ſelf by *Pius* the Vth. It was admitted in *Britain*, and *Ireland*, before the coming of *Auguſtine* the Monk, and prevail'd after, except in the Church of *Canterbury*[b] which was more immediately under the Arch-biſhop's Eye, and more conformable to the *Roman* Offices, than other parts of the Kingdom. This very *Gallican* Pſalter is what we ſtill retain in conſtant uſe, in our *Common-Prayer* Books: The other, in our *Bibles*, is from the *Hebrew*, by ſeveral learned Hands.

4. The *Hebraick* latin Pſalter means *Jerom*'s own Tranſlation immediately from the *Hebrew*, made in the year 391. This tho' otherwiſe of great Eſteem, was never uſed in the publick Church-Offices.[c] There are but few Copies of it, in compariſon, any where to be met with, becauſe This *Pſalter*, as before hinted, having never been in common uſe, like the *Ro-*

a Anno 1369. *Urbani* V. Autoritate Sancitum, ut *Caſſinenſes* Pſalterio *Gallicano* uterentur. *Montfauc.* Diar. Ital. p. 331. P. Adrian, *long before, had recommended the* Gallican *Pſalter to the Church of* Breme. *See below in Ch.* VI. *and C.* Bona, *p.* 506.

b Ante Adventum *Auguſtini* Monachi, primi Archiepiſcopi Cantuarienſis, in *Angliam*, i. e, ante annum 597, Eccleſiæ *Britannicæ* & *Hibernicæ* Pſalterium *Gallicanum* receperant: *Auguſtinus* huc a *Gregorio* M. miſſus *Romanum* ſecum advexit, & Eccleſiæ ſuæ *Cantuarienſi* tradidit. Sed loco illius iuvaluit tandem, per omnes Eccleſias *Anglicas*, uſus *Gallicani*. *Hodius.* de Text. Bibl. Origin. p. 384.

c Tertium eſt de *Hebræo* in latinum quod *Jeronymus* tranſtulit de Hebræo in Latinum. Sed non eſt in uſu Eccleſiæ, ſed viri ſtudii literati & ſapientes eo utuntur. *Roger: Bacon.* apud *Hodium* de Text. Original. p. 384.

Hæc autem (*Verſio ex Hebræo*) ideo recepta non fuit, quia duæ priores, quotidiano uſu in Eccleſiis frequentatæ, ſine magna divini officii perturbatione non poterant abrogari. *Bona.* Rerum Liturg. l. 2. c. 3. p. 506. *Vid.* etiam *Hodium.* p. 385.

MAN

man and *Gallican*, has been confined to a few Hands. We are not to expect an *Athanaſian* Creed in This Pſalter, as not being intended for the Uſe of the *Choir*: neither are we to expect to meet with it in the *Italick* Pſalters which are few, and which were grown, or growing, out of uſe before the *Athanaſian* Creed was brought into the Publick Offices. But in the *Roman* and *Gallican* Pſalters, we may find it: And it will be of moment to obſerve in which of them it is found. Indeed, ſome manuſcript Pſalters there are, which have the *Roman* and *Gallican* together in oppoſite Columns, the *Gallican* always ſet firſt.[a] Others have the *Hebraick* and *Gallican* ſet Column-wiſe as the former: And ſome have all the *Three* Verſions of *Jerom* placed in the like order. Dr. *Hody* informs us of Two ſuch Manuſcripts, to which may be added a *Third* now in *Trinity-College* in *Cambridge*, which has the *Athanaſian* Creed with *Bruno*'s Comment in it; as intimated above. Nay ſome Manuſcripts have the *Greek* alſo with the other, making a *Fourth* Column: An account of ſome Manuſcripts of this laſt ſort may be ſeen both in Dr. *Hody*, and *Le Long*.[b] Theſe Double, Triple, or Quadruple Pſalters came not in, I preſume, before the end of the *Tenth* Century, or beginning of the *Eleventh*. For *Berno Augienſis* of that Time acquaints us with the occaſion and uſe of them, and how They came to be ſo contrived. When the *Roman* way of *Singing*, firſt adapted to the *Roman* Pſalter, had been introduced into *France*, and *Germany* (which was firſt done in the VIIIth Century) in proceſs of Time it bred ſome confuſion in the two Pſalters, mixing and blend-

a *Hody* de Text. Bibl. Original. p. 385.

b *Le Long* Biblioth. Bibl. Vol. 1. p. 244.

c Inter cætera, ex emendata LXX Interpretum Tranſlatione *Pſal.* ex Græco in Latinum vertit (*Hieronymus*) illudque cantandum omnibus *Galliæ*, ac quibuſdam *Germaniæ* Eccleſiis tradidit. Et ob hoc *Gallicanum Pſalterium* appellavit, *Romanis* adhuc ex corrupta vulgata Editione, Pſalterium canentibus: ex qua *Romani* cantum compoſuerunt, nobiſque uſum cantandi contradiderunt. Unde accidit quod verba, quæ in diurnis vel nocturnis Officiis canendi more modulantur, intermiſceantur, & confuſe noſtris Pſalmis inſerantur; ut a minus peritis haud facile poſſit diſcerni quid *noſtræ*, vel *Romanæ* conveniat Editioni. Quod pius Pater ac peritus Magiſter intuens, *tres Editiones* in uno Volumine compoſuit: & *Gallicanum* Pſalterium, quod nos canimus, ordinavit in una Columna, in altera *Romanum*, in tertia *Hebraum*. Berno Augienſ. Epiſt. inedit. apud *Mabill.* de curſu Gallicano: p. 396. *Hodium* de Text. Original. p. 382.

ing

ing them one with the other; that it was difficult to diſtinguiſh what words belong'd to This, and which to That. To remedy This inconvenience, a way was found out to have Both the Pſalters diſtinctly repreſented to the Eye together, in Two ſeveral Columns: And thus came in the kind of Pſalters before mention'd. We eaſily ſee why the *Gallican* uſed to be ſet in the *firſt* Column: Namely, becauſe Thoſe Pſalters were contrived by the *French*, and *Germans*, who made uſe of the *Gallican*, and ſo gave the preference to their own. If I have detain'd my Reader a little too long in This Digreſſion about the *Pſalters*; I hope the uſefulneſs of the Subject may make Him ſome amends, and be a juſt Apology for it. I now return to our *Creed*, and what more immediately belongs to it; cloſing This Chapter, as I promis'd, with a *Table* repreſenting a Summary, or ſhort Sketch of what hath been done in it.

A Table

A Table of MANUSCRIPTS.

A. Dn	MSS.	Psalters	Titles of the Creed.
600	Bp. *Usher's*		*Fides Catholica.*
660	*Treves*		
700	*Ambrosian*		
703	*Cotton* 1	Gallican	*Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini.*
760	*Colbert* 1		
760	St. *Germans*		*Fides Sancti Athanasii Episcopi.*
772	*Vienna*	Gallican	*Fides Sancti Athanasii Episcopi Alexandrini.*
800	*Regius, Paris*		
850	*Benet.* Coll, *Cant.* 1.	Gallican	*Fides Sancti Anasthasii Episcopi.*
860	*Colbert* 2		*Fides Athanasii*
883	*Benet* C. 2	Gallican	*Fides Catholica.*
930	St. *James's* 1	Roman	*Hymnus Athanasii.*
957	*Lambeth*	Gallican	*Fides Catholica S. Athanasii Episcopi.*
970	*Harley* 1	Gallican	*Fides Catholica Athanasii Alexandrini Episcopi.*
1031	*Cotton* 2	Gallican	*Fides Catholica Athanasii Episcopi Alexandrini.*
1050	*Norfolk*	Gallican	*Fides Catholica Athanasii Alexandrini.*
1064	*Benet* C. 3		
1066	*Cotton* 3		*Fides Catholica*
1066	*Cambridge*	Roman	
1090	*Cassinensis*		*Fides Sancti Athanasii Episcopi.*
1120	*Harley* 2		*Fides Anastasii Episcopi.*
1240	St. *James's* 2		*Fides Catholica.*
1300	*Friars Minors*	Gallican	*Canticum Bonefacii.* *Ce Chant fust St Anaistaise qui Apostoilles de Rome.*
1400	*Bodleian*		*Anastasii Expositio Symboli Apostolorum.*

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Antient Verſions, printed or manuſcript.

SOME Account of the antient Verſions, of the *Athanaſian* Creed, may be of uſe to ſhew *when* and *where* it has been *received*, and what *Value* hath been ſet upon it, at ſeveral Times, and in ſeveral Countries. I ſhall note the Time, in the margin, when the *firſt* Verſion into any Language appears to have been made: And I ſhall rank the Verſions of the ſeveral Countries according to the Chronological Order of Thoſe *Firſt* Verſions reſpectively.

French Versions.

Under the name of *French Verſions*, I comprehend all Ver- 850
ſions made at any Time into the *vulgar* Language then current in *France*, whatever other Name ſome may pleaſe to give them. I beg leave alſo to comprehend under the ſame Name all *Oral* Verſions delivered by word of mouth, as well as *written* ones: Otherwiſe I am ſenſible that I ought not to have begun with *French Verſions*. I do not know that the *Gauls*, or *French* had any written ſtanding Verſion of This Creed ſo early as 850, or for ſeveral Centuries after. Their oldeſt Verſions of the *Pſalter* are ſcarce earlier than the XIth Century,[a] and of the *intire* Scripture ſcarce ſo early as the XIIth:[a] And we are not to expect a *written* Verſion of the *Athanaſian* Creed more antient than of their *Pſalter*. But what I mean by ſetting the *French Verſions* ſo high as I here do, is that the *Athanaſian* Creed was, as early as is here ſaid, interpreted out of *Latin* into the *vulgar* Tongue for the uſe of the People, by the Clergy of *France*, in their *verbal* Inſtructions. This is the ſame Thing, in effect, with a *written* ſtanding Verſion, as ſupplying the Place of it; and is as full a proof of the general *Reception* of the Creed, at That Time, as the other would be. Now, that the *Athanaſian*

a *See Le Long.* Biblioth. Bibl. Vol. 1. p. 313. *&c.*

Creed was thus interpreted into the *vulgar* Tongue in *France*, as early as the year 850, or earlier, I prove from the words of *Hincmar*, above cited, giving Orders to the Clergy of his Province to be able to expreſs This Creed *communibus verbis*, that is, in their *vulgar*, or Mother Tongue. What That mix'd kind of Language which They then uſed, ſhould be called, is of no great moment to our preſent purpoſe to inquire. Some perhaps, with *Vitus Amerbachius*, and Biſhop *Uſher*,[a] will call it *Teutonick*, or *German*, becauſe the *Franks* and *Germans*, being Originally the ſame, ſpake the ſame Language. But I ſee no conſequence that, becauſe *Franks* and *Germans* uſed the ſame Language, therefore *Franks* and *Gauls* mix'd together muſt ſtill keep the ſame; any more than that a mix'd Nation of *Normans*, and *Saxons*, muſt all agree either in *Norman*, or *Saxon*. One would rather expect in ſuch a mix'd People, a mix'd Language too, as uſually happens in ſuch Caſes. As to *France* in particular, at That Time, Mr. *Wharton* has plainly ſhewn that the Language there ſpoken was very widely different from the *Teutonick*, or *German*.

The *Concordate* between the Two Brothers *Lewis* and *Charles*, at *Strasburgh*, puts the matter out of Diſpute: Where one expreſs'd Himſelf in the *Teutonick*, the other in the Language then current in *France*, called *Romanenſis*, or *Ruſtica Romana*, corrupt *Roman*, or *Latin*;[b] nearer to the *Latin* than to the *German*, but a confuſed mixture of Both. Such was the Language then vulgarly ſpoken in *France*, as appears from the Specimen of it given by *Wharton* from *Nithardus*. And this I preſume is the Language into which our Creed was interpreted in *Hincmar*'s Time; for which reaſon I have ſet the *French* Verſions firſt. If any one contend that the *Teutonick* prevailed then in the *Dioceſs* of *Rheims*, tho' not in the other parts of *Gaul* more remote from *Germany*, I ſhall not think it of moment to diſpute the point, ſince it is not material to our preſent purpoſe.

As to the *French* Verſions, properly ſo called, *written* ſtanding Verſions, I have ſaid, that none of them reach higher than

a *Uſſer.* Hiſtor. Dogmat. p. 111.
b Vid. *Wharton.* Auctar. Hiſtor. Dogmat. p. 344.

the

the XIth Century. *Montfaucon* gives us one, tho' imperfect, 600 years old;[a] that is, of the XIth Century, and very near the end of it, about 1098, ſix hundred years before the Time of his writing. And this is the oldeſt that I have any where found mention'd. Next to which, perhaps we may reckon That in *Trinity* College in *Cambridge*; I mean the interlinear Verſion which Mr. *Wanley*[b] calls *Normanno-Gallican*, about 580 years old. There is one in the *Cotton* Library (*Nero*. C. 4.) above 500 years old, according to Mr. *Wharton*.[c] *Montfaucon* gives us Another above 400 years old.[d] But it is needleſs, and foreign to my purpoſe to number up all the Verſions: The *firſt* in its kind is what will be chiefly ſerviceable to our following Inquiries.

German Versions.

As to *written* and ſtanding Verſions, the *German*, ſo far as 870
we find any Records, ought to have the firſt place. There is in the Emperor's Library at *Vienna*,[e] a *German*, or *Teutonick*, Verſion of This Creed made by *Otfridus*, Monk of *Weiſſenberg* in the IXth Century: The Manuſcript, as *Lambecius* aſſures us, is coeval with the Author. There have been ſeveral later *German* Verſions, a brief account of which may be ſeen in *Lambecius*,[f] *Tentzelius*,[g] and *Le Long*;[h] but more particularly in *Tentzelius*. It is ſufficient to my purpoſe to have taken notice of the *firſt*, and moſt conſiderable in its kind.

Anglo-Saxon Versions.

There have been *Anglo-Saxon* Verſions of this Creed as ear- 930
ly as the Time of K. *Athelſtan*; as appears from the Manu-

a *Montfaucon*. Diatrib. p. 721. 727. 733.
b *Wanleii* Catal. MSS. Septentr. p. 168.
c *Wharton*. Auctar. Hiſtor. Dogmat. p. 390.
d *Montf*. Diatr. p. 722.
e *Lambec*. Catal. Biblioth. Vindobon. l. 2. p. 460. 760.
f *Lambec*. Catal. L. 2. p. 763.
g *Tentzel*. Judic. Erudit. Præf. & p. 226.
h *Le Long*. Biblioth. Biblic. Vol. 1. p. 376.

ſcript of the *Royal* Library with an *interlinear* Verſion, noted above; and which I place in 930. The *Lambeth* Manuſcript of 957 has alſo an *interlinear* Saxon Verſion. Both which Manuſcripts confirm the Account which our Learned Dr. *Wotton* gives of an *Anglo-Saxon* Copy of this Creed which He has printed from a Manuſcript of the Church of *Salisbury*. He judges the *Verſion* it ſelf to have been made about the middle of the Xth Century, or about 950; which ſuits exactly with the Age of the Manuſcripts before mention'd. Only, This we may expect, that the *Saxon* Copies of thoſe Manuſcripts (if They happen to contain the *ſame Verſion*) will be found much more *correct* than the *Sarum* Copy, being written at a Time when the *Saxon* Language was leſs corrupted, and retain'd more of its primitive purity; whereas the *Sarum* Copy was written,[a] as Dr. *Wotton* conjectures, after both *Danes* and *Normans* had much alter'd the Language. I before obſerved that the Title in Dr. *Wotton*'s Copy is *Hymnus Athanaſii*, as in St. *James*'s Copy: And there is ſomething farther worth the noting, which is the Rubrick following the Title, directing the Creed to be ſung *alternately*;[b] which confirms the Account given by *Abbo Floriacenſis* of the cuſtom of the *Gallican* and *Engliſh* Churches in that Age. But to proceed; From the Time we have had any Verſion of this Creed into our Country-Language, we may reaſonably conclude that ſuch Verſions have varied, by little and little, in every Age, in proportion to the gradual Alteration in our Language; till at length the Verſion became ſuch as it ſtands at This Day. Such as are deſirous of having a Specimen of the Creed in very old *Engliſh verſe*, may find one in Dr. *Hicks*'s

a Verſionem iſtam circiter medium *Decimi Sæculi* eſſe factam ipſius Sermonis cum puritate (ubi non hallucinatur Interpres) conjuncta proprietas oſtendit. *Recentius* vero deſcriptam fuiſſe, ſub *Nortmannorum* in Angliam Adventum, non tantum Librarii Linguæ *Saxonicæ* haud gnari recentior manus in qua exaratur, ſed pravum illud *Anglo-Danicum*, vel forſan *Anglo-Nortmannicum*, ſcribendi genus demonſtrat. *Wotton*. Not. ad Brevem Conſpect. Operis *Hickeſiani*. p. 75.

b *Hymnus Athanaſii, de Fide Trinitatis.*

*Quem Tu *concelebrans*, diſcutienter intellege. Incipit de Fide.

On which Dr. Wotton *makes this Note.*

* Ita MS. Hoc eſt, quem Tu *antiphonatim*, vel *alternatim* pſallens, animo percipe. p. 77.

'*The ſau-*

Theſaurus.[a] And They may ſee a good part of a *Proſe-Verſion* in old *Engliſh* (tho' conſiderably later than the other) in *Wickliff*'s Comment. But theſe and the like Obſervations are out of the compaſs of my Deſign, and ſo I paſs on.

Greek Versions.

I have before intimated that this Creed was Originally *Latin*, and therefore the *Greek* Copies can be no more than *Verſions*. And They appear to be very *late* alſo, in compariſon to the former. However, ſince the *Greek* is one of the *learned* Languages, ſince the Creed has been aſcribed to a *Greek* Author, and has been alſo ſuppoſed by Many to have been written in *Greek*; it will therefore be proper to give as particular and as diſtinct Account as is poſſible of the *Greek* Verſion, or Verſions. Our Inquiries here will lie within a little compaſs: For the *Greek* Copies are neither *many*, nor *antient*. *Montfaucon*, a very diligent Searcher into theſe matters, frankly profeſſes that He had never ſeen any *Greek* Copy of this Creed ſo old as 300 years; nor ever heard of any that was *antient*.[b] He ſcruples not to ſay farther, that there had not been yet ſeen any *Greek* Record, of *certain* and *undoubted* credit, whereby to prove that This Creed had been known to the *Greek* Church for more than 500 years upwards.[c] He ſpeaks only of *Greek* Records: As to *Latin* ones they afford ſufficient proof that This Creed was pleaded againſt the *Greeks* in the Diſpute, about the *Proceſſion*, in the 8th or 9th Century at lateſt, and therefore muſt have been in ſome meaſure known to them. The *Greeks* and *Latins* had ſome Diſpute on that Head in the Synod of *Gentilly*, not far from *Paris*, in the year 767, under K. *Pepin*.

a *Hickeſ:* Theſaur. Linguar. Septentr. p. 332.

b Sane nullum vidimus Græcum hujus Symboli Codicem qui *trecentorum* ſit annorum; nec *antiquum* alium a quopiam viſum fuiſſe novimus. *Montfauc. Diatrib.* p. 727.

c Adjicere non pigeat non viſum hactenus fuiſſe *Græcorum* quodpiam monumentum (certum ſcilicet ac indubitatum) quo ab annis plus quingentis notum Eccleſiæ *Græcæ* fuiſſe Symbolum, *Quicunque*, poſſit comprobari. *Montf.* ibid. p. 721.

To the ſame *purpoſe ſpeaks* Combefis *of this Creed*.

Vix enim extat præterquam in recentiorum Collectaneis, libriſque eorum Polemicis, quibus ipſum vel impugnant, vel etiam defendunt: Idque volunt illi qui aiunt *non haberi in Græcorum libris*; non enim ſic ſtupidi videntur ut negent *Græce* haberi. *Combef.* Not. ad *Man. Calec.* p. 297.

But

But perhaps this Creed was not pleaded at That Time: At leaſt it does not appear that it was.

It cannot be doubted but that the *Greeks* had heard ſomething of This Creed from the *Latins*, as early as the Days of *Ratram*, and *Æneas Pariſienſis*; that is above 850 years ago, when the Diſpute about the *Proceſſion* between the *Greeks* and *Latins* was on Foot: This the Teſtimonies above cited plainly ſhew. But This is not enough to prove that the *Greek* Church had yet any value for This Creed, or that there was then extant any *Greek* Copy of it.

1200 *Nicolaus Hydruntinus*, cited above, who flouriſh'd under *Alexius* IV, Emperor of the Eaſt, and Pope *Innocent* the Third, that is, in round numbers about 1200, He gives us the firſt notice of This Creed being extant in *Greek* in his Time. He obſerves, that the Article of the *Proceſſion from the Son* was not in the *Greek* Copy of This Creed, as neither in the *Nicene*, blaming the *Latins*, as I apprehend, for *interpolating* Both. Which was a juſt cenſure with reſpect to the *Nicene* Creed, but not with reſpect to the *Athanaſian*, which certainly never wanted That Article; as is plain from the Agreement of the *Latin* Copies, and the earlieſt of them, thoſe of a Thouſand years Date: which I remark by the way. As to our preſent purpoſe, This is certain that, ſome Time before This *Nicolaus* of *Otranto* wrote, the Creed had been tranſlated into *Greek*, by a *Greek*, or at leaſt by one that took part with the *Greeks* in the Queſtion about the Proceſſion. It can hardly be imagined that *Nicolaus* had tranſlated it Himſelf, and that He appealed to his *own* Verſion. There muſt have been a Verſion before undoubtedly: And one can ſcarce ſuppoſe leſs than 50, or 100 years before, ſince both the *Time* and *Author* of it were forgotten, and This *Greek* Verſion paſs'd with *Nicolaus* for *Athanaſius*'s Original. *Manuel Caleca*,[a] who wrote about the Year

a Teſtantur autem hanc ipſam Fidei Confeſſionem Sancti viri (*Athanaſii*) eſſe, atque id dictum ita ſe habere, qui contra *Latinos* multo ante ſcripſerunt; quam ſibi ut adverſam fruſtra labefactare nituntur. Atque, ut intelligi datur, tunc quidem adhuc ſervabatur; *poſtmodum* vero pertinaciores ad contradicendum facti, *omnino auferre* voluerunt: etſi modo nihilominus curioſe inquirentibus raro, licet in vetuſtiſſimis Codicibus, ita habere invenitur. *Man. Calec.* contr. Græc. l. 2. B. PP. Tom. XXVI. p. 414.

1360,

1360, intimates that there had been *Greek* Copies long before his Time, and that the moſt antient of all had the Article of the Proceſſion from *the Son*; and that the older *Greeks* who wrote againſt the *Latins* did not pretend to ſtrike out That Article, as thoſe did that came after. Could we depend upon this Report, we might then be certain that the *Greek* Copies of the Time of *Nicolaus Hydruntinus*, were late in Compariſon, and that there had been other *Greek* Copies much more antient. But This I leave to the conſideration of the Learned. However this fact be, one thing is certain, that the oldeſt *Greek* Copy could be only a *Verſion*, whether ſooner or later.

As to *Greek* Copies now extant in *manuſcript*, They are but *few*, and *modern*. I may here give a ſhort Account of them, of as many as I have hitherto found mentioned in Books, or Catalogues of Manuſcripts.

1. There is one in the Emperor's Library at *Vienna*, ſaid to be in *paper*, *antient*, and of *good Value* [a]. Theſe words are too general to fix any certain Date upon: One may gueſs from the *Paper*, that the Manuſcript is not very antient; ſince *Paper* came not into frequent, or common uſe before the XIIIth Century. But not to inſiſt upon That, one may judge from what is written in the ſame Volume, and, I ſuppoſe, in the ſame Hand (for *Neſſelius* makes no Diſtinction) that the Copy of the *Creed* is not earlier than the middle of the XIVth Century. *Maximus Planudes* makes a part of the Manuſcript: He flouriſh'd about the year 1340.

2. There is Another *Greek* Manuſcript of this Creed in the ſame Library, a *paper* one too, and ſaid to be *pretty antient*, by *Neſſelius*, who gives account of it [b]. From the mention

a CCXIV. Codex MS. Theologicus Græcus eſt *Chartaceus*, *antiquus*, & *bonæ notæ* in 4to. Conſtatque foliis 341.
Continentur eo Hæc.
1mo &c.
2do & quidem a Fol. 77, ad Fol. 79. *S. Athanaſii* Archiepiſcopi Alexandrini *Symbolum* Fidei, cujus Titulus & principium· Τῆ ἁγίᾳ Ἀθανασίᾳ τῆ μεγάλῃ. Ὅσις δ' ἂν βούληται σωθῆναι, ϖρὸ πάντων χρὴ κρατεῖν πίστιν &c. Neſſel. Catal p. 344. Vol. 1.

b CXCmus Codex MS.——eſt *Chartaceus*, *mediocriter antiquus*, & *bonæ notæ*, in 4to. Conſtatque nunc Foliis 332, & ad *Johannem Sambucum* olim pertinuit. Continentur eo Hæc. I primo &c.

therein

therein made of the Creed's being preſented to Pope *Julius*, I ſhould be apt to conclude that the Manuſcript is not earlier, nor copied from any earlier than *Manuel Caleca*'s Time, or the XIVth Century: But there are other Marks, particularly ſome Pieces of *Julianus Cardinalis*, which demonſtrate that the Manuſcript cannot be much older than the middle of the XVth Century.

3. *Felckman* had a manuſcript Copy of This Creed in *Greek*, without any *Title* to it, or any *Author* named [a]. I can ſay nothing to the Age of it, for want of further Particulars.

4. *Felckman* had Another Manuſcript out of the *Palatine* Library, (which Library is ſince transfer'd to the *Vatican*) with a *Title* to it, σύμβολον τῦ ἁγίυ Ἀθανασίυ, St. *Athanaſius*'s Creed [b]. The *Title* alone is a ſufficient Argument of it's being *modern*, to any that conſider what were the more uſual and antient Titles, repreſented above. It is to be noted that Thoſe Two manuſcript Copies are ſo nearly the ſame, that They make but *one* Copy in Print, which has been inſerted in all the Editions of *Athanaſius*'s Works after *Felckman*'s, as well as in his, and makes the fifth in *Gundlingius*, [c] who gives us ſix *Greek* Copies of this Creed. It is obſervable, that This Copy owns not the Proceſſion *from the Son:* From whence we may infer that it was not made by the *Latins*, or however not by any who were not Friends to the *Greeks*.

5. *Lazarus Baifius*'s Copy [d], which He had from *Venice*, in

18. Et quidem a fol. 303. ad fol. 304. *S. Athanaſii magni*, Archiepiſcopi Alexandrini, *Confeſſio Catholica Fidei*, ad S. *Julium* Pontificem Romanum; cujus & Titulus & Principium Τῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀθανασίυ τῦ μεγάλυ Ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς πίστως ἣν ἔδωκε πρὸς Ἰάλιον Πάπαν Ῥώμης. Τῷ θέλοντι σωθῆναι &c. *Neſſel.* Catal. Vol. 1. p. 281.

a Extat Hoc *Symbolum* in noſtro Codice 2 anonymo, ſed abſque Titulo & nomine Autoris; unde & ſic editum. *Felckman.* Ed. *Athanaſ.* Commelin. p. 83

Incipit; εἴ τις θέλοι σωθῆναι, πρὸ πάντων χρὴ αὐτῷ τὴν καθολικὴν κρατῆσαι πίστιν. &c.

b Invenimus id ipſum etiam poſt in Codice quodam *Palatino* Bibliothecæ, expreſsè Athanaſio inſcriptum (licet id recentiores Græci nolint, ut videre eſt ex epiſtola *Meletii* Conſtantinopolitani Patriarchæ ad *Douzam*) ex quo etiam diſcrepantias quaſdam notabimus.

Incipit; εἴ τις θέλει σωθῆναι, πρὸ πάντων χρεία ἐστὶν ἵνα τὴν καθολικὴν κρατήσῃ πίστιν. &c. Felckman. *ibid.*

c *Gundlingii* not. ad *Euſtratii* & p. 76.

d Titulus Ἔκθεσις ὁμολογίας τῆς καθολικῆς πίστεως τῦ μεγάλυ Ἀθανασίυ πατριάρχυ Ἀλεξανδρείας πρὸς Ἰάλιον Πάπαν.

Incipit. Ὅστις ἂν βούληται σωθῆναι, πρὸ πάντων χρὴ κρατεῖν τὴν καθολικὴν πίστιν.

the

the Time of *Francis* I. in the year 1533, was publiſhed by *Genebrard*, An. 1569. This Copy, probably, was contrived by a *Latin* (having the Proceſſion *from the Son* in it) or at leaſt by ſome *honeſt* Greek who would not vary from the *Original*. I conclude this *Greek* Copy to be *modern*, from the *Title*; for a reaſon before hinted.

6. There was Another manuſcript Copy [a] of this Creed, which *Nicolaus Bryling* firſt printed at *Baſil*, and afterwards *H. Stephens* in *France*, in the year 1565. This alſo muſt, in all probability, be very *modern*, becauſe of σύμβολον in the Title. It acknowledges the Proceſſion *from the Son*, conformable to the *Original*.

7. In the *Royal* Library at *Paris*. (Numb. 2502,) there is another manuſcript *Greek* Copy of this Creed,[b] written in the year 1562. publiſhed by *Genebrard* 1569, and ſaid by Him to belong to the Church of *Conſtantinople*. This was taken from an older Manuſcript, but how much older cannot certainly be known [c]. One may imagine from the *Title* [d], and *Beginning* of it, that the Form is the ſame with one of thoſe in the *Emperor*'s Library, and that they were copied from each other, or Both from a Third Copy. This Manuſcript acknowledges the Proceſſion *from the Son*. I had underſtood, from *Montfaucon*'s general way of Expreſſion, that *Genebrard* had publiſh'd his Copy from this very Manuſcript of the *Royal* Library, Num. 2502. But obſer-

a Titulus: Σύμβολον τῶ ἁγίω Ἀθανασίω.
Incipit: Ὅστις βέλεται σωθῆναι &c.

b De græcis autem Codicibus pauca ſuppetunt dicenda, cum unum tantum nobis inſpicere licuerit, ſcil. Reg. 2502. In quo extat *Symbolum* ſuperiore ſæculo exaratum. *Montf.* Diatrib. p. 722.

Secunda, quam edimus formula, jam olim publici juris facta per Genebrardum Anno 1569, quam ait ille eſſe Eccleſiæ Conſtantinopolitanæ, extat in Regio Codice num. 2502, olim ex Bibliotheca Johannis Huralti Boiſtallerii a Carolo IX. Venetias Legati. in quo Codice hæc leguntur, ante Dialogum S. Athanaſii cum Ario——*tranſcriptus & recognitus liber Hic eſt, ex vetuſtiſſimo exemplari Cretico; Venetiis An. 1562. impenſa facta aureorum X. Zacharias Sacerdos tranſcripſit & habuit.* Montf. Diatrib. p. 727.

c Incertum autem utrum ex illo quod memorat *Vetuſtiſſimo Exemplari*, Symbolum etiam ſit mutuatus; Codex quippe amplæ molis multa & varia complectitur, quæ dubitare licet ex unone Codice exſcripta fuerint, an ex Compluribus. *Montf.* ibid.

d Titulus. Τῶ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀθανασίω τῶ μεγάλου ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς πίστεως ἣν ἔδωκε πρὸς Ἰόλιον Πάπαν Ῥώμης.
Incipit. Τῶ θέλοντι σωθῆναι, &c.

ving that *Genebrard*'s wants ſome words (ἀΐδιος ὁ πατὴρ, ἀΐδιος ὁ υἱὸς, ἀΐδιον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) which *Montfaucon*'s Copy has, I conclude that He meant only the *ſame Form*, as to Matter and Words, for the moſt part, not the ſame Manuſcript.

8. There is Another manuſcript *Greek* Verſion, or rather Paraphraſe of this Creed, having ſeveral Interpolations, publiſh'd by Biſhop *Uſher* A. 1647, from a Copy ſent Him by *Patrick Young*. It has been often ſince printed: in the *Councils*, in *Gundling*, and in *Montfaucon*.

It leaves out the Article of Proceſſion *from the Son*; from whence we may judge that it was compoſed by a *Greek*, or Grecizing *Latin*. The Title inſinuates that the Creed was drawn up in the *Nicene* Council[a]: an opinion entertain'd by *Johan. Cypariſſiota*, about the year 1360, as obſerved above. When This Story, or Fiction firſt came in, I cannot pretend to determine. Biſhop *Uſher* ſpeaks of a *very antient* Manuſcript, partly in *Iriſh*, and partly in *Latin*, which hints at the ſame Thing: But He fixes no Date to the Manuſcript; the words, *very antient*, are too general to give Satisfaction in it. The Creed is there ſaid to have been compoſed in the *Nicene* Council by *Euſebius*, and *Dionyſius*, and a *Third* left *Nameleſs*[b], as not being known. The Author of that Book of *Hymns* muſt have been very Ignorant, not to know *Athanaſius*, who was undoubtedly the *Third* Man, and for whoſe ſake (to account for the Creed's being wrote in *Latin*) the whole Story ſeems to have been contrived. By *Euſebius* muſt have been intended *Euſebius* of *Verceil* in *Piedmont*, a *Latin*, and a great Friend and Intimate of *Athanaſius*: By *Dionyſius* undoubtedly is meant *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Milan* of the ſame Time, and of the ſame Principles, and well acquainted with *Euſebius*[c]. Had the Contrivers of

a Ἐκ τ ἁγίας ϵ οἰκουμενικῆς τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ, περὶ πίστεως κατὰ συντομίαν, ϗ πῶς δεῖ πιστεύειν τὸν ἀληθῆ χριστιανόν. *Uſſer.* de Symb. p. 26.

b In Hymnorum, partim *Latino* partim *Hibernico* Sermone ſcriptorum, Codice vetuſtiſſimo—— notatum reperi, trium Epiſcoporum opera, in eadem *Nicæna* Synodo illud fuiſſe compoſitum, *Euſebii*, & *Dionyſii*, & *nomen tertii* (ſic enim ibi legitur) *neſcimus*. *Uſſer.* de Symb. præf.

c *It ſeems highly probable, that the whole Fable about* Euſebius, *and* Dionyſius, *was firſt raiſed out of a Paſſage of St.* Ambroſe, *which might be thought to hint ſome ſuch Thing. The words are:*

the

the Fable laid their Scene at *Alexandria*, where *Athanaſius* and this *Euſebius*, with ſeveral other *Latins*, met together in the year 362, They had made it the more plauſible. But let us return to our *Greek* Copies, from which we have a little digreſs'd.

This is obſervable of the *Greek* Copies in general, that They differ very widely from each other, and therefore cannot be Copies of one and the ſame Verſion. Poſſibly, Three, or Four of them may be thrown into one, admitting however many *Various Lections:* But ſtill there will be as many remaining, which cannot be ſo dealt with, but muſt be look'd upon as diſtinct, and different Verſions. Such as deſire to ſee all the Copies together, may find them in *Gundling*, and *Montfaucon*; Four at large, the reſt exhibited only by *Various Lections*. I do not know whether the Manuſcripts of the *Vienna* Library have been *collated* for any of the *printed* Editions: Perhaps not; I do not remember that I have met with any mention of them, in any of the Editors of the printed Copies.

It may be of uſe to ſet the *printed* Editions, after our Account of the Manuſcripts, in Chronological order, as diſtinctly as may be, ſince we cannot fix the Dates of the manuſcript Copies.

1. The Firſt printed Edition was by *Nicolaus Bryling*,[a] a Printer of *Baſil*. My Authors have been deficient in not ſetting down the Date of it. I have endeavor'd to fix the year, but have not yet been ſo happy as to come to a certainty in it. Wherefore, I hope, my Reader will excuſe it, if, rather than ſet no year at all, I chuſe one which I know cannot be very much over, or under, becauſe of other Pieces printed by the ſame *Bryling* about That Time. *Fabricius* mentions *Michael Neander* as Editor of the ſame Copy after *Bryling*, and before *Stephens:* 1540

Itaque ut Euſebius *Sanctus prior levavit Vexillum Confeſſionis, ita Beatus* Dionyſius *in exilii locis, priori Martyribus Titulo vitam exhalavit.* Ambroſ. ad *Vercellenſ.* Ep. 63. p. 1039.

a Quod olim evulgavit Baſileæ *Nicolaus Bryling*; deinde in Gallia An. 1565. *Henricus Stephanus.* Genebrard. in *Symb. Athanaſ.* p. 8.

Quam poſt *Nic. Brylingium*, & *Mich. Neandrum*, *H. Stephanus* in lucem edidit. *Fabric.* Bibl. Græc. Vol. V. p. 315.

But what year, is not ſaid. *Tentzelius* mentions a *Third*[a], namely *Sebaſtian Lepuſculus*, whoſe Edition was in 1559; and *Stephens*'s in 1565. I have not ſeen *Lepuſculus*'s Copy: But I can make no doubt of it's being the ſame[b] with *Bryling*'s: which has been called the *Vulgate*, or *Common* Verſion.

1569 2. The Second *printed* Copy was taken from the Manuſcript of *Lazarus Baiffius*, which He received from *Dionyſius*[c], a *Greek*, in the year 1533, as before hinted. This was firſt printed by *Genebrard* in the year 1569, again in 1585, and oftentimes ſince. This Copy is ſometimes called the *Dionyſian* Copy; and it is obſerved by *Gundling* to differ from the firſt Copy but in *ſeven* Places; and therefore theſe Two have been commonly thrown into one, by all the Editors of Both.

1569 3. The *Third* Copy was alſo firſt printed by *Genebrard*, at the ſame Time with the other. It has gone under the Name of the *Conſtantinopolitan* Copy, becauſe *Genebrard* ſuppoſed it to have been in uſe at *Conſtantinople*[d]. It differs conſiderably from Both the other, and is never thrown into one with them, but kept diſtinct by it ſelf.

1600 4. The *Fourth* is the *Commeline*, or *Felckman*'s Copy, from the *Palatine* Manuſcripts, often reprinted with *Athanaſius*'s Works. This alſo ſtands by it ſelf, as a diſtinct Verſion.

1647 5. The *Fifth* was firſt publiſh'd by *Uſher*, in the year 1647.

a *Sebaſtian: Lepuſculi* Compendium *Joſephi Gorionidis*, cum Collectaneis quibuſdam. *Baſil.* 1559. Vid. *Tentzel.* p. 166.

b Nic. Serarius, *who wrote in the year* 1590, *ſpeaking of that firſt Copy printed by* Bryling, *and* Stephens, *ſays as follows.*

Quarum prima, *vulgata* dici poteſt, eo quod hactenus ea ſola hic apud nos, *Germania* & *Gallia*, typis evulgata fuerit. *Nicol. Serar.* de Symbol. Athanaſ. *Opuſc. Theolog.* Tom. 2. p. 9. *From hence one may juſtly conclude, that* Sebaſtian's *Copy, in* 1559, *was no* new *one. For there was no* Second, *before* Genebrard's, *publiſh'd in* France, *or* Germany; *as we may learn from what* Serarius *here teſtifies.*

c Hoc Symbolum reperi in libro Græco MS. de Proceſſione Spiritus Sancti, quem *Lazaro Baiffio* Oratori Regis *Franciſci* I. apud *Venetos*, obtulit *Dionyſius* Græcus, Epiſcopus *Zienenſis* & *Firmienſis* An. 1533. *Genebr.* Comm. in Symb. Athanaſ. p. 8.

In manus meas pervenit liber quidam Græcus, de Proceſſione Spiritus Sancti, oblatus *Lazaro Bayffio* claro Regis noſtri *Franciſci* I. apud *Venetos* Oratori, anno Chriſti 1533. Quem manu ſua elegantiſſime pinxerat *Nicolaus Sophianus* Patrum noſtrorum ævo vir valde doctus. *Genebr.* ibid. p. 2.

d Superius Symbolum, *Athanaſii* verbis aliquantulum immutatis, *Conſtantinopolitani* ſic Græce legunt, & recitant. *Genebr.* ibid. p. 14.

This

This differs extremely from all the reſt, having, beſides many *Variations*, and ſlight Inſertions, one very large *Interpolation*. It hath been often reprinted ſince *Uſher*'s Time.

6. The *Sixth* and laſt was firſt publiſh'd by *Labbe* and *Coſſart* 1671
in the ſecond Tome of *Councils*. This Copy comes the neareſt to the Two firſt, and therefore is ſometimes thrown into one with them: But it differs from Both in about *forty* Places, according to *Gundling*'s Computation.

Theſe are all the *printed* Copies; which are ſometimes call'd *Four* and ſometimes *Six*: *Four*, becauſe the *Firſt*, *Second*, and *Sixth* may be tolerably thrown into One; *Six*, becauſe They may alſo be kept diſtinct, and may be reckon'd as ſo many *Copies* at leaſt, if not ſo many ſeveral *Verſions*. So much for the *Greek* Verſions of our Creed.

To the Verſions already mention'd may be added the *Sclavonian*, of ſeveral *Dialects*, and, as I conceive, pretty *antient*: But we have little or no Account of them; only, as I ſhall ſhow in the Sequel, we may be certain that there have been ſuch. There are *Italian*, *Spaniſh*, *Iriſh*, and *Welch* Verſions; but whether any that can juſtly be called *antient*, I know not. Future ſearches into Libraries may perhaps produce farther Diſcoveries. *Fabricius* makes mention of an *Hebrew* Verſion of late date, and of an *Arabick* one ſtill later [a]: But theſe or the like *modern* Verſions will be of no uſe to us in our preſent Inquiries.

a Hebraice Verſum a *Julio Marcello Romano* MS. in Bibliotheca *Vaticana* memorat *Imbonatus* in Bibl. Latino-Hebraica p. 149. Sed omitto recentiores Verſiones, ut *Arabicam* a *Niſſelio* editam Lugd. Bat. 1656. 4to, una cum Cantico Canticor. *Fabric.* Bibl. Græc. V. 5. p. 315.

Georgius Niſſelius Symbolum *Athanaſii Arabico* idiomate cum Cantico Canticorum Æthiopice & Arabice edito Ludg. Bat. An. 1656, conjunxit ——— id tamen non hauſit ex Codice MS, ſed ipſe in *Arabicum* Sermonem tranſtulit. *Tentzel.* p. 125.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Reception of the Athanaſian *Creed in the Chriſtian Churches.*

FROM the Materials here laid down, we may now be able to determine ſomething about the *Reception* of the Creed, eſpecially in the *Weſtern* Churches; among which the Churches of *France*, or *Gaul*, ought undoubtedly to be named firſt.

FRANCE, or GAUL.

This Creed obtain'd in *France* in the Time of *Hincmar*, or about 850, without all diſpute. We may advance higher up to 772: For it was then in *Charles* the *Great*'s Pſalter, among the *Hymns* of the Church. The *Cotton* manuſcript Pſalter, with this Creed in it, will carry us up to 703: And the *Canon* of the Council of *Autun* to 670; at which Time the *Gallican* Clergy, at leaſt of the *Dioceſs* of *Autun*, in the Province of *Lyons*, were obliged to recite this Creed together with the *Apoſtles*, under pain of Epiſcopal *Cenſure*. Which ſhows of how great Value and Eſteem the Creed was at that Time, and affords a ſtrong Preſumption (as *Queſnel*, and *Pagi*[a] well argue in the Caſe) that it had been in uſe there long before. There will be ſome doubt, as I intimated above, about the ſuppoſed *Canon* of the Council of *Autun*; which will in ſome meaſure abate the force of our Evidence, and of the Argument built upon it. But as it is certain from other Evidence, that This Creed was receiv'd in the *Gallican* Churches as high as 772, or 703; So it muſt be own'd that This very much confirms the Suppoſition of the Council of *Autun*: And the con-

A. D. 550

a Dubium non eſt quin multis ante Synodum illam *Auguſtodunenſem* annis compoſitum eſſet, & jam olim per totam Eccleſiam celebre evaſiſſet: Nunquam enim Sapientiſſimi Præſules id commiſiſſent, ut iſtam Fidei Formulam omnium Ordinum Clericis amplectendam, & *irreprehenſibiliter*, ut aiunt, recenſendam, Synodali Edicto ſub *condemnationis pœna* præciperent; imo & illam e regione cum *Symbolo Apoſtolico* ponerent, niſi jam *longo uſu recepta*, approbata, & inter germanas *Magni Athanaſii* Lucubrationes numerata fuiſſet; quod niſi poſt plurium annorum Seriem fieri vix potuit *Queſnel.* Diſ. XIV. p. 731.

Quare jam ante *centum* fere Annis opûs illud *Athanaſio* attributum fuerat. *Pagi* Critic. in *Baron.* Vol. 1. p. 441.

curring

curring Circumſtances give very great Light and Strength to each other. But what moſt of all confirms the foregoing Evidence, and the reaſoning upon it, is, that *Venantius Fortunatus*, a full hundred years before the Council of *Autun*, had met with this Creed in the *Gallican* Parts, and found it then to be in ſuch Eſteem as to deſerve to be *commented* upon, like the *Lord's-Prayer*, and *Apoſtle's-Creed:* Accordingly He wrote Comments upon it, as well as upon the other. This wonderfully confirms the reaſoning of *Queſnel*, and *Pagi*, that this Creed muſt have been in uſe there near a hundred years before the Council of *Autun*, that is, as high as 570, about which Time *Fortunatus* flouriſhed, and wrote. And conſidering that this Creed muſt have been for ſome Time growing into repute, before it could be thought worthy to have ſuch Honour paid it, along with the *Lord's-Prayer* and *Apoſtle's-Creed*; I may perhaps be allowed to ſet the Time of it's *Reception*, in the *Gallican* Churches, ſome years higher: Reception of it, I mean, as an excellent Formulary, or an acknowledged *Rule* of *Faith*, tho' not perhaps admitted into their *Sacred* Offices. Upon the whole, and upon the ſtrength of the foregoing Evidences, we may reaſonably conclude, that the Reception of this Creed, in the *Gallican* Churches, was at leaſt as early as 670; underſtanding it of it's Reception into the Publick Offices: But underſtanding it of it's Reception as a *Rule* of *Faith*, or an orthodox and excellent Formulary and Syſtem of *Belief*, it may be juſtly ſet as high as 550, which is but 20 years, or thereabout, before *Fortunatus* Commented upon it. *Le Quien* ſcruples not to ſet it as high as 500.[a]

SPAIN.

Next to *France*, we may mention her near Neighbour *Spain*, 630
which ſeems to have received This Creed very early, and within leſs than a hundred years after the Time before fix'd for it's Reception in *France*. As to the Truth of the Fact, it may be argued Two ſeveral ways. 1. From the near Affinity and Relation between the *Spaniſh* and *Gallican* Offices, before either

a Non niſi ex eodem Symbolo, quod jam ante *receptum* eſſet, *Avitus Viennenſis* —— alicubi ſcribebat &c. *Le Quien.* Diſſert. Damaſcen. p. 98.

France

France, or *Spain* had received the *Roman*. 2. From the IVth Council of *Toledo*, their quoting Paſſages from this very Creed.

1. As to the firſt Argument, tho' a *general* one, it muſt appear of great Weight. If the Sacred Offices in *France* and *Spain* were in thoſe Times the ſame, or very nearly ſo; then the Reception of this Creed in *France* will afford a very conſiderable Argument of it's Reception in *Spain* alſo.

Cardinal *Bona* is very large and diffuſe in ſetting forth the Agreement and Harmony of the old *Gallican* Offices with the *Spaniſh*, in ſundry Particulars[a]. And He ſuppoſes this Uniformity of the Two Churches to have been as early, at leaſt, as the days of *Gregory* Biſhop of *Tours*, who died in the Year 595. *Mabillon*, after Him, frequently aſſerts the ſame Thing[b], and with greater Aſſurance than *Bona* had done; having met with new, and fuller Evidences to prove it: Only, He dates the Agreement of the *Spaniſh Moſarabick* Offices with the *Gallican*, from the IIId and IVth Councils of *Toledo*,[c] the latter of which was in the Year 633. Mr. *Dodwell*, ſpeaking of the ſame matter, ſays, "Nor does *Mabillon* Himſelf judge it probable that "the Innovations attempted by Pope *Vigilius* in *Spain* held long, "of what kind ſoever they were. All *Spain* was ſoon after "united in *one Form*, and that different from the *Romans*, and "agreeing with the *Gallican*[d]. It is therefore a plain Caſe, that the *Gallican* and *Spaniſh* Offices were very much the ſame in the beginning of the VIIth Century, and ſo continued for ſome Time. If therefore the *Gallican* Churches received the *Athanaſian* Creed into their Publick Offices before the year 670, it will appear extremely probable that the *Spaniſh* receiv'd it alſo, and about the ſame Time. I here make a Diſtinction, as I did before, between receiving the Creed as a *Rule* of *Faith*, and receiving it into the *Solemn Offices*, to be recited, or ſung in Churches. The *Reception* of it, in the firſt Senſe, I conceive to

a *Bona* Rerum Liturg. l. 1. c. 12. p. 372.
b *Mabillon*. de Liturg. Gallican. Præf. & lib. 1. c. 3. p. 20, 23.
c *Mabillon*. Lib. 1. c. 4. p. 32.
d *Dodwell* of Incenſe. p. 190.

have

have been ſomewhat earlier, in *Spain*, as well as in *France*, than it's Reception in the latter Senſe. But as different Churches in *France* had anciently different Cuſtoms, ſo alſo was it in *Spain*: And therefore it is probable that the Reception of this Creed into the publick Offices was in ſome Churches ſooner, and in others later, according to the various Rites, Cuſtoms, and Circumſtances of the ſeveral Churches.

But I proceed to the Second Article, whereby we are to prove the Reception of this Creed in *Spain*.

2. The IVth Council of *Toledo* cites a conſiderable part of this Creed, adopting it into their own *Confeſſion*[a]. We may be confident that The Creed did not borrow the Expreſſions from Them, but They from the Creed; ſince we are certain that This Creed was made long before the year 633. The Reference to this very Creed appears ſo plain in the words of That Council, that moſt of the Learned have concluded from thence, that the *Spaniſh* Fathers had both ſeen, and approved this Creed. *Baronius* is poſitive that the Council took their Expreſſions from it[b]. *Calviſius* dates the *Publication* of the Creed from That Council[c]: So alſo *Alſtedius*[d]. *Gavantus*, in his Comments upon the *Roman Breviary*, concludes from thence that This Creed had been *read in the Church*, as high as That Time[e].

a Nec perſonas confundimus, nec Subſtantiam ſeparamus. Patrem a nullo factum, vel genitum dicimus: Filium a Patre non factum, ſed genitum aſſerimus: Spiritum vero Sanctum nec creatum, nec genitum, ſed procedentem a Patre & Filio profitemur, ipſum autem Dominum Jeſum Chriſtum——ex ſubſtantia Patris ante ſæcula genitum——æqualis Patri ſecundum Divinitatem, minor Patre ſecundum Humanitatem.——Hæc eſt Eccleſiæ Catholicæ Fides: Hanc Confeſſionem Conſervamus, atque tenemus. Quam quiſquis firmiſſime Cuſtodierit, perpetuam Salutem habebit.] *Concil. Tolet.* IV. Capitul. I.

b Ex eodem *Athanaſii Symbolo* ea verba primi Capituli *Toletani* quarti Concilii deducta noſcuntur, quibus dicitur, *Patrem a nullo factum* &c. *Baron.* Annal. Tom. 3. p. 436.

c Repoſitum fuit in Archivis, nec *publicatum*, niſi, quantum ex Hiſtoriis conjicere licet, poſt trecentos fere Annos, ubi in Concilio *Toletano* quarto quædam ex eo tranſlata verba recenſentur. *Seth. Calviſ.* Op. Chronolog. p. 396.

d Symbolum *Athanaſii* ab illo ſcriptum eſt *Romæ* itidem contra *Arium*. Publicatum eſt poſt 300 fere Annos in Concilio *Toletano*, & inde uſque ad noſtra Tempora in Eccleſia uſurpatum. *Alſted.* Theſaur. p. 178.

e *Athanaſius* dum eſſet *Romæ*, ſcripſit latine Symbolum——& recitavit coram Pontifice & ei aſſidentibus, Ann. 340, ut ſcribit *Baronius*; & eſt illud idem, non mutatum, *legique ſolitum in Eccleſia*, ante annos nongentos ſexaginta. Vide Annales ad Annum prædictum. *Barthol. Gavant.* Commentar. in Rubric. *Breviarii* Romani. p. 106.

Helvicus [a] falls in with the Opinion of *Calviſius*, and *Alſtedius*, grounded upon the Expreſſions of this Council being parallel to thoſe of the Creed. Theſe Authors have perhaps carried the Point too far, in ſuppoſing This a ſufficient Proof of any *publick* Reception of the Creed in *Spain*, at That Time, or of it's being *read* in their *Churches:* But it is clear enough, that the *Spaniſh* Fathers had both ſeen and approved it; otherwiſe They could not, or would not, have borrow'd ſo plainly from it. Thus much is allowed by moſt of the learned Moderns, as *Queſnel* [b], *Natalis Alexander* [c], *Montfaucon* [d], *Tillemont* [e], *Muratorius*, *Oudin* [f], and Others, that the Expreſſions of That Council, and This Creed, are parallel, and one borrow'd from the other, and the words of the Council from the words of the Creed: Only, *Muratorius* hints as if a doubt might be made whether the Council took from the Creed, or the Creed from the Council [g]; which may ſeem ſtrange in Him, who ſuppoſes the Creed to have been made by *Fortunatus*, many years before That Council was held. But, I ſuppoſe, He is there ſpeaking of the Argument drawn from the words of that Council alone, abſtracting from the other Circumſtance, and previous to the Conſideration of *Fortunatus*'s Comment: Otherwiſe He is guilty of a very great Over-ſight. It appears then, that this Creed was known, and approved in *Spain* as early as 633: And it is obſervable how exactly This falls in with the Time, when the *Spaniſh* Churches are ſuppoſed to have received the *Gallican* Offices, according to *Mabillon*'s Account. Wherefore it is ex-

a *Athanaſius* Symbolum ſcribit *Romæ*, & Concilio offert; non tamen publicatur, niſi poſt 300 fermè Annos in Concilio *Toletano*. Helvic. *Theatr. Hiſtor.* ad An. 339.

b Imo & jam ab Anno 633 aliqua ex iſto Symbolo deſcripta mihi videntur in ea Confeſſione Fidei, quæ edita eſt a Concilio *Toletano*. 4. habeturque Capit. 1. ejuſdem. *Queſnel.* Differt. XIV. p. 731.

c *Natal. Alexand.* Tom. IV. p. 109.

d *Montfauc.* Diatrib. p. 720.

e *Tillemont.* Memoires. Tom. 8. p. 670.

f *Oudin.* Comment. de Script. Eccl. p. 348.

g Verum ne majoris quidem momenti ſunt verba illa, quæ in Concilii *Toletani* quarti Profeſſione leguntur: Quamvis enim Phraſes nonnullæ ibidem inveniantur *Symboli* Phraſibus oppido ſimiles, attamen ejuſmodi non ſunt ut iis Patribus *Symbolum* jam innotuiſſe demonſtrent. Quin ex eodem Concilio has formulas quis delibaſſe videri poteſt, ut inde *Symbolum* iſtud conflaret. *Muratorii* Anecdot. Ambroſ. Tom. 2. p. 223.

tremely

tremely probable, that about This Time They receiv'd this Creed from the *Gallican* Churches; received it as an *Orthodox* Formulary, and an approved *Rule* of *Faith*. As to their taking it into their *publick* Service, and *Pſalmody*, I pretend not to ſet it ſo high, having no Proof that they did *receive* it, in that Senſe, ſo early: But as ſoon as the *Gallican* Churches made it a part of their *Pſalmody*, we may reaſonably think that the *Spaniſh* did ſo too; or within a very ſhort Time after.

GERMANY.

Next to *France*, and *Spain*, we may mention *Germany*; not 800
only becauſe of their nearneſs of Situation to *France*, but alſo becauſe of their mutual Intercourſe, and Affinity with each other. This Creed, very probably, was received in ſome Parts of *Germany*, ſoon after it obtain'd in the *Gallican* Church. The mutual Intercourſe of the *German* and *Gallican* Churches makes it probable: And the antient Manuſcript of the Creed found at *Treves*, or *Triers*, in *Germany*, may perſuade the ſame Thing. Our poſitive Evidence is however clear and certain for the Reception of the Creed, as early as 870, being then tranſlated by *Otfridus* into the *German*, or *Teutonick* Language. *Anſcharius*'s Inſtructions to his Clergy (above mention'd) will afford an Argument for the Reception of this Creed in *Germany* from the Time of his holding the See of *Hamburg*, or from 830: And it was received at *Baſil*, as we learn from *Hatto* Biſhop of the Place, before 820. Indeed, I have above refer'd *Baſil* to *France*, conſidering how it ſtood in *Hatto*'s Time, and that it was part of antient *Gaul*: But then it was upon the Confines of *Germany*, and has in later Times been reckon'd to it; and we have good reaſon to think that the Cuſtoms of the *German* Churches in the IXth Century were nearly the ſame with thoſe of the Church of *Baſil* in 820. What paſs'd in the Council of *Frankfort* (if I miſtake not in my Conſtruction of it) may warrant the carrying it up as high as 794. And it was 6 years before That, namely in the year 788, that Pope *Adrian* ſent to St. *Willehad*, Biſhop of *Breme*, The famous Pſalter of *Charles* the

Great[a], with this *Creed* in it, the ſame that I have ſpoken of above. No wonder therefore that *Anſcharius* and *Rembertus*, afterwards Archbiſhops of *Hamburg* and *Breme*, ſo very highly valu'd This Creed. The particular regard paid to this Creed by *Charles* the *Great*, in the year 772, may plead perhaps in favor of a more early Date: At leaſt, no doubt can be made but as ſoon as He came to be *Emperor*, if not a great deal ſooner, the *German* Churches (as well as the *Gallican* before) admitted this Creed, even into their *publick* Offices. It is of This Time that an *Anonymous* Author cited above, in a Tract directed to *Charlemagne*, then Emperor, ſays, that this Creed was *profeſs'd by the Univerſal Church*. We cannot therefore be miſtaken in ſetting the *Reception* of it in *Germany*, as high as the year 800. So high may paſs for *certain* Fact: And there is great probability for the running it up many years higher.

ENGLAND.

880 As to our own Country, we have clear and poſitive Proof of the Creed's being ſung alternately in our Churches in the *Tenth* Century, when *Abbo* of *Fleury* an ear-witneſs of it, was here; and when the *Saxon* Verſions, ſtill extant, were of ſtanding uſe for the Inſtruction and Benefit both of Clergy and People. Theſe Evidences alone will prove the *Reception* of this Creed in *England* to have been as early as 950, or 930, or the Time of *Athelſtan*, whoſe *Latin* Pſalter, with the Creed in it, remains to this Day. The Age of the manuſcript *Verſions* will warrant us thus far: But, poſſibly, if thoſe *Verſions* were thoroughly examin'd by a *Critick* in the *Saxon*, it might appear that the Verſion, or Verſions were many years older than the Manuſcripts. This I am no judge of my ſelf; nor have I an opportunity of Examining: But I am willing to leave a ſhort Hint

a Codex iſte——in Bibliotheca cubiculari ſummi Pontificis *Hadriani* I. permanſit uſque ad Annum DCCLXXXVIII, quo S. *Willehadus* ab eodem, cum conſenſu *Caroli* M. primus Epiſcopus *Bremenſis* declaratus eſt. Tunc videlicet P. P. *Hadrianus* eundem illum *Codicem Pſalterii*, quem ipſe in principio Pontificatus ſui tanquam munus gratulatorium a *Carolo Magno* acceperat, eadem ratione donavit S. *Willehado*, ut ille, in novo Epiſcopatu ſuo, frueretur uſu ſacri iſtius muneris. *Lambec. Catal.* Bibl. Vindob. l. 2. c. 5. p. 297.

with

with Thoſe that have ſuch Opportunities, and can judge with *certainty*, from a thorough Acquaintance with all the little, gradual Alterations introduced into the old *Saxon* Language, from the firſt coming in of the *Danes*,[a] that is, from the year 787. There is yet another Rule for determining the Time when This Creed came firſt to be received in *England*; which is from it's having a place in the *Latin* Pſalters, ſuch as were written in *England* at ſuch a Time. For I perſuade my ſelf, that it would not have been inſerted in the *Pſalters* among the other *Canticles* of the Church, but when it was receiv'd as well as Thoſe. Such a *Pſalter*, as I conceive, there now is in *Benet* College Library in *Cambridge*, written in *England*, and in the *Ninth* Century. Wherefore, upon the whole, and all Circumſtances conſider'd, I may preſume to name the year 880, or thereabout, for the Reception of this Creed in *England*, in the Time of K. *Alfred*. Further Inquiries may perhaps carry it up higher: But it cannot reaſonably be brought lower, and ſo there I leave it.

ITALY.

We learn from *Ratherius*, above cited, that This Creed was 880.
in common uſe in ſome parts of *Italy*, particularly in the Dioceſs of *Verona* in Low *Lombardy*, in his Time; that is about 960. He then ſpeaks of it as a Man would do of a Formulary that had been cuſtomary amongſt them, and of long ſtanding. He exhorts his Clergy to make themſelves Maſters of the Three Creeds, *Apoſtles*, *Nicene*, and *Athanaſian*; without the leaſt intimation of the laſt of them being newly introduced. I incline to think that from the Time that *Lombardy* became a Province of the *French* under *Charles* the *Great* (about the year 774.) This Creed obtain'd there by means of That *Prince*, who had ſo great a value for it, and whoſe Cuſtom it was to diſperſe it abroad wherever He had any Power, or Influence. He preſented it to the Pope Himſelf in 772: He delivered it, about the ſame Time, or before, to the *Monks* of *Mount-Olivet* in *Jeruſalem* of his Foundation. And it appears to have been with his conſent,

a. Vid. *Hickeſ.* Grammat. Anglo-Saxon. p. 88.

or

or perhaps at his Requeſt, that Pope *Adrian* conveyed it to *Willehad*, the firſt Biſhop of *Breme*, in 788. Theſe Circumſtances make it highly probable that the ſame *Charles* the *Great* introduced this Creed into *Lombardy* ſoon after his Conqueſt of it. And indeed nothing could be more ſerviceable at That Time, in a Country which had ſo long before been corrupted with *Arianiſm*. Add to This, that it appears highly probable that the *Gallican* Pſalter was introduced into the Churches of *Italy*, ſoon after *Lombardy* became a Province under the Kings of *France:* And if their *Pſalter* came in, no doubt but their *Creed*, Then a part of their *Pſalter*, came in with it. Cardinal *Bona* obſerves, and ſeems to wonder at it, that the *Gallican* Pſalter obtained in moſt parts of *Italy* in the eleventh Century.[a] He might very probably have ſet the Date higher, as high perhaps, or very near, as the conqueſt of *Lombardy* by *Charlemagne*. Thus far at leaſt, we may reaſonably judge, that Thoſe parts which were more immediately ſubject to the Kings of *France*, *Verona* eſpecially, one of the firſt Cities taken, receiv'd the *Gallican* Pſalter ſooner than the reſt. However, ſince I here go only upon Probabilities, and have no poſitive Proof of the preciſe Time when either the *Creed*, or the *Pſalter* came in, and it might take up ſome years to introduce them, and ſettle them There (new Cuſtoms generally meeting with difficulties, and oppoſition at the firſt) Theſe things conſidered, I am content to ſuppoſe the ſame Time for the Reception of this Creed in *Italy*, as I have before named for our own Country; which is but 80 years higher than *Ratherius*, and is above 100 years from the intire conqueſt of *Lombardy* by *Charles* the *Great*. There may be ſome reaſon to ſuſpect that This Creed had been known in *Italy*, and *received*, at leaſt in ſome of the *Monaſteries* there, near 200 years before. The Manuſcript of *Bobio*, in *Langobardick* Character, and written about the year 700, or ſooner, will afford a very ſtrong Preſumption of it. And if we conſider how from the year 639, in the Time of *Rotharis*, one of the *Lombard* Kings of

a *Bona:* rerum Liturg. Lib. 2. c. 3. p. 506.

Italy

Italy, there had been a conſtant ſtruggle between the *Catholicks* and *Arians*, and a Succeſſion of *Biſhops* on Both Sides kept up, in almoſt every City of his Dominions, for many years together; I ſay, from Theſe conſiderations, one might reaſonably preſume that the Catholicks had about that Time procured This *Creed*, together with *Bachiarii Fides*, and *Gennadius*'s Tract, out of the *Gallican* Parts, to arm themſelves the better againſt the ſpreading Hereſy. But as This does not amount to a *publick Reception* of it, nor is the Fact ſo clear as not to be liable to diſpute, I pretend not to inſiſt upon it.

ROME.

Rome is of diſtinct Conſideration from the other parts of 930
Italy, and was always more deſirous of impoſing her own *Offices* upon other Churches, than of receiving any from Them. The *Filioque*, in the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed, had been long admitted into all the other *Weſtern* Churches before *Rome* would accept it; which was not (at leaſt it does not appear that it was) till the Middle of the Eleventh Century, or about 1050. The Cuſtom of reciting the *Nicene*, or *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed, in the *Communion-Service*, had prevailed in *Spain*, *France*, and *Germany* for ſeveral Centuries; and was at length but hardly admitted at *Rome* in the year 1014. It was thought civil enough of the Popes of *Rome* to allow the other *Weſtern* Churches to vary from the *Roman* Cuſtoms in any thing: And Thoſe other Churches could not enjoy that Liberty and Privilege in quiet, without complying with the *Roman* Offices in moſt Things beſides. The Uſe of the *Athanaſian* Creed was one of thoſe Things wherein They were before-hand with the Church of *Rome*, and in which they were indulg'd; as was alſo the Uſe of the *Gallican* Pſalter, which the *Weſtern* Churches in general were allowed [a] to have, while the *Romans* were tenacious of

a *Alexander* IV in ſua Conſtitutione quæ eſt Sexta in Bellario Ordinis *Eremitarum* Sancti *Auguſtini*, mandat *Priori Generali* & reliquis Fratribus in *Tuſcia*, ut recitent Officium juxta morem *Romanæ* Eccleſiæ, excepto *Pſalterio*. Bona; Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 3. p. 506.

their

their *own*. But tho' the *Romans* retain'd their own *Pſalter* all the way down to the middle of the XVIth Century; yet They had long before borrowed This Creed from the *Gallican*, and received it into their Offices. This is certain Fact; but as to the preciſe Time when it was firſt done, it may not be eaſy to determine. It was, without all queſtion, before *Thomas Aquinas*'s days; who tells us (as above cited) that This Creed was *receiv'd by the Authority of the Pope:* I wiſh He had told us *what* Pope. That it was not received into the *Roman* Offices ſo ſoon as the year 809, may be probably argued from a Caſe that then happen'd, which has been hinted above. The *Latin* Monks of *Mount Olivet*, (founded by *Charles* the *Great*) in their Apologetical Letter to Pope *Leo* III, made the beſt Defenſe they were able of their own Practice in their publick Profeſſing that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the *Son*. They pleaded the open Acknowledgment of the ſame Doctrine in *Charles* the *Great*'s own Chapel; and that the ſame Doctrine had been taught Them, in St. *Gregory*'s Homilies, and in the *Rule* of St. *Benedict*, and in the *Athanaſian* Creed, and in a *Dialogue* given Them by Pope *Leo* Himſelf[a]. Now, had the *Athanaſian* Creed been at That Time recited in the publick Offices at *Rome*, Thoſe *Monks* who were ſo particular in every little Circumſtance pleadable in their Favor, could not have failed (eſpecially upon their mentioning the *Athanaſian* Creed) to have pleaded a Thing ſo notorious, and which would have given the greateſt Countenance and Authority poſſible to Them, and their Doctrine; and muſt have been of the greateſt Weight and Force with Pope *Leo*, to whom They were writing, and whoſe Protection They

Sic quoque S. *Franciſcus*, ut teſtatur *Fraſſenius* (Diſqu. Bib. c. 6. S. 1.) illius Ordinis Frater, in Regula ſuorum præcipit: *Clerici faciant Divinum Officium ſecundum Ordinem ſanctæ* Romanæ *Eccleſiæ, excepto* Pſalterio. *Hod.* de Text. Bibl. p. 383. Vid. etiam ſupra p. 61.

a Beniginiſſime Pater, dum eſſem Ego *Leo*, ſervus veſter, ad Sancta veſtigia veſtra, & ad pia veſtigia Domni *Karoli*, piiſſimi Imperatoris, Filiique veſtri, audivimus in Capella ejus dici in Symbolo Fidei, *qui ex patre Filioque procedit*. Et in Homilia S. *Gregorii*, quam nobis Filius veſter Domnus *Karolus* Imperator dedit, in parabola Octavarum Paſchæ, ubi dixit: *Sed ejus miſſio ipſa proceſſio eſt, qui de Patre procedit & Filio.* Et in *Regula* S. *Benedicti*, quam nobis dedit Filius veſter *Domnus Karolus*, ——— & in *Dialogo* quem nobis *veſtra ſanctitas* dare dignata eſt, ſimiliter dicit. Et in *Fide S. Athanaſii* eodem modo dicit. *Epiſt.* Monach. *Montis-Olivet:* apud *Le Quien*, Damaſc. Diſſert. præv. p. 7.

were

were then ſeeking, and humbly imploring. From hence then one may reaſonably infer, that This Creed was not received into the *Roman* Offices ſo early as the year 809. Let us now inquire whether we can fix upon any later Time for it's coming in.

Genebrard teſtifies that in the oldeſt *Roman Breviaries* He could meet with, or hear of, This Creed always made a part of the Service[a]. But This is too general, nor can we be certain how antient thoſe oldeſt *Breviaries* were, nor whether They belong'd to the *Roman* Church, ſtrictly ſo called, or to other *Weſtern* Churches. And indeed, I know not how we can come to any Certainty in This Matter, unleſs it be by examining into the *Roman* Pſalters which have This Creed in Them. Whenever The Creed came into the *Roman* Pſalters, we may juſtly conclude, that at the ſame Time it came into the *Roman* Offices. We have in our Publick Library at *Cambridge* a *Roman* Pſalter, written for the uſe of the Church of *Canterbury* (as our judicious Mr. *Wanley* reaſonably conjectures[b]) and about the Time of the *Conqueſt*, or a little before, ſuppoſe 1060. The Church of *Canterbury* more eſpecially uſed the *Roman* Pſalter, as hath been obſerved above, and was in all Things conformable, of old Time, to the *Roman* Offices. Now, if this Creed, which had long before been introduced into the *Gallican* Pſalters, did at this Time obtain in the *Roman* alſo; it is obvious to conclude, that it at the ſame Time made a part of the *Roman* Offices, even at *Rome* it ſelf, as well as *Canterbury*, ſince one was conformable to the other. This Argument may carry us up ſome years higher: For there is another, an older *Roman* Pſalter, taken notice of above, which has This Creed in it[c]; written about the year 930, in the Time of K.

a In vetuſtiſſimis Romanæ Eccleſiæ ὠρολογίοις (Hæc nunc vocamus *Breviaria*) ſub *Athanaſii* nomine ejus ad *Primam* recitatio uſu recepta eſt. *Genebr.* in Symb. Athanaſ. p. 3.

b Notandum vero in Litania extare hæc verba: *Ut Archiepiſcopum noſtrum, & omnem Congregationem illi commiſſam, in ſancta religione conſervare digneris, te rogamus:* quibus pene inducor ut credam hunc Cod. olim pertinuiſſe ad Eccleſiam Chriſti Salvatoris Cantuariæ. *Wanleii* Catal. p. 152.

c *I have been certified of This ſince my writing of page the* 54*th. The Creed in That Pſalter bears the very ſame Title with Dr.* Wotton's *above.* p. 68.

Athelſtan. It is ſaid to have belonged formerly to Archbiſhop *Cranmer.* Perhaps This alſo might have been written for the uſe of the Church of *Canterbury:* I know of no Church, amongſt us which at that Time uſed the *Roman Pſalter*, but the Church of *Canterbury.* However, it is highly improbable that any Church which complied ſo far with *Rome*, as to uſe the *Roman* Pſalter, ſhould take This Creed into That Pſalter before ſuch Time as *Rome* it ſelf had done the ſame Thing. Upon the Strength of This Argument, tho' it be not demonſtrative, but probable only, (ſuch as the Caſe will admit of, and ſuch as may very well paſs till we can fix upon ſomething more certain) I ſay upon the Strength of This, I incline to date the *Reception* of this Creed at *Rome* from the *Tenth* Century, and the Beginning of it, about the year 930. From this Time forwards, I preſume, the *Athanaſian* Creed has been honoured with a *publick* Recital, among the other Sacred Hymns and Church *Offices*, all over the *Weſt.* The way has been to recite it at the *Prime*, or Firſt Hour (*one* a *Clock* in the *Latin* Account, with us *ſeven* in the Morning) every *Lord's-Day*[a]; and in ſome Places *Every* Day[b]. But as the Cuſtom of making it only a part of the *Sunday-Service* is the moſt *antient*, ſo has it likewiſe been the moſt *general*, and *prevailing*; and is at this Day the common and conſtant Uſage of the Churches within the *Roman* Communion. And let This ſuffice ſo far as concerns the *Weſtern* Churches.

of the GREEK *and* ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

As to the *Greek*, or *Oriental* Churches, I reſerved This Place for them, that I might not entirely omit them. It has been queſtion'd, whether any of them ever received This Creed at

a Die Dominico ad *primam* recitetur. *Hatt. Baſil.* A. D. 820.
Per omnes occidentis Eccleſias Dominicis ſemper diebus Pſallitur ——— in Cunctis Eccleſiis publice cani præcepta. *Manuel. Calec.* Bibl. P. P. Tom. XXVI. p. 414.

b Fidem, *Quicunque vult*, quotidie ad primam iterat. *Honor. Auguſt.* Ad primam dicunt *quotidie* Symbolum *Athanaſii.* Bona de *Carthuſianis.* p. 897. Pſalmod.
Ad primam——— quotidie ſubditur Symbolum *Athanaſii.* Bona de *Ambroſianis* p. 900. Divin. Pſalmod.

all.

all. *Voſſius*[a] ſeems to have thought that they never have: And ſo alſo *Combefiſius*[b]. And Dr. *Smith*, in his *Account of the Greek Church*, is poſitive that *as to the Creed of* Athanaſius, *the* Greeks *are* wholly Strangers to it[c].

Nevertheleſs, I find ſome very conſiderable Men of a contrary Perſwaſion, and not *Romaniſts* only, as *Baronius*, *Spondanus*[d], *Muratorius*[e], *Renaudot*[f], and others, but *Proteſtants* alſo; as particularly *Gundling*, whoſe words I have put into the Margin[g]. We may obſerve however, that thus far is agreed on all Hands, that This Creed is not received in *All* the *Greek* Churches; and, if it is in *Any*, yet it is there differently read in the Article of *Proceſſion*. It is not pretended that Any of the *African* Churches, *Alexandrian*, *Nubian*, or *Ethiopian* (which are, moſt of Them, of the *Jacobite*, or *Eutychian* Sect) have received it. So far from it, that They have not, (at leaſt the *Ethiopian* or *Abyſſene* Churches have not) ſo much as the *Apoſtle's-Creed* amongſt them, if we may believe *Ludolphus*:[h] So little are They acquainted with the *Latin* Forms, or Con-

a Nec qui noſtra ætate Patriarcha *Alexandrinus*, & Præſes *Conſtantinopoleos* fuit, progermano illud *Symbolum* habuit. Sic enim *Meletius* literis ſuis *Conſtantinopoli*, Anno 1597, ad *Johannem Douzam*, *Nordovicem* datis, & a Filio *Georgio Douza* editis. "*Athanaſio* falſo "adſcriptum *Symbolum*, cum appendice illa Romanorum Pontificum adulteratum, luce "lucidius conteſtamur. *Voſſ.* de Trib. Symb. Differt. 2. c. 20. p. 521.

b *Combef.* not. ad Calec. p. 297. & notatione 48 in vitam Baſilii Pſeudo-Amphiloch. ——*Symbolum* Athanaſii *Græci ut ejus non recipiunt.*

c Smith. *Account* &c. p. 196.

d Spondanus *epitomizing the words of* Baronius, *as I find quoted by* Tentzelius *p.* 152. Cum autem e Romanæ Eccleſiæ antiquis monumentis, veluti eruderatum emerſit in lucem, tum a *Latinis* omnibus, tum a *Græcis* æque ſuſceptum eſt: non ab Eccleſia *Conſtantinopolitana* tantum, ſed *Serviana*, *Bulgarica*, *Ruſſica*, *Moſcovitica*, & aliis; licet ab eis dempta inde pars illa fuerit, qua Spiritum Sanctum a Patre *Filioque* procedere expreſſum habetur.

e Re vera, non Eccleſia tantum *Conſtantinopolitana*, ſed *Serviana*, *Bulgarica*, *Ruſſica*, *Moſcovitica*, aliæque Ritui Græco addictæ, etſi *Athanaſiano* Symbolo in *Sacris Liturgiis utantur*, hanc tamen particulam, *& Filio*, inde excluſere. *Murator.* Tom. 2. p. 227.

f Quod dicitur Domini Filius aſſumpſiſſe Hominem *&c.* rectum eſt, *Symbolo* quod *Athanaſii* dicitur, & *a Græcis Latiniſque recipitur*, conforme. *Renaud.* Orient. Liturg. Vol. 2. p. 643.

g Mirari quis poſſit cur *Græci* Proceſſionem Spiritus Sancti a Filio negent, Additionem ad *Symbolum Nicænum* tam ægre ferant, cum tamen *Symbolum Athanaſii recipiant*. Gundling. Not. ad Euſtrat. *&c.* p. 68.

h *Ludolph.* Hiſtor. Æthiop. l. 3. c. 5. Symbolo Fidei Catholicæ *Nicæno* communiter utuntur——illo quo nos utimur, uti cæteri Orientales, carent: haud levi indicio *Apoſtolos* illius Autores non eſſe.

feſſions. Nor is it pretended that the more Eaſtern Chriſtians, belonging to the Patriarchates of *Antioch*, and *Jeruſalem*, have any Acquaintance with the *Athanaſian* Creed: No not the *Maronites*, tho' They formerly ſubmitted to the See of *Rome*, and are ſtill ſuppoſed to hold Communion therewith, and to acknowledge the *Pope* for their Head. All that is pretended, with reſpect to This Creed, is, that the Churches of *Conſtantinople*, *Servia*, *Bulgaria*, *Ruſſia*, and *Muſcovy*, acknowledge it as *Athanaſius*'s, or make uſe of it in their Common and Sacred Offices. And for proof of This, it has been uſual to appeal to a Paſſage of *Cazanovius*, a Poliſh Knight, in a Letter of his to *Calvin*: which Letter I have not ſeen, but find quoted both by *Genebrard* [a] and *Voſſius* [b], Men of oppoſite Principles, and therefore the more ſafely to be relied on where They agree. But what does *Cazanovius* confeſs? That the *Greek*, *Servian*, *Ruſſian*, and *Muſcovite* Churches acknowledge the *Athanaſian* Creed, as *Athanaſius*'s; only *curtail'd* (or, as They would ſay, *corrected*) as to the Point of the *Proceſſion*. A Confeſſion from a *Socinian* Adverſary, in this caſe, is of ſome Weight; and eſpecially if it can be inforced by any corroborating Evidence. Let us ſee then what may be further learn'd concerning the ſeveral Churches here named, and the *Reception* of this Creed in them. I may take them one by one.

1. To begin with *Muſcovy*, where the Matter of Fact ſeems to be moſt fully atteſted of Any. In the Account given of the Lord *Carliſle*'s Embaſſy from K. *Charles* II. to the *Great Duke* of *Muſcovy*, in the year 1663 [c], I meet with This Paſſage, relating to the *Muſcovites*, and their *Divine Service*: "The "whole Service is perform'd by Reading of certain Pſalms, or "Chapters in the Bible: Sometimes the Prieſt adds *Athana-*

a Si *Athanaſii* eſt, cujuſnam illud erit quod nunc *Græcorum*, *Serviorum*, *Ruſſorum*, & *Moſcorum* Eccleſiæ ſub ejuſdem *Athanaſii* titulo retinent, ac pro genuino agnoſcunt? *Cazanov.* ad *Calvin.* Epiſt. apud Genebr. de Symbol. Athanaſ. p. 7.

b *Cazanovius* Sarmata —— etſi multum ei Hoc *Symbolum* diſpliceat, agnoſcit tamen *Athanaſianum* vocari, non in *Latina* ſolum Eccleſia, ſed etiam in *Conſtantinopolitana*, *Serviana*, *Bulgarica*, *Moſcovitica*. Voſſ. de Symb. Diſſ. 2. c. 1. p. 516.

c Harris's *Compleat Collection* &c. Vol. 2. p. 181. *See alſo the* Duke *of* Holſtein's *Travels*. ibid. p. 36.

"*ſius*'s

" *ſius*'s Creed, or ſings certain Hymns, and St. *Chryſoſtom*'s " Homily. In another Treatiſe intituled, *of the antient and modern Religion of the Muſcovites*, written in *French*, and printed at *Cologne* 1698, and ſince tranſlated into *Engliſh*, there is this Account of the *Muſcovites*; that " They receive the Creed of " the *Apoſtles*, and That of *Nice*, and *Athanaſius* [a]. Theſe two Teſtimonies are undoubtedly ſufficient, ſo far as concerns *Muſcovy*. Now, the *Muſcovites* received their Religion, and their *Orders* from the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, about the Xth Century, or Beginning of the XIth: And their receiving of this Creed will be a preſumptive Argument in favor of it's *Reception* at *Conſtantinople* alſo, if there be no evident Reaſon againſt it. That the *Muſcovites* did not receive the Creed from the *Latins*, but from the *Greeks*, is very plain, becauſe their Copies of the Creed are without the Article of the Proceſſion *from the Son*. [b] For They pretend that the *Latins* have *interpolated* the Creed, appealing to their own uncorrupted Copies; and they blame the *Latins*, farther, for inſerting the *Filioque* into the *Nicene* [c]. From what hath been ſaid it appears to be certain Fact, that the *Muſcovites* receive the *Athanaſian* Creed: How long they have had it, or how far ſhort of 700 years, (reckoning from the Time that Chriſtianity was receiv'd, or reſtored amongſt them) I cannot ſay. I ſhould obſerve that the *Muſcovites* always perform their Service in their own *Vulgar* Tongue, as is allowed on all Hands [d]: Since then the *Athanaſian* Creed is a part of their Service, They muſt have had a

a Harris's *Collect. of Travels.* Vol. 2. p. 238 *See alſo* p. 240. 241.

b Vid. *Tentzel.* Judic. Erudit. p. 151.

c *See* Harris *ibid.* p. 240.

d In cæteris autem Regionibus, videlicet in *Servia*, *Myſia*, *Boſnia*, *Bulgaria*, *Ruſſia minori* Regi *Poloniæ* ſubdita, in *Volhinia*, *Podolia*, & parte quadam *Lituaniæ*, aliiſque finitimis provinciis, ritu *Græco* divinum peragitur officium, tranſlatis Græcorum Typicis in *Sclavonicam* Linguam. Eoſdem Græcos Ritus, eadem Lingua, ſervant *Moſcovitæ*, quorum Regio *Ruſſia major*, ſeu *Roxolania* nuncupatur &c. *Bona* de Divin. Pſalmod. c. 18. Sect. 17. p. 911. *Vid.* etiam *Uſſer.* Hiſtor. Dogmat. p. 246.

Armeni ſuo quoque nativo ſermone dudum ſacra celebrant, tum qui *Orthodoxam* Fidem retinuerunt, tum *Jacobitæ*, ut *Moſcovitæ* ſeu *Rutheni*, Conſtantinopolitanæ ſedi ſubjecti, *Ruſſico*; & alii quidam de quibus pauca ſcimus. *Renaudot.* Liturg. Orient. Vol. 1. Diſſertat. 6. p. 43.

Verſion

Verſion of it in the *Muſcovite* Language, which is a Dialect of the *Sclavonian*. Wherefore This alſo, after our Proof of the Thing, may now be added to the other *Verſions* above mention'd.

2. *Ruſſia*, as diſtinguiſh'd from *Muſcovy*, muſt mean *Ruſſia Minor*, or the *Black Ruſſia*, a Province of *Poland*. As many as there follow the *Greek* Rites, are of the ſame Account with the *Muſcovites* before ſpoken of: And therefore what has been ſaid of the former, with reſpect to the uſe of the *Athanaſian* Creed, will be applicable to theſe alſo; and ſo I need not be more particular about them. The Patriarch of *Muſcovy* ordains their *Archbiſhop*, who is therefore ſubject to Him, and follows the ſame Rites and Cuſtoms: And their Language is alſo a Dialect of the *Sclavonian*, like the other.

3. *Servia*, now a large Province of the *Turkiſh* Empire, part of *Northern Turky* in *Europe*, firſt received Chriſtianity about the year 860, by the means of *Cyrill* and *Methodius*, who are ſaid to have invented the *Sclavonian* Letters, and to have tranſlated the Scriptures into the *Sclavonian* Tongue. *Cyrill* was a *Greek*, and came from *Conſtantinople*; And *Methodius* was a *Greek* too, Both ſent by the *Greek* Emperor to convert the Country; which therefore became inſtructed in the *Greek* Rites and Religion. It is not improbable that They ſhould have the *Athanaſian* Creed, as well as the *Muſcovites* and *Ruſſians*; or perhaps before them, being converted ſooner: And They alſo muſt have received it from the *Greeks*, and not from the *Latins*, becauſe of their varying, in the Article of the *Proceſſion*, from the *Weſtern* Churches.

4. *Bulgaria* is likewiſe part of *Turky* in *Europe*, and has been ſo from the year 1396. Chriſtianity was planted there in the year 845. There were of old great Diſputes between the Two Biſhops of *Rome*, and *Conſtantinople*, upon the Queſtion to whoſe *Patriarchate* the *Bulgarians* did of right belong. In Concluſion, about the year 870, the *Greek* Patriarch prevailed over the *Roman*, by the Intereſt of the then Emperor of *Conſtantinople*. The *Bulgarians* of conſequence fell to the Share of the *Greek* Church, and ſo have been educated in their Rites, and Cuſtoms.

Their

Their Language is a Dialect of the *Sclavonian*, in which They perform their *Sacred* Offices: And therefore, if they make uſe of the *Athanaſian* Creed, They muſt be ſuppoſed to have it in their own *Vulgar* Tongue. I have no particular Evidence, of their uſing it, beyond what has been mention'd from *Cazanovius*, and the *Romiſh* Writers; which yet ſeems to be ſufficient, ſince it has been fully proved that it is uſed in *Muſcovy*, and in *Ruſſia*, to whom the *Bulgarians* are Neighbours, and with whom they conform in their other religious Rites derived from the ſame Fountain, namely, the *Conſtantinopolitan Greeks*.

5. It remains then, that we conſider the Fact in reſpect of *Conſtantinople* it ſelf, and the *Greek* Church there: For, This alſo, as we have ſeen, has been named with Others, as receiving the *Athanaſian* Creed. *Genebrard* is poſitive in it, and gives us the very Creed it ſelf, which the *Conſtantinopolitans*, as He ſays, uſe and recite[a]. He wrote in the year 1569. The Truth of his Report is very much doubted, becauſe the *Form*, which He exhibits, acknowledges the Proceſſion from *the Son*, which the *Conſtantinopolitans* admit not: And even Thoſe who, as before ſeen, aſſert, or allow that They receive this Creed, yet at the ſame Time intimate that it is not the *intire* Creed, but *curtailed* in That Article. However, *Genebrard* might be in the right, as to the main Thing, that the *Conſtantinopolitans* do receive the Creed, tho' miſtaken in the particular *Form*: Or poſſibly ſome *Latinizing Greeks* at *Conſtantinople* might have one Form, and the reſt another, and thus all will be well. But let us inquire what further Evidence there is of this Creed's having been ever received at *Conſtantinople*, and by the *Greeks* properly ſo called. An Argument thereof may be drawn from the *Greek* Copies that vary from the *Latin*, in the Article of Proceſſion. For, who ſhould draw up, and curtail the *Greek* Copies but the *Greeks*? And why ſhould They be at the trouble of *correcting* (as They will call it) the Creed, if They did not *receive* it? A ſecond Argument may be drawn from the Creed's being found in the *Horologia* belonging to the *Greeks*;

a Superius Symbolum, *Athanaſii* verbis aliquantulum immutatis, *Conſtantinopolitani* ſic Græce legunt, & recitant. *Genebrard.* in Symb. Athan. p. 14.

that

that is, in their *Breviaries* (as we ſhould call them) their Books of Service for the *Canonical* Hours. How ſhould the Creed come in there; unleſs the *Greeks* received it into their Sacred Offices? As to the Fact, Biſhop *Uſher*'s Copy found in ſuch a *Breviary*, is a ſufficient Evidence: And it is plain from the Copy it ſelf, that it was no *Latinizing Greek* that made it, or uſed it; ſince the Proceſſion from the *Son* is ſtruck out. Further, This *Horologion* belong'd to a Monk of *Conſtantinople*[a]; which argues the Reception of the Creed in That very *City*: And as a Token of their Eſteem of it, and Value for it, it is aſcribed to the *Nicene* Council it ſelf; which all the *Greeks* receive and reſpect with the greateſt Veneration. From hence then it is plain that the *Conſtantinopolitan Greeks* (ſome of them at leaſt) receive, or have received This Creed, but with ſome Alterations proper to their peculiar Tenets in oppoſition to the *Latins*. This Fact, of the *Conſtantinopolitans* their receiving This Creed, might be farther proved from the *Confeſſion* of *Metrophanes Critopulus* (in the year 1620, publiſhed in 1667.[b]) who admits the Creed, and looks upon it as owing to a very particular Providence, that the *Greek* Copies (as He ſuppoſes) have been preſerved pure and entire, while the *Latin* ones have been corrupted, or interpolated. We find by *Nicolaus Hydruntinus*, above cited, that ſuch had been the general Perſwaſion of the *Greeks*, 500 years upwards, in relation to This Creed; not rejecting the *Creed*, but the *Latin Interpolation* only, as they take it to be.

Which when I conſider, reflecting withal how the *Muſcovites*, *Ruſſians*, &c. (who derived their Religion from the *Greeks* ſince the IXth Century) have all come into this Creed, (only ſtriking out the Proceſſion from the Son) and that no good Account can be given of ſuch Agreement, but that They all received the ſame Form when they firſt received their Religion; I ſay, when I conſider, and compare theſe Things toge-

a In Thecaræ, Conſtantinopolitani Monachi, Græcorum Hymnorum Horologio (a *Ravio* noſtro ex Oriente huc advecto) *Symbolum* Hoc, eo quo poſt finem hujus Diatribæ cernitur interpolatum modo, *Nicenæ* Synodo adſcriptum——reperi &c. *Uſſer.* de Symb. p. 1.

b Metrophanis Critopuli, Protoſyngeli Conſtantinopolitani Ὁμολογία τῆς ἀναπολικῆς ἐκκλησίας edit. Helmſtad. in 4to, a *Joann. Hornejo*: Vid. cap. 1. p. 18. apud *Tentzel.* p. 150.

ther,

ther, it cannot but give me a Suſpicion, that This Creed had been received by the *Greeks* ſoon after their firſt Diſputes with the *Latins* about the *Proceſſion*; only They took care to ſtrike out a part of it, hoping to ſolve all by charging the *Latins* with *Interpolation*.

However This be, not to inſiſt upon a bare Conjecture without antient Records to confirm it, one Thing is certain, and, I think, hath been proved abundantly, that the profeſs'd *Greeks*, even under the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, have in former Times received, and ſtill do receive this Creed, with ſuch Alterations, or Corrections as are proper to their Principles: And ſo I underſtand Dr. *Covel*[a], where He ſays, ſpeaking of what is done amongſt the *Greeks*, that *Athanaſius*'s *Creed is owned, as corrupted*; that is, with ſuch Corruptions as the *Greeks* have made to it. Upon the whole, therefore, I cannot but cloſe in with thoſe many learned *Romaniſts* who have affirm'd, and ſtill do affirm, that This Creed is *received* both by *Greeks* and *Latins*. If the Expreſſion be thought too *general*, ſince it is certain that the Creed is rejected by innumerable *Greeks*, or more properly *Orientaliſts*, in *Aſia* and *Africa*; as the *Cophtes*, and *Nubians*, and *Abaſſines*, and *Maronites*, *Armenians*, *Neſtorians*, &c. I ſay, if this be objected; it is to be conſider'd, that the *Romaniſts*, under the name of *Greeks*, mean generally the *Orthodox* Greeks only, the *Melchite* Greeks, or as many as hold Communion with the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; making no Account of the reſt, as being by their Hereſies cut off from the Church, and therefore of little or no Conſideration[b]. Now, in this Senſe, it is excuſable enough to ſay, that the Creed is received both by *Greeks*, and *Latins*.

To Sum up what hath been ſaid of the *Reception* of this

a Covel: *Account of the Greek Church. pref.* p. 9. *To which I may add a Remark of the learned Dr.* Hickes, *that* This Creed, tho' of an uncertain Author, was, for it's excellent Compoſure, received into the *Greek*, and *Latin* Churches. *Hickes. Serm. Vol.* 2. *p.* 235.

b Attamen hoc ævi ſub *Orientalis Eccleſiæ* nomine diverſarum Nationum Orientalium Eccleſiæ veniunt; quæ licet a *Græca* ſuam cognoſcant Originem, propter tamen variarum Hæreſium colluviem, & alia præter mores Chriſtianos peſſima introducta, a *Græca* longiſſime abſunt. *Græci* enim illius Religionis Homines, tanquam a ſe disjunctos, atque improbiſſimos, arcent, & deteſtantur. *Leo Allat.* de perpet. Conſenſ. Eccl. Occid. & Orient. p. 9.

Creed: From the foregoing Account it appears that it's Reception has been both *general*, and *antient*. It hath been received by *Grecks* and *Latins*, all over *Europe*: And if it hath been little known among the *African*, and *Aſian* Churches, the like may be ſaid of the *Apoſtles* Creed, which hath not been admitted, ſcarce known, in *Africa*, and but little in *Aſia*[a], except among the *Armenians*, who are ſaid to receive it[b]. So that, for *generality* of Reception, the *Athanaſian* Creed may vie with Any, except the *Nicene*, or *Conſtantinopolitan*, the only *general* Creed common to all the Churches. As to the *Antiquity* of it's Reception into the *Sacred Offices*, This Creed has been received in ſeveral Countries, *France*, *Germany*, *England*, *Italy*, and *Rome* it ſelf, as ſoon, or ſooner than the *Nicene*; which is a high Commendation of it, as gaining Ground by it's own Intrinſick worth, and without the Authority of any *general Council* to inforce it. And there is this Thing further to be ſaid for it, that while the *Nicene* and *Apoſtles* Creeds have been growing up to their preſent Perfection in a Courſe of years, or Centuries of years, and not compleated till about the year 600, This Creed was made and perfected at once, and is more antient, if conſider'd as an *intire Form*, than either of the other; having received it's full Perfection, while the others wanted theirs. No conſiderable Additions or Defalcations have been made to it, (it has needed none) ſince it's firſt compiling, till of late years, and in the *Greek* Church only; which yet are ſo far from correcting or amending the Form, that they have rendred it ſo much the leſs perfect: And the only way of reſtoring it to it's Perfection, is to reſtore it to what it was at the firſt. But I paſs on.

a Illo quo nos utimur, uti cæteri Orientales, carent (*Habeſſini*) haud levi indicio, Apoſtolos illius Autores non eſſe, quamvis doctrinæ ratione *Apoſtolicum* rectè vocetur. *Ludolph. Hiſt. Æthiop.* l. 3. c. 5. n. 19.

Symbolum nec ab *Apoſtolis*, nec a Synodo ulla generali factum eſt: Adhæc, nec in *Græc.* nec in *Orient.* ullis Eccleſiis obtinuit, ſed in Eccleſia *Romana*. *Suicer. Theſaur.* p. 1093.

b Sr Paul Ricaut, *Preſent State of the Greek Church*. p. 409

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Time when, and Place where the Creed was compoſed.

HAVING obſerved *when*, and *where* this Creed hath been *received*, we may now aſcend higher, and conſider *when* and *where* it was *made*. Our Inquiries here will be in ſome meaſure dark, and conjectural; ſtrong Probabilities will perhaps be as much as we can reach to: Which made it the more neceſſary for me to begin, as I have, at the lower end, where Things are more plain, and clear, in hopes to borrow ſome Light to conduct our ſearches into what remains ſtill dark, and obſcure. Whatever we have to advance in this Chapter, muſt reſt upon Two Things. 1. Upon *External Teſtimony* from Antient Citations, Manuſcripts, Comments, Verſions, and the like, ſuch as have been previouſly laid down. 2. Upon the *Internal Characters* of the Creed.

1. To begin with the *External* Evidence: Our *Antient Teſtimonies*, above recited, carry up the Antiquity of the Creed as high as the year 670, if the firſt of them be admitted for genuine; as it reaſonably may, notwithſtanding ſome Objections. Our *Manuſcripts*, now extant, will bring us no higher than 700; but ſuch as have been known to be extant may reach up to 660, or even 600. This muſt be thought very conſiderable to as many as know how great a *Rarity* a Manuſcript of eleven hundred, or of a Thouſand years Date, is; and how few Books, or Tracts there are that can boaſt of Manuſcripts of ſuch Antiquity. The Injuries of Time, of Duſt, and of Moths, and above all, the Ravages of *War*, and Deſtructions of *Fire* have robb'd us of the antient Monuments, and left us but very thin Remains; that there is ſcarce ſuch a Thing to be found as a Manuſcript of the IVth Century, higher none at all, of the Vth very few, and even of the VIth not many. So that our want of Manuſcripts beyond the VIth, or VIIth, Century is no argument againſt the *Antiquity* of the Creed, however certain an Argument may be drawn

from Thoſe we have, ſo far as They reach. But, beyond all This, we have a Comment of the VIth Century, of the year 570, or thereabout; and this certain, and unqueſtionable: Which may ſuperſede all our Diſputes about the *Antient Teſtimonies*, or *Manuſcripts*, of more doubtful Authority. Here then we ſtand upon the foot of *external Evidence*: The Creed was, about the year 570, conſiderable enough to be commented upon, like the *Lord's-Prayer*, and *Apoſtles-Creed*, and together with Them. Here is *certain* Evidence for the Time ſpecified; and *preſumptive* for much greater Antiquity. For, who can imagine that This Creed, or indeed any Creed, ſhould grow into ſuch Repute of a ſudden, and not rather in a Courſe of Years, and a long Tract of Time? Should we allow 100, or 150 years for it, tho' it would be *Conjecture* only, yet it would not be unreaſonable, or improbable Conjecture. But we will let This Matter reſt here, and proceed to our other Marks of Direction:

2. The *Internal Characters* of the Creed. The Creed contains two principal Doctrines; one of the *Trinity*, and the other of the *Incarnation*. Poſſibly from the *Manner* wherein theſe Doctrines are there laid down, or from the *Words* whereby they are expreſs'd, we may be able to fix the true Date of the Creed, or very nearly at leaſt; certain however thus far, that it muſt be ſomewhere above 570.

From the Doctrine of the *Incarnation*, as expreſs'd in this Creed, we may be confident that it is not earlier than the Riſe of the *Apollinarian* Hereſy, which appear'd firſt about the year 360, and grew to a head about 370, or a little later. This Creed is ſo minute and particular againſt Thoſe Hereticks (without naming them, as it is not the way of the Creed to name Any) obviating every Cavil, and precluding every Evaſion, or Subterfuge, that one cannot ſuppoſe it to have been written before the Depths of That Hereſy were perfectly ſeen into, and the whole Secrets of the Party diſcloſed: which we have no reaſon to think could be before the year 370, if ſo ſoon. This Conſideration alone is to me a ſufficient Confutation of Thoſe who pretend, that *Athanaſius* made this Creed either

either during his Baniſhment at *Treves*, which ended in the year 338, or during his Stay at *Rome* in the year 343; or that He preſented it to Pope *Julius*, or Pope *Liberius*, who were Both dead before the year 367.

I muſt add, that *Epiphanius* [a] marks the very Time when the Creeds firſt began to be inlarged in Oppoſition to the *Apollinarian* Hereſy; namely the Xth year of *Valentinian* and *Valens*, and the VIth of *Gratian* (it ſhould be VIIth) which falls in with A. D. 373, the very laſt year of *Athanaſius*'s Life, according to thoſe that place his Death the lateſt; ſome ſay, He died a year or two ſooner. If therefore He made this Creed at all, it muſt be about that Time. And, indeed, were there no ſtronger Objections againſt the *Antiquity* of the Creed, or againſt it's being made by *Athanaſius*, than the common Objection about the ſuppoſed Condemnation of the *Neſtorian* and *Eutychian* Hereſies; I ſhould ſcarce think it at all improbable that *Athanaſius* ſhould be the Author, admitting that He lived to the year 373. For *Epiphanius*'s larger Creed made about that Time, appears to me as full and expreſs againſt Both thoſe Hereſies, as the *Athanaſian* can be ſuppoſed to be, and in ſome reſpects more ſo: And yet Neither of thoſe *Hereſies* were then in Being, nor for many years after. But, there are many other reaſons which convince me, that the *Athanaſian* Creed muſt be placed lower than this Time. I take *Epiphanius*'s larger Creed to have been the firſt that inlarged the Article of the *Incarnation*, in oppoſition chiefly to the *Apollinarians*: And That Creed being drawn up, as *Epiphanius* expreſsly teſtifies, by the joint Advice of *all the Orthodox Biſhops*, and the *whole Catholick Church*, became a kind of *Rule*, or *Model* for moſt of the Creeds that came after; among which I reckon the *Athanaſian*.

For, from the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as particularly, and minutely drawn out in That Creed, it is to me very plain, that it muſt be ſome years later than the Creed of *Epiphanius*: which will evidently appear to any Man who will but be at the Pains to compare the Two Creeds together.

a Epiphan. Ancorat. c. 121. p. 123.

One

One very obſervable particular is the manner of expreſſing the *Unity* by a ſingular Adjective; *Unus æternus, unus immenſus*, &c. *One eternal, one incomprehenſible*, &c. and the condemning the Expreſſion of *Tres æterni, Tres immenſi*, &c. The *Greeks* never laid down any ſuch Rule of Expreſſion, never obſerved or followed it, but have ſometimes run counter to it[a]; meaning indeed the very ſame Thing, but not ſo *expreſſing* it. As to the *Latins*, we ſhall find none of them (at leaſt, I have not obſerved any) coming into That way of Expreſſion before *Ambroſe*[b] and *Fauſtinus*[c] (in the years 381, and 384) who are the firſt that uſe it, and that but once, or very ſparingly; not repeating and inculcating it, like the *Athanaſian* Creed, nor leaving it deſtitute of Explication. But St. *Auſtin*, afterwards, in his Books of the *Trinity*, in the Vth eſpecially, inlarges in Juſtification of this Rule of Expreſſion, and is full and copious upon it. His Proofs, Illuſtrations, Example, and Authority gave new Strength and Credit to this *Rule*, which might then paſs current, and become fit to appear, without farther Explication, in a *Creed*. For This Reaſon, principally, I incline to think that This Creed was not made before St. *Auſtin*'s Books of the Trinity were *publick* (which was not till 416) or not before 420, or thereabout, to allow ſome Time for his Works to be read, conſider'd, approved, and to gain a general Eſteem. If it be ſaid, that St. *Auſtin* might as well copy from this Creed, as the Creed from Him; I ſay, No: For, the Reaſon is different. Creeds and other the like Formularies which are to be put into every ones Hands, and ſpread round about, ought not to contain any thing till it has been maturely weigh'd, long conſidered, and fully explain'd, as well

a Τριῶν ἀκρίβων ἄκριτον συμφυΐαν. Nazianz. in Bapt. Orat. 40. p. 668.

b Ergo ſanctus Pater, ſanctus Filius, ſanctus & Spiritus Sanctus: ſed *non tres Sancti*, quia unus eſt Deus ſanctus, unus eſt Dominus. Una eſt etenim vera Sanctitas, ſicut una eſt vera Divinitas, una illa vera Sanctitas naturalis. *Ambroſ.* de Sp. S. lib. 3. c. 16. p. 688.

c Sed *ne duos omnipotentes* intelligas, præcavendum eſt: licet enim & Pater ſit omnipotens, & Filius, tamen *unus eſt omnipotens*, ſicut & unus eſt Deus; quia Patris & Filii eadem omnipotentia eſt, ſicut & eadem deitas *&c.*——Oſtenditur Unitas Divinitatis in Patre & Filio, ſicut & *Omnipotentia*, & quicquid omnino *Divinæ Subſtantiæ* eſt; hoc ſolo differens a Patre Filius, quod ille Pater eſt, & Hic Filius. *Fauſtin.* de Trinit. c. 3. p. 123, 124.

as

as proved, and *generally* acknowledged by the Churches of Chriſt. It is therefore much more reaſonable to believe that St. *Auſtin*'s Writings ſhould go firſt, and a *general* Approbation of them in That particular; and then the Creed might conveniently follow, the way being now open'd for it[a].

I may obſerve the like of another Article of the *Athanaſian* Creed; namely, the *Proceſſion from the Son:* A Doctrine entertain'd indeed both by *Greeks* and *Latins* (as may appear by the Teſtimonies commonly cited for that purpoſe) and expreſs'd frequently *in Senſe*, tho' rarely *in Terms*; but ſuch as came not to be much inculcated, or inſiſted upon till St. *Auſtin* undertook to aſſert and clear it, and to render it leſs liable to any Diſpute hereafter. For which reaſon the modern *Greeks* have look'd upon Him, in a manner, as the *Father* of that Doctrine, being at leaſt the principal Man that brought it into Vogue; however weakly they may pretend that He *invented* it. Thus far is certain, that his elaborate Arguments, and ſolid Proofs, from *Scripture*, of the Truth, and of the Importance of the Doctrine, made it paſs the more readily; and gave it Credit and Authority enough to have a place in a ſtanding *Creed*, or *Confeſſion:* Which is to me another Argument of the Creed's being made after St. *Auſtin*'s Writings were well known in the World, in That Place, at leaſt, where the Creed was made. From the Premiſes then I preſume to infer, that the *Athanaſian* Creed is not earlier than the year 420.

I will next endeavour to ſhow, that it cannot reaſonably be ſet lower than the *Eutychian* Times, not later than the Council of *Chalcedon*, or than the year 451: And This alſo I ſhall attempt from the *internal Characters* of the Creed, in like manner as above.

[a] Combefis, *ſpeaking to this Point, ſeem'd inclinable to ſuppoſe that St.* Auſtin *had borrowed from the* Creed; *but correcting Himſelf afterwards, He ſuppoſes rather that the* Creed *borrowed from Him. His words are theſe.*

Ejus Symboli, ſeu Formulæ Fidei, Antiquitatem produnt illi ejus verſiculi quos totidem verbis habet Auguſt. *in Libris de Trinitate & alibi, quos non aliunde deſumpſiſſe videatur quam ex eo Symbolo——Quanquam nihil vetat dicere ipſum potius Symboli Auctorem ex* Auguſtino, *aliiſque P. P. ſua Conſarcinaſſe.* Combefiſ. not. in *Man. Calec,* Auctar. Tom. 2. p. 296.

1. There

1. There is not a Word in the Creed directly and plainly expreſſing *Two Natures* in Chriſt, or excluding *One Nature*: Which *Critical* Terms, againſt the Error of *Eutyches*, are very rarely, or never omitted in the Creeds drawn up in the *Eutychian* Times, or the Times immediately following. 'Tis true, there is, in the *Athanaſian* Creed, what may be ſufficient to obviate, or preclude the *Eutychian* Hereſy; as there is alſo in the *larger* Creed of *Epiphanius* A. D. 373, and in the Works of *Nazianzen* and *Ambroſe*, about the year 380; and in *Pelagius*'s Creed A. D. 417; and in the writings of *Auſtin*, and *Vincentius* of *Lerins*, Both before the year 435, many years before *Eutyches*. The ſtrongeſt Expreſſion of the Creed againſt the *Eutychians*, and which has been moſt frequently urged in this Caſe, is, *Unus omnino, non confuſione Subſtantiæ, ſed unitate Perſonæ: One altogether, not by Confuſion of Subſtance, but by unity of Perſon:* Which yet is uſed by *Vincentius*,[a] and by *Auſtin*[b] too, almoſt in *Terms*. And if this be no reaſon for making Either of thoſe Authors, or the Tracts aſcribed to them, later than *Eutyches*; why ſhall the like Expreſſion be of any Force in reſpect to the *Athanaſian* Creed? There is nothing in the Creed but what was common and ordinary in Catholick Writers before the *Eutychian* Times: But there are wanting thoſe *critical*, diſtinguiſhing Terms of *Two natures*, or *One nature*, neceſſary to be inſerted in the Creeds after theſe Times, and never, or very rarely omitted; which is one reaſon, and a very conſiderable one, for ſetting the Date of the Creed higher than 451.

2. Another Argument of the ſame thing, near akin to the former, is, that this Creed makes no mention of Chriſt being *Conſubſtantial with us*, in one Nature, as He is *Conſubſtantial* with the *Father* in another: A Tenet expreſsly held by ſome of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers before *Eutyches*'s Time; but ſeldom or never omitted in the *Creeds*, or *Confeſſions* about that Time, or after. To be convinced of the Truth both of this, and of the

a Unus autem, non——Divinitatis & Humanitatis confuſione, ſed——unitate perſonæ. *Vincent. Lerin.* c. 19. p. 58.

b Idem Deus qui Homo; *non confuſione* naturæ, *ſed unitate perſonæ*. Auguſt. Tom. V. p. 885.

preceding

preceding Article, one need but look into the *Creeds* and *Formularies* of thoſe Times: Namely, into That of *Turribius* of *Spain* in 447, of *Flavian* of *Conſtantinople*, as alſo of Pope *Leo* in 449, of the *Chalcedon* Council in 451, of Pope *Felix* III in 485, and *Anaſtaſius* II in 496, and of the Church of *Alexandria* in the ſame year: As alſo into Thoſe of Pope *Hormiſdas*, and the Churches of *Syria*, and *Fulgentius*, and the Emperor *Juſtinian*, and Pope *John* II, and Pope *Pelagius* I. within the Sixth Century. In all which we ſhall find either *expreſs* denial of *One nature*, or expreſs affirming of *Two natures*, or the Doctrine of Chriſt's *Conſubſtantiality* with us, or all three together, tho' they are all omitted in the *Athanaſian* Creed. This is to me a ſecond reaſon for ſetting our Creed higher than the *Eutychian* Times.

3. I may argue This point farther from a Paſſage of the *Athanaſian* Creed, running thus: *One, not by Converſion of the Godhead into Fleſh, but by taking of the Manhood into God.* This would not, I conceive, have run in theſe words, or in this manner, in the *Eutychian* Times. For tho' the *Eutychians* were ſometimes, (as well as the *Apollinarians* often) charged with the Doctrine of a *Converſion of the Godhead into Fleſh*; yet nothing more certain than that the generality of them abſolutely diſown'd and deteſted any ſuch Tenet, teaching rather *a Converſion of the Manhood into God*, juſt the Reverſe. And, by the way, I would here offer it to the learned Reader to conſider, whether we may not from hence give a probable Account of a very noted *Variation* obſervable in many of the moſt antient Copies of this Creed, which run thus; *Unus autem, non converſione divinitatis in carne, ſed aſſumptione Humanitatis in Deo:* where there is *carne* for *carnem*, and *Deo* for *Deum*. A ſlight Alteration in the Words, but a very great one in the Senſe. A Change of the Godhead *in the Fleſh* the *Eutychians* admitted, by making the *two natures* become *One*; tho' they allowed not a Change *into Fleſh*: So that by this little Alteration of *carne* for *carnem*, the Creed would ſtrike more directly at the *Eutychian* Principles. Then again as to *Deum*, if that Reading was to ſtand, the Creed inſtead of confuting the *Eutychians* would ſeem rather to favor them;

for They taught that the *Manhood* was *aſſumed into God*, and that in ſo literal and ſtrict a Senſe as really to become *God*, or to be abſorb'd and loſt in the divine Nature, Both Natures becoming one *divine* Nature. Such a Conſtruction might the words of the Creed be liable to. But put *Deo* for *Deum*, and it is entirely defeated: For then the Senſe is not that the Manhood is aſſumed *into God*, but that God aſſumed the human Nature; which is true, and not liable to any ſuch Miſconſtruction as the other. However this be, as to the Variation of the Copies, and the reaſon here aſſign'd for it (which I offer only as a probable Conjecture to be further inquired into) yet This is certain, that theſe words of the Creed, according to the common Copies, are not ſo cautiouſly, or accurately choſen as They might, or would have been, had the Creed been drawn up after the *Eutychian* Times.

4. A fourth Argument may be drawn from the *Similitude* in the Creed, running thus: *As the reaſonable Soul, and Fleſh, is one Man; ſo God and Man is one Chriſt.* This familiar, and eaſy Compariſon was much made uſe of by the Catholicks, down from the *Apollinarian* Times, to the Time of *Eutyches:* By *Nazianzen, Auſtin, Vincentius, Claudianus Mamertus*, and Others. But no ſooner did the *Eutychians* wreſt the Compariſon to their own Senſe, pleading for *One nature* in Chriſt, like as Soul and Body make *One nature* in Man, but the Catholicks grew ſtrangely averſe to the *Similitude*, and rarely made uſe of it: Or when They did, it was either to diſpute againſt it, and condemn it, or elſe to guard and qualify it with proper Cautions and Reſtrictions. Wherefore it is by no means probable that This *Similitude* would have been inſerted, at ſuch a Time, in a Catholick Creed, and there left without Guard or Caution, for the *Eutychians* to make an ill uſe of. This fourth Argument I take from the learned and acute *Le Quien*, whoſe words may be ſeen in the Margin[a]. And may we not from hence

a Quod quidem *Simile*, quo *Theologus* etiam, aliique Patres *Apollinariſtas* confutarunt, tanti poſthac non fecerunt inſequentis, ſeu quinti ſæculi deſinentis Doctores, ut illud in *Expoſitione Fidei* inſererent; cum *Monophyſitæ*, *Severo* præſertim Duce, eo vehementius contra *Catholicos pugnarent*, ut *unam* in Chriſto *naturam* eſſe ex Deitate & Humanitate compoſi-

give

give a probable Gueſs at the reaſon why the antient Manuſcript of *Treves*, and the *Colbertine*, copied from it, have entirely omitted this *Similitude*, throwing in a few words, both before and after, to ſolve the Breach, in ſome Meaſure, and to preſerve a Connexion: which ſhows that it was no caſual Omiſſion, but made with deſign. But I paſs on.

Theſe reaſons convince me that the Creed was not made ſo late as the Council of *Chalcedon*, but before the year 451. It cannot therefore be aſcribed to *Vigilius Tapſenſis* in the year 484: Not to mention that the *Phraſeology* of it agrees not with That Writer's uſual manner of Expreſſion, as *Le Quien* hath obſerved[a]. Beſides that the principal reaſons on which *Queſnel* reſted his opinion in regard to That Author, are now found to have been grounded on a falſe Preſumption of certain Works being *Vigilius*'s which are none of his[b]. And I may add, that to Me there does not appear in *Vigilius*'s Pieces any thing of that Strength, Cloſeneſs, and Acuteneſs, which we find in the *Athanaſian* Creed.

But I proceed to ſhow that This Creed is earlier than even the Times of *Neſtorius*, or the *Epheſine* Council of the year 431. It is certain that this Creed does not condemn the *Neſtorian* Hereſy in ſuch full, direct, critical Terms, as the Catholicks found to be neceſſary againſt the Wiles and Subtilties of thoſe Men. There is not a word of *the Mother of God*, or of *One Son* only, in oppoſition to *Two Sons*, or of *God*'s being *born*, *ſuffering*, *dying*: which kind of Expreſſions the Creeds are full of after *Neſtorius*'s Times, and after the Council of *Epheſus*, to

tam evincerent. Quinimo omnes ingenii vires explicare coacti ſunt, ut varias diſcrepantias reperirent inter Unionem Deitatis cum Humanitate in Chriſto, & Unionem Animæ cum Corpore in Homine. *Le Quien.* Diſſert. Damaſc. p. 10. Confer *Petav.* Dogm. Theol. Tom. V. l. 3. c. 9, 10, *&c.*

a Sunt qui Suſpicentur Expoſitionem iſtam Fidei fuiſſe concinnatam a *Vigilio Tapſenſi*, qui ſcripſiſſe exiſtimatur libros tres contra *Varimadum* Arianum: Sed ab illorum Opinione me deterruit verſus iſte, *Unus omnino, non Confuſione Subſtantiæ, ſed Unitate Perſonæ.* Nam *Vigilius* in Libris quinque contra *Eutychem* nuſquam *Unitatem Perſonæ* dicit, ſed paſſim, & frequentiſſime *Unionem Perſonæ.*——Cumque variæ ſuperſint hodie *Vigilii Tapſenſis* Confeſſiones Fidei de Trinitate & Incarnatione, nulla earum ſimilitudo & Convenientia cum *Symbolo Athanaſiano*, quoad Stylum animadvertitur. *Le Quien.* Diſſert. Damaſc. p. 9.

b Vid. *Monſ.* Diatrib. p. 724.

guard the more certainly againſt *Equivocations*, and to expreſs the Catholick Doctrine in ſtrong Terms, ſuch as could not be eluded. As to what the *Athanaſian* Creed really does expreſs, and is conceiv'd to ſtrike directly at the *Neſtorian* Hereſy; it is Demonſtration that the words are not more full, or expreſſive, than may be found in elder Creeds, and in the Fathers that wrote againſt the *Apollinarians* and others, before ever *Neſtorius* was heard of [a]. I know not how to give my Reader a clear and juſt Idea of this whole Matter, but by ſetting down in Chronological order the Doctrine of the *Incarnation*, as expreſs'd in Catholick Writings from the *Apollinarian* Times down to the *Neſtorian*, from the year 373 to the year 431. One Thing only I would remark before-hand, to make the following Account the clearer, that the *Apollinarians* really held a Doctrine very near akin to That which afterwards was called *Eutychian*; and They maliciouſly charged the Catholicks with That very Doctrine which was afterwards called *Neſtorian*: So that the Catholicks, in their Charge upon the *Apollinarians*, condemn'd the *Eutychian* Doctrine long before *Eutyches*; and, in their Defenſe of themſelves, They alſo condemn'd the *Neſtorian* Tenets, before *Neſtorius*. I ſhall firſt juſtify the Truth of This Remark in Both it's parts, and then ſhall proceed farther to what I intend.

As to the firſt part, that the *Apollinarians* held a Doctrine very near akin to That which was afterwards called *Eutychian*, it is a Thing ſo well known that I need not cite many Teſtimonies for it. 'Twas one of the commoneſt Charges againſt the *Eutychians*, that They had revived the Hereſy of the *Apollinarians* [b] in ſome conſiderable Branches of it: *Petavius* briefly ſhows what thoſe Branches were [c].

a Le Quien *is beforehand with me in the obſervation, whoſe words I may here cite.*
Nec cuiquam negotium faceſſat, quod *Neſtorii* & *Eutychis* Hæreſes eâ *(Formulâ)* prius peſſundatæ eſſent, quam ipſarum Autores emergerent: Alibi ſiquidem oſtenſum fuit SS. Patres, qui contra *Apollinarium* calamum ſtrinxerant, diſertiſſimis etiam verbis Amborum impietates proſcripſiſſe. *Le Quien* Diſſert. Damaſc. p. 9.

b *Eutyches* ——— per impios veterum Hæreticorum volutatus errores, tertium *Apollinaris* dogma delegit; ut negatæ Humanæ carnis atque Animæ veritate, totum Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum *unius* aſſerat eſſe *naturæ*, tanquam *verbi* Deitas ipſa ſe in Carnem animamque converterit. *Leon* Epiſt. 97. p. 633 *Quenell* ed. confer Ep 134. p. 699.

c Sane cum & multiplex, & ab Autore ſuo interpolata ſæpius *Apollinaris* Hæreſis fue-

As

As to the other part of my Remark, that the *Apollinarians* charg'd the Catholicks with the oppoſite Extreme, afterward called *Neſtorian*, That has not been ſo much obſerved, but is no leſs true than the other; as may abundantly appear from the Teſtimonies in the margin[a]; beſides others that will occur as we paſs along. This alſo is obſerved by *Le Quien* in his Notes to *Damaſcen*[b], whereupon He rightly infers, that it will be a falſe Concluſion to argue that ſuch or ſuch Writings muſt belong to the *Neſtorian* Times, only becauſe of their treating of an *Unity* of *Perſon* in Chriſt.

Theſe things premiſed, I now proceed to lay down the Doctrine of the *Incarnation*, as expreſs'd in Catholick Writers from the year 373 down to the year 431, incluſive.

I begin with the larger Creed of *Epiphanius*, which ſets forth the *Incarnation* in the following Terms.

" The word was made Fleſh, not by undergoing any Change, 373
" nor by converting his Godhead into Manhood, but by co-
" uniting it into his one holy Perfection and Godhead. For
" there is *one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and not *Two*; the ſame He is
" God, the ſame He Lord, the ſame He King[c].

Here we may obſerve that the Creed guards, juſt as the *Athanaſian* does, againſt the Two Extremes; againſt the *Apollinarian*

rit, ut capite ſexto docuimus; ea parte cum Iſto conſenſit *Eutyches*, qua Carnem Chriſti non ex utero ſumptam B. Virginis ſed e cælo delapſam *Apollinaris* credidit: tum quatenus uterque *unicam naturam* aſſeveravit, & utriuſque permiſtam ac confuſam Subſtantiam. *Petav. Dogmat.* Theol. Tom. V. l. 1. c. 16. p. 37.

a Neque vero *Alium* Jeſum Chriſtum, *Alium* Verbum dicimus, ut *Nova Hæreſis calumniatur*, ſed eundem, & ante ſæcula & poſt ſæcula, & ante mundum & poſt *Mariam*; imò ex *Maria* magnum Deum appellamus. *Hieronym.* in Tit. c. 3. p 431.

Qui *Apollinarii* Dogmata defendunt, per querimoniam quam adverſus nos faciunt ſua confirmare conantur, carnale Verbum & Dominum ſæculorum, Hominis Filium immortalem Filii Deitatem Conſtruentes. Proferunt enim quod Aliqui quaſi Eccleſiæ Catholicæ exiſtentes, *Duos* colunt *Filios* in Dogmate; unum quidem ſecundum naturam, alterum autem ſecundum Adoptionem poſtea acquiſitam; neſcio a quo talia audientes——nondum enim novi eum qui Hæc ſubloquitur. *Gregor. Nyſſen. cit.* Concil. V. Collat 6. p. 106. *Harduin.* Vid. etiam. *Ambroſ. de Incarn.* c. 7. p. 721. *Athanaſ.* epiſt. ad *Epictet.* p. 907.

b *Le Quien* Not. in *Damaſcen* Vol. 1. p. 97.

c Ὁ γὰρ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, ἢ τροπὴν ὑπομείνας, ἢ διὰ μεταβαλὼν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεότητα εἰς ἀνθρωποτητα· εἷς μίαν συνενώσαντα ἑαυτῷ ἁγίαν πλήρωσιν τε & θεότητα· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, & ὁ υἱὸς, ὁ αὐτὸς Θεὸς, ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος, ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεύς. *Epiph.* Ancor. p. 124. *Petav.*

notion

notion of the Godhead being converted into Fleſh, and againſt the *Apollinarian* Calumny that the Catholicks made *Two Chriſts* inſtead of One.

380 *Gregory Nazianzen*, not long after, expreſſes Himſelf in Terms to the like effect. " We divide not the Man from the God-" head, but we make them one and the ſame (*Perſon*) —— If " any one imagines *Mary* not to be the *Mother of God*, He has " no part with God.—— If any Man introduces *Two Sons*, One " of God and the Father, and a *Second* of the Virgin-Mother, " and not one and the ſame Him, let him forfeit the Adoption " of Sons promis'd to true Believers. For, God and Man are " indeed *Two Natures*, like as *Soul* and *Body*: But They are not " *Two Sons*, nor (two) Gods[a].

Here, again, we find the *Neſtorian* Tenets very fully obviated, while *Nazianzen* is anſwering the *Apollinarian* Calumny againſt the Catholicks: And at the ſame Time, the *Eutychian* Hereſy (afterwards ſo called) is as plainly precluded, while *Nazianzen* is laying down the Church's Faith in *Two Natures* againſt the *Apollinarians* who made but one.

382 *Ambroſe*, in like manner, confutes the *Apollinarians*, without naming them. " We ought alſo to condemn Thoſe who, " in another Extreme, teach not one and the ſame Son of " God, but that He who is begotten of God the Father is *One*, " and He that is generated of the Virgin *Another*: when the " Evangeliſt ſaith, that *the word was made Fleſh*, to inſtruct us " that there is but *one Lord Jeſus*, not *Two*. —— There are " Others riſen up who pretend that our Lord's Fleſh and God-" head are Both of *one Nature*. —— And when They ſay " that THE WORD was converted into Fleſh, Hairs, Blood, and " Bones, and changed from it's own Nature; after ſuch a pre-" tended change of the divine Nature, They may take the Handle

[a] Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον χωρίζομεν τῆς θεότητος, ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δογματίζομεν. —— εἴ τις ὁ Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν ὑπολαμβάνει, χωρὶς ἐστὶ τῆς θεότητος —— εἴ τις εἰσάγει δύο ὑιὰς, ἕνα μὲν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ & Πατρὸς, δεύτερον δὲ τὸν ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῆς υἱοθεσίας ἐκπέσοι τῆς ἐπηγγελμένης τοῖς ὀρθῶς πιστεύσι. Φύσεις μὲν γὰρ δύο Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἐπεὶ καὶ ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα, ὑιοὶ δὲ δύο, οὐδὲ θεοί. *Gregor. Nazianz.* ad *Cledon.* Ep. 1. p. 738, 739.

to

" to wreſt any thing to the weakneſs of the Godhead, which " belongs to the Infirmity of the Fleſh [a].

Ambroſe ſeems here to intimate as if there were really Some at That Time, who had run into That very Error which the *Apollinarians* charged upon the Catholicks, and which was afterwards called *Neſtorian*. However That be, He condemns it in the name of the Catholicks; as He condemns alſo the *Apollinarian* Extreme, which afterwards became *Eutychian*. There is another Paſſage of *Ambroſe* cited by *Theodoret*, ſeemingly ſo full and expreſs againſt the *Neſtorian* and *Eutychian* Hereſies, that one can hardly be perſwaded to think it really *Ambroſe*'s. But, on the other hand, it appears to be ſo well atteſted, that the late learned Editor of *Ambroſe* could not but yield to place it among his genuine Works. Tom. 2. p. 729.

There is a Creed of *Pelagius* (as learned Men now agree) 417
inſerted among the Works both of *Jerom* [b] and *Auſtin* [c]. It was made ſeveral years before the *Neſtorian* Controverſy. Our learned Dr. *Wall* has tranſlated it into *Engliſh* [d], ſubjoining ſome excellent Notes of his own to it: I ſhall tranſcribe as much as is to our purpoſe. " We do in ſuch manner hold that there " is in Chriſt one Perſon of the Son, as that we ſay there are " in Him two perfect and intire Subſtances (*or*, *Natures*) *viz.* " of the Godhead, and of the Manhood which conſiſts of Body " and Soul. —— We do abhor —— the Blaſphemy of Thoſe " who go about by a new Interpretation to maintain that " ſince the Time of his taking Fleſh, all Things pertaining to " the divine Nature did paſs into the Man [*or*, *Manhood*] and " ſo alſo that all Things belonging to the human Nature were

a Et illos condemnare debemus qui adverſa erroris linea, non unum eundemque Filium Dei dicunt, ſed *Alium* eſſe qui ex Deo Patre natus ſit, *Alium* qui ſit generatus ex virgine; cum Evangeliſta dicat quia *verbum caro factum eſt*, ut *Unum* Dominum Jeſum *non duos* crederes——emergunt alii qui Carnem Domini dicant & Divinitatem *unius* eſſe *naturæ* ——Deinde, cum iſti dicant quia *Verbum* in *Carnem*, Capillos, Sanguinem, & Oſſa *converſum* eſt, & a natura propria mutatum eſt, datur illis locus ut infirmitatem Carnis ad infirmitatem Divinitatis, quadam facta divinæ naturæ mutatione, detorqueant. *Ambroſ.* de Incarn. Lacram. c. 6.

b *Hieronym.* Oper. Tom. V. p. 123. Bened. edit.

c *Auguſtin.* Oper. Tom. V. Append. p. 388.

d *Wall's* Hiſt. *of* Inf. Bapt. p. 200.

" trans-

" transferred into God [*or the divine Nature,*] From whence " would follow (a Thing no Hereſy ever offer'd to affirm) " that Both Subſtances [*or Natures*] *viz.* of the Divinity and " Humanity, would by This Confuſion ſeem to be extinguiſh'd, " and to loſe their proper State, and be changed into another " Thing: ſo that They who own in the Son an imperfect God " and an imperfect Man, are to be accounted not to hold " truly either God or Man.

Dr. *Wall* hereupon judiciouſly remarks, that *there wanted only the Accuracy of ſpeaking, which* Pelagius *had here uſed, to clear and ſettle the diſpute between the* Neſtorians, *and* Eutychians. I would remark farther, that if *Pelagius*'s Creed, in the year 417, had ſo plainly obviated both the *Neſtorian*, and *Eutychian* Hereſy, before *Neſtorius*, or *Eutyches* was known; it may eaſily be conceived that the *Athanaſian* Creed might do the ſame Thing, at or about the ſame Time.

422 I might next ſhow, how St. *Auſtin* likewiſe has expreſs'd Himſelf in as ſtrong Terms againſt Both thoſe Hereſies, as the *Athanaſian* Creed has done: But, becauſe I ſhall have another Occaſion to cite the Paſſages, where I draw out a ſelect Number of Expreſſions *parallel* to Thoſe of the Creed; I may ſpare my Self the Trouble of doing it here.

426 I might go on to obſerve what paſſed in the Caſe of *Leporius*, a Man of the ſame Principles, in the main, with *Neſtorius*, but ſome years before Him. His Recantation-Treatiſe (*Libellus Satisfactionis*) ſuppoſed to be drawn up by St. *Auſtin* in the year 426, would furniſh me with many full and ſtrong Expreſſions againſt the *Neſtorian* Principles, beyond any to be met with in the *Athanaſian* Creed; ſo that there is no juſt Argument to be drawn from any Expreſſions in That Creed, for ſetting it ſo low as the *Neſtorian* Times.

431 I ſhall conclude this Account with the recital of a Creed made about the ſame Time, or in the ſame Year that the Council of *Epheſus* was held againſt *Neſtorius*. It is the Creed of *John*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, approved by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and thought ſufficient to wipe off all Suſpicion of *Neſtorianiſm* from the Author of it. It runs thus: " We confeſs then that Jeſus

" Jesus Christ our Lord, the only begotten Son of God, is " *perfect God, and perfect Man*, of a *reasonable* Soul, and Body; " *born of the Father before the Worlds, as touching his Godhead*; " The *same* also in the end of days, for us and for our Sal- " vation, *(born)* of the Virgin *Mary*, as *touching his Manhood*, " consubstantial with us according to his Manhood. But there " was an Union made of *Two Natures*, on which account we " profess *one Christ*, one Lord, *one Son*. Conformable to this " Sense of an Union without Confusion, we acknowledge the " holy Virgin as *Mother of God*, because that God the *Word* " was incarnate and made Man, and from the very Con- " ception united to Himself a Temple which He had taken " of Her[a].

Here we may observe several Expressions nearly resembling those of the *Athanasian* Creed; but withal several others more *particular*, and *explicite* against the *Nestorian* Principles than That Creed is: *One Son*, and Him *Consubstantial with us*, in respect of his Manhood; The Virgin, *Mother of God*, and the like. Such is the constant Strain and Tenor of the *Creeds*, and *Confessions*, and Catholick Writings, treating of the *Incarnation*, at This Time, and after: As might be shewn at large from *Cassian* about 431, and *Vincentius* in the year 434, and from *Flavian*, and Pope *Leo* I, and Others before the Council of *Chalcedon*. We have therefore very great Reason to believe, that the *Athanasian* Creed was drawn up either before the *Nestorian* Controversy had made much noise in the World, or at least before the Compiler had notice of it. The Sum then of my Argument is This; there is nothing in the *Athanasian* Creed but what might have been said, and had been said by Catholick Writers before the Time of *Nestorius*: But the Creed wants many of those *particular* and

a Confitemur igitur Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, *Deum perfectum & Hominem perfectum*, ex anima rationali & Corpore; ante sæcula quidem ex patre natum secundum Deitatem: in fine vero dierum *eundem* propter nos & propter nostram salutem de *Maria* Virgine secundum Humanitatem, *Consubstantialem nobis* secundum Humanitatem. *Duarum* vero *Naturarum* unitio facta est; propter quam *unum Christum*, unum Dominum, *unum Filium* confitemur. Secundum hunc inconfusæ unionis intellectum, confitemur Sanctam Virginem *Dei Genitricem*, propter quod *Deus Verbum* incarnatus est & inhumanatus, & ex ipsa conceptione sibimet univit Templum quod ex ipsa suscepit. *Johan. Antioch.* Harduin. Tom. 1. p. 1558.

critical Expreſſions, which came into uſe after That Time: Therefore, ſince the *internal* Characters of the Creed ſuit exactly with the *Apollinarian* Times, and not with the *Neſtorian*, it ought to be placed ſomewhere between *Apollinarius*, and *Neſtorius*, not lower than 430, or 431 at the utmoſt. And it is ſome Confirmation of what hath been ſaid, that *Venantius Fortunatus*, who lived in the *Eutychian* Times, and commented upon This Creed about the year 570, as before obſerved, yet in his Comment takes not the leaſt notice of any part of This Creed being oppoſed to the Errors of *Neſtorius*, or *Eutyches*, but only to thoſe elder Hereſies of *Sabellius*, *Arius*, and *Apollinarius*; whom He ſpecially makes mention of. I perſwade my ſelf therefore, that This Creed ought not to be placed lower than 430 or thereabout; And I have before ſhown why it ſhould not be ſet higher than 420; ſo that now we have brought it within the Compaſs of Ten years; where we may let it reſt a while till we conſider farther what *Place*, or *Country*, the Creed was moſt probably compoſed in; which may help us to ſettle the Time of it's date within ſomewhat ſtricter and narrower limits than before.

There is great reaſon to believe that This Creed was made in *Gaul*. The Conſiderations which perſwade us thereto are theſe following. 1. It's early Reception in the *Gallican* Church, ſo far as appears, before all other Churches. 2. The great Eſteem and Regard *antiently* paid to it by the *Gallican Councils*, and Biſhops [a]. 3. The Creed's being firſt admitted into the *Gallican* Pſalter, and firſt received in thoſe Countries where That Pſalter was received, as in *Spain*, *Germany*, and *England*. As the *Gallican* Churches delivered their Pſalter to other Churches, ſo is it reaſonable to believe that the Creed was received from Them likewiſe. 4. The oldeſt *Verſion* we hear of is *Gallican*, in the Time of *Hincmar*. 5. The oldeſt Authors that make mention of it, are likewiſe *Gallican:* For Proof of which I refer to the *antient Teſtimonies* above. 6. The

a Tanti namque apud *Gallos* Symbolum Hoc fuit ut una cum Symbolo Apoſtolorum memoriæ commendari *Presbyteris* præcipiat *Hincmarus* idem in Capitulis, *Clericis omnibus* Synodus *Auguſtodunenſis*. Sirmond. Oper. Vol: 2. p. 978.

firſt

firſt that cite the Words of it (as it ſeems) are likewiſe *Gallican*. I will here mention Two; *Avitus* of *Vienne* in *Gaul*[a], and *Cæſarius* of *Arles*:[b] I have ſet their words in the Margin. 7. The oldeſt Commentator upon it, tho' an *Italian* by Birth and Education, had yet travelled into *France*, and was at length Biſhop of *Poictiers*. 8. The *Number* and *Antiquity* of the Manuſcripts of this Creed found in *France* confirm the ſame Thing: which has made ſeveral very learned Men ſubſcribe to This Opinion[c], that the *Athanaſian* Creed came firſt from *Gaul*. And it is certain, that no other Country, or Church in the World has ſo fair, I may now ſay, ſo *clear* a pretence to it: Many Circumſtances concur to make good their Title, as we have already ſeen; and more will appear in my next Chapter, when I come to inquire who was the *Author*.

Let it be allowed then, for the preſent, that our Creed was

a *The Words of* Avitus Viennenſis, *who was Biſhop in* 490, *died* in 523.

De Divinitate Spiritus Sancti, quem *nec factum* legimus, *nec creatum, nec genitum* ——— Nos vero Spiritum diſcimus *ex Patre & Filio procedere* ——— Sicut eſt proprium Spiritui Sancto *a Patre Filioque procedere*, iſtud *Fides Catholica* etiamſi renuentibus non perſuaſerit, in ſuæ tamen *Diſciplinæ Regula* non excedit. *Sirmond.* Op. Vid. *Le Quien* Panopl. contr. Schiſm. Græc. p. 241.

Non niſi ex eodem Symbolo, quod jam ante *receptum* eſſet, *Avitus Viennenſis* alicubi ſcribebat *De Divinitate Sp. S.* &c. *Le Quien.* Differt. Damaſcen. p. 98.

b *The Words of* Cæſarius, *who was Biſhop in* 503, *died in* 543.

Rogo & admoneo vos, Fratres cariſſimi, ut *Quicunque vult Salvus eſſe, Fidem* rectam & *Catholicam* diſcat, *firmiter teneat, inviolatamque conſervet.* ———*Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus & Spiritus Sanctus: ſed tamen non tres Dii, ſed unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis & Spiritus Sanctus.* Attamen credat unuſquiſque Fidelis quod *Filius æqualis eſt Patri ſecundum Divinitatem, & minor eſt Patre ſecundum Humanitatem* carnis, quam de noſtro aſſumpſit. *Cæſar. Arelat.* apud Auguſt. Op. Tom. V. App. p. 399.

N. B *The Editors of St.* Auſtin *adjudge This to* Cæſarius; *as does alſo* Oudinus: *Comment.* de ſcript. Eccl. Vol. 1. p. 1348.

c Cæterum cum ex allatis ſupra Teſtimoniis videatur in *Galliis* primum celebrari cœpiſſe Hoc *Symbolum*, haud abs re conjectant eruditi viri, in *Galliis* illud fuiſſe elucubratum. Quod idem forte ſuadeat antiquiſſimus ille in *Galliis* & in *Anglia* Mos *Symboli* alternatim concinendi; itemque MSS. *Gallicanorum* Copia & Antiquitas. *Monfauc.* Diatrib. p. 726.

E *Gallis* primum prodiiſſe Symbolum *Athanaſianum* animadvertimus, tum quod a *Gallis* ſcriptoribus ante omnes celebratum, a Synodis Epiſcopiſque *Galliarum* receptum, & commendatum antiquitus fuerit, tum etiam quod *Treviris* in *Galliarum* Metropoli illud lucubratum fuiſſe opinio increbuerit. Quapropter *Pithoeus*, ac *Voſſius*, aliique eruditiſſimi viri *Gallum* Hominem *Symboli* Parentem opinati ſunt; *Antelmius* vero, hac potiſſimum ratione ductus, non *Vigilium* in *Africa* epiſcopum, ſed *Vincentium Lirinenſem* Opuſculi hujus Auctorem affirmavit. *Lud. Murator.* Tom. 2. p. 229.

originally *Gallican*, and made between 420, and 430: We may next conſider, whether we cannot come a little nearer towards fixing the Time of it's Compoſition. We muſt point out ſome Seaſon when St. *Auſtin*'s Works were known, and ſtudied, and well eſteem'd of in *Gaul*; and when the Circumſtances of the Place might the moſt probably give occaſion for the compiling ſuch a Creed. Now, it is obſervable that about the year 426, St. *Auſtin* held a very cloſe and intimate Correſpondence with the *Gallican* Churches. *Leporius* had for ſome Time ſpread falſe Doctrine in *Gaul*, chiefly relating to the *Incarnation*. His Hereſy was much the ſame with what *Neſtorius*'s was afterwards. The *Gallican* Biſhops cenſured Him; and He was forced to quit his Country, having given general Offence to all there. He took his leave of *Gaul*, and paſſed over into *Africa*, with ſeveral Others of the ſame Party, and Principles: where lighting upon *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, and St. *Auſtin*, He was by Them brought to a Senſe of his Error, and induced to ſign a full Recantation, called *Libellus Satisfactionis*; whereupon St. *Auſtin*, and *Aurelius*, and other *African* Biſhops became Interceſſors with the Biſhops of *Gaul*, in favour of *Leporius*, that He might be again receiv'd and reſtored by them. One can ſcarce imagine any more likely Time, or more proper Occaſion for the compiling ſuch a Creed as the *Athanaſian* is. All the Lines and Characters of it ſuit extremely well with the *Place*, the *Time*, the *Occaſion*, and other Circumſtances; which concur to perſwade us that the Creed was, in all Probability, compoſed in *Gaul*, ſometime between the year 426, and the year 430: So that now we are confined to the narrow Compaſs of four or five years, upon the moſt probable Conjecture, and upon ſuch Evidences as a Caſe of this Nature can admit of, where more cannot be expected.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Author of the Creed.

IF we have hitherto gone upon ſure Grounds, about the *Time*, and *Place*, we cannot long be at a loſs for the *Author* of This Creed. Who were the moſt conſiderable Men, and beſt qualified for ſuch a Work, at That Time in *Gaul? Anthelmius* will ſay, *Vincentius Lirinenſis*. But I have ſeveral Reaſons to perſwade me that it was not, or could not be *Vincentius*. No Contemporary of his, nor any antient Writer ever gives the leaſt Hint of his compoſing ſuch a Work. *Anthelmius* ſuppoſes it to be after his *Commonitory*, that is, after 434; which if it had been, we ſhould undoubtedly have found the Creed more particular, and explicite againſt the *Neſtorian* Hereſy: We ſhould have read in it *Mother of God*, *One Son* only, and ſomething of *God*'s being *born*, *ſuffering*, *dying*, or the like; It cannot therefore be juſtly aſcribed to *Vincentius*. Not to mention, that ſuch a Work appears to have been much fitter for a *Biſhop* of a Church, than for a private *Presbyter*; in as much as *Biſhops* generally were obliged to give an Account of their Faith, upon their firſt Entrance upon the Epiſcopate: And They had the Privilege likewiſe of making *Creeds*, and Forms of Prayer, for their reſpective Dioceſſes: For which Reaſons, *cæteris paribus*, this Creed ought rather to be aſcribed to ſome *Biſhop* of that Time than to an inferior Presbyter. And who more likely to compoſe ſuch a Creed than *Hilary* Biſhop of *Arles*, a celebrated Man of That Time, and of chief Repute in the *Gallican* Church? His Title to it will ſtand upon the following Circumſtances.

1. He was made Biſhop in *Gaul* within the Time mention'd, about the year 429. 2. He is allowed to have been a Man of great Parts and Capacity, of a neat Wit, and elegant Style, for the Age He lived in; inſomuch that *Livius*, a Poet, and a celebrated Writer of that Time, did not ſcruple to ſay, that if *Auſtin* had come after *Hilary*, He would have been judged his

his *Inferior*[a]. 3. *Gennadius*'s Character of *Hilary*'s Writings, that They were *ſmall Tracts*[b], but *extremely fine*, ſuits well with our preſent Suppoſition: But what moſt of all confirms and ſtrengthens it, is what *Honoratus* of *Marſeilles*, the writer of his Life, tells us; that *Hilary* compoſed an *Expoſition*, a very *admirable Expoſition* [*Symboli Expoſitio ambienda*] *of the Creed*[c]. He calls it an *Expoſition of the Creed*, (not a *Creed*) which is the proper *Title* for it, and more proper than that of *Symbolum*, or *Creed*, which it now bears. And ſo we find that it was but very rarely called *Symbolum* by the Antients; once, I think, by *Hincmar*, and never after for ſeveral Centuries: And when it was, yet it was obſerved, by *Thomas Aquinas*, that That was not ſo proper a name for it, not being compoſed *per modum Symboli*, in the way of a Creed; as indeed it is not. What the more antient, and uſual *Titles* were, may appear in one View in the *Tables* above. Among others, we ſometimes find the Title of *Expoſitio Catholicæ Fidei*, or yet nearer, *Expoſitio Symboli Apoſtolorum*, *An Expoſition of the Apoſtle's Creed*, which is as proper a Title as any, and not unlike to This of *Honoratus*. 4. I may farther obſerve, that This *Hilary* of *Arles* was a great Admirer and Follower of St. *Auſtin*[d], and had ſtudied his Writings: which may account for his very often following St. *Auſtin*'s

a Quid plura dicam? Niſi dicendi Pauſa deſuper eidem adveniſſet, ſermonem finire non potuerat, tanta gratia exundante, & miraculo & ſtupore creſcente, ut peritiſſimis deſperationem tunc Autoribus ſæculi ejus inferret Oratio: in tantum ut *Livius* Temporis illius Poeta, & Autor inſignis, publicè proclamaret; *Si Auguſtinus poſt Te fuiſſet, judicaretur inferior.* *Honoratus*, in Vita Sti *Hilarii* p. 740. edit. *Queſnell.*

b Ingenio vero immortali, aliqua & *parva* edidit, quæ *erudita Animæ*, & *fidelis Linguæ* indicio ſunt; in quibus præcipue &c. *Gennad.* de Hilario Arelat. c. 69. p. 32.

c Gratia ejus ex his operibus, quæ eodem dicendi impetu concepit, genuit, ornavit, protulit, poſſit abſque Hæſitatione dignoſci: *Vita* ſcilicet Antiſtitis *Honorati*, Homiliæ in Totius Anni Feſtivitatibus expeditæ, *Symboli expoſitio ambienda*, Epiſtolarum vero tantus numerus *&c.* Honorat. Vit. Hilar. p. 740.

N. B. *There is ſome doubt whether* Ravennius *of* Arles, *Succeſſor to* Hilary, *or* Honoratus *of* Marſeilles *be the Author of This* Life: *But there is good reaſon to aſcribe it to the Latter. See* Queſnel. *Vol.* 2. *p.* 730. *and* Anthelmius, *de veris operibus Leon.* M. p. 367.

d Unum Eorum præcipuæ Auctoritatis, & ſpiritualium ſtudiorum Virum, ſanctum *Hilarium*, *Arelatenſem* Epiſcopum, ſciat Beatitudo Tua *Admiratorem*, Sectatoremque in *aliis omnibus* tuæ eſſe doctrinæ: Et de hoc quod in querelam trahit, jam pridem apud Sanctitatem tuam ſenſum ſuum per literas velle conferre. *Proſper* ad *Auguſtin.* ep. 225. p. 825. Bened. ed.

Thoughts

Thoughts in the compiling of the Creed, and ſometimes his very *Expreſſions*; and indeed forming the whole Compoſition, in a manner, upon St. *Auſtin*'s Plan, both with reſpect to the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation*. He did not indeed come heartily in to St. *Auſtin*'s Doctrine about *Grace*, *Predeſtination*, *Free-will*, &c. any more than the other *Gallican* Biſhops: But as to other Points, as *Proſper* obſerves, *Hilary* was intirely in *Auſtin's* Sentiments. 5. Hence likewiſe we may account for the Similitude of Thoughts and Expreſſions between *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, and the Author of the Creed; which *Anthelmius* inſiſts much upon to juſtify his aſcribing it to *Vincentius*. *Hilary* and *Vincentius* were Contemporaries, and Country-men, and Both of the ſame Monaſtery in the Iſle of *Lerin*, much about the ſame Time: So that it is natural to ſuppoſe that They ſhould fall into the like Expreſſions, while treating on the ſame Things; or that *Vincentius* might affect to copy from ſo great a Man as *Hilary* (firſt, *Abbot* of *Lerin*, and then Archbiſhop of *Arles*) when writing on the ſame Subject. 6. As to the Style of *Hilary*, tho' we have but little of his left to compare the Creed with, yet what there is anſwers very well to the Idea one ſhould have of a Man that might be able to draw up ſuch a Piece. His *Life* of the elder *Honoratus*, who was his Predeceſſor in the See of *Arles*, is an excellent Performance, and comes nothing ſhort of the Character He had raiſed for Wit and Eloquence. The Style is clear and ſtrong, ſhort and ſententious, abounding with Antitheſes, elegant Turns, and manly ſtrokes of Wit. He does but touch a little, in That Piece, upon the Subject of the *Trinity*: So that one cannot from thence diſcover how He wou'd have expreſs'd Himſelf upon That Head. Only, that little there is There, is very like to a Paragraph in the *Athanaſian* Creed, both for Turn, and Expreſſion. Speaking of *Honoratus*, or rather to Him, in the way of a Rhetorical Apoſtrophe, He obſerves how clear and expreſſive He had been in his Diſcourſes

a Quotidianus ſiquidem in ſinceriſſimis Tractatibus Confeſſionis Patris, ac Filii, ac Spiritus Sancti Teſtis fuiſti: Nec facile tam exerte, tam lucide Quiſquam de Divinitatis Trinitate differuit, cum eam *Perſonis* diſtingueres, & gloriæ (*gloriâ,*) æternitate, ac Majeſtate ſociares. *Hilar.* Vit. Honorat. p. 770. *Queſnell.* ed.

concern-

concerning the *Trinity* in the *Godhead*; making the *Perſons* diſtinct, but co-uniting them in *Glory*, *Eternity*, and *Majeſty*. Which may remind us of the Words of the *Athanaſian* Creed, "There is *one Perſon of the Father*, &c. but the Godhead of the "Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt is all one, "*The Glory equal, the Majeſty co-eternal.* However That be, This we may learn from it, how great a Commendation it was, in *Hilary*'s Account, to be able to ſpeak clearly, and accurately upon the Subject of the *Trinity*, and how ambitious He might be of ſo doing Himſelf: And we know, from his *dying* Inſtructions[a] to his Friends about Him, how much He had the Subject at Heart. Theſe, I confeſs, are but little Circumſtances: Yet They are of ſome weight along with others more conſiderable, and therefore ought not to be intirely omitted. What weighs moſt with me is, that He was, in his Time, a Man of the greateſt Authority in the *Gallican* Church[b], without whoſe Advice, or Privity at leaſt, ſuch a Creed would hardly have paſs'd; and that He actually was the Author of *ſuch a Work* as This is, and which muſt either be This, or elſe is loſt. This Creed has been ſometimes aſcribed to the elder *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, tho' neither the *Diction*, nor the *Matter*, nor the *Manner* of it look any Thing like his: Only, it ſeems, This Creed in one Manuſcript was found tack'd to ſome Pieces of That *Hilary*. I pretend not to draw any Argument from hence in favor of our *Hilary*: Tho' had the Manuſcript been a very antient one, or copied from one that was (neither of which appears) I ſhould have thought it of ſome moment; ſince the ſimilitude of Names might poſſibly have occaſion'd it.

a *Among which this is one, and the firſt,*
Fidem Trinitatis immobiliter retinete. *Vit. Hilar.* p. 747.

b Queſnel *quotes This* elogium *of Him, from* Conſtantius Presbyter *of the ſame Time.*
Illuſtrabatur Hæc Civitas *Hilario* Sacerdote, multimoda virtute pretioſo: Erat enim *Fidei igneus Torrens*, cæleſtis eloquii, & præceptionis divinæ Operarius indefeſſus. *Quenell.* p. 543.

To which may be added one Line of his Epitaph.
Gemma Sacerdotum, Plebiſque, Orbiſque Magiſter. *Quenell.* ibid.

Tanta fuit ejus in dicendo vis, ut *Silvius*, *Euſebius*, *Domnulus*, Auctores coævi, admiratione ſuccenſi in hæc verba proruperint: *Non Doctrinam, non Eloquentiam, ſed neſcio quid ſuper Homines conſecutum.* Natal. Alexand. Sec. V. c. 4. Art. 19. ex Honorati Vit. Hilar. c. 11.

Having

Having conſidered ſuch Reaſons as ſeem to favor the Conjecture about *Hilary* of *Arles*; it will next be proper to conſider alſo what may be objected againſt it.

1. It may be objected, that This *Hilary* lived to the Year 449, ſaw the Riſe, Progreſs, and Condemnation of the *Neſtorian* Hereſy, and the Beginning at leaſt of the *Eutychian*. May it not therefore be reaſonably preſumed that, had He been to compile a *Confeſſion* of *Faith*, He would have made it more *full* and *particular* againſt Both thoſe Hereſies than I have ſuppoſed the Creed to be? To This I anſwer, that the Objection would be of weight if I ſuppoſed this Creed to have been made by Him in the laſt years of his Life: But as I take it to have been made a little after his Entrance upon his Epiſcopate (to be a Rule to his Clergy all his Time, as well as to ſatisfy his Collegues of his own Orthodoxy) the Objection affects not me. Admit the Creed to have been drawn up by Him about the Year 429, or 430; and then it is juſt what it ſhould be, exactly ſuited to the Circumſtances of Time, and Place: And as to his inlarging, or altering it afterwards, upon the Riſe of the Two Hereſies, it might not be in his Power when once gone out of his Hands: Nor would it be *neceſſary*, ſince Both Theſe Hereſies are ſufficiently obviated in This Creed, tho' not ſo *explicitely* condemn'd as in many that came later.

2. It may be ask'd, how the Author's Name came to be ſo ſtudiouſly conceal'd even by Thoſe that received and admired the Creed; and how it came to take at length the Name of *Athanaſius*, rather than of *Hilary*? I anſwer: This Objection will equally lie againſt any other Author aſſignable whatever, except *Athanaſius* Himſelf whom we cannot, with any colour of reaſon, aſcribe it to. It will be as eaſy to account for the ſtudious Concealment of the Author's Name, ſuppoſing it *Hilary*, as for any Other, or perhaps eaſier. This *Hilary* had ſtoutly defended the Rights of his See againſt Pope *Leo*'s Encroachments, in the matter of *Appeals*, and other Branches of Juriſdiction. This brought the good Man under diſfavor, and diſrepute; as muſt happen to the beſt of Men when They have Perſons of greater Figure and Authori-

ty than themſelves to contend with, however righteous and clear their Cauſe may be. Beſides This, *Hilary* had entertain'd a diſlike to ſome of St. *Auſtin*'s prevailing Doctrines, about *Grace*, growing much in Vogue; ſo that St. *Auſtin*'s more zealous Diſciples had a Pique againſt him on That account, and had the leſs value for his Name. The way then to have This Creed paſs current, and make it generally received was to ſtifle as much as poſſible the Name of the *Author*, and to leave it to ſtand by its own intrinſick worth and weight. As to the Name of *Athanaſius*, I take it to have come Thus. Upon the revival of the *Arian* Controverſy in *Gaul*, under the influence of the *Burgundian* Kings, it was obvious to call one ſide *Athanaſians*, and the other ſide *Arians*; and ſo alſo to name the Orthodox Faith the *Athanaſian Faith*, as the other *Arian*. This Creed therefore, being a Summary of the Orthodox and Catholick Faith, might in proceſs of Time acquire the Name of the *Athanaſian Faith*, or *Fides Athanaſii*, in oppoſition to the contrary Scheme which might as juſtly be called *Fides Arii*, or the *Arian Faith*. The equivocalneſs of the *Title* gave a handle to thoſe that came after to underſtand it of a Form of Faith *compoſed* by *Athanaſius*; juſt as the equivocal Title of *Apoſtolical* given to the *Roman* Creed occaſion'd the miſtake about its being made by the *Apoſtles*. This appears to me the moſt probable Account of the whole matter: And it is very much confirm'd by what we ſee of ſeveral Tracts, wrote in the fifth and ſixth Centuries *Dialogue-wiſe*, where *Athanaſius* is made the Mouth of the Catholick Side, and *Arius* of his Party, and *Photinus* of his: Not meaning that *Athanaſius*, *Arius*, and *Photinus* were really the Speakers in Thoſe Conferences, but the Readers were to underſtand the *Athanaſian*, *Arian*, and *Photinian* Principles as being there fairly repreſented under Thoſe leading Names.

3 If it be ask'd farther, why This Creed was not cited during the *Neſtorian* and *Eutychian* Controverſy, when there was ſo frequent occaſion for it: I anſwer, partly becauſe the Creed was not *particular* and *explicite* enough to have done much ſervice; but chiefly, becauſe the *Author* had been eclips'd, and his Reputation obſcured by greater *Names* than his, ſo that

that his Authority had weighed little; and to produce it without a Name would have ſignified leſs. This Objection therefore, tho' it might be of great Force in the Queſtion about *Athanaſius*, is of no weight at all againſt our preſent Suppoſition about *Hilary* of *Arles*.

Theſe are all the Objections which to me occur: And they ſeem to be ſo far from weak'ning the Grounds upon which I proceed, that they rather tend to ſtrengthen and confirm Them. And tho' I do not pretend to ſtrict Certainty about the *Author* of the Creed; yet I perſwade my ſelf that none that have been hitherto named have any fairer, or ſo fair a Claim to it as the Man I have mention'd. Not *Athanaſius*, not *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, not *Euſebius* of *Verceil*, not Pope *Anaſtaſius* I, nor any of That name; not *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, nor *Vigilius Tapſenſis*, nor *Athanaſius* of *Spire*, nor *Fortunatus*, nor *Bonifacius*, nor Any other that has been thought on. From the many Conjectures heretofore advanced by learned Men, one may perceive that it has been judged to be a Thing worth the inquiring after: And as Others have taken the liberty of naming ſuch *Author*, or *Authors* as to Them appeared moſt likely to have made the Creed, ſo have I, in my Turn, not ſcrupling to add one more to the Number.

The Sum then of what I have preſumed to advance upon probable Conjecture, in a Caſe which will not admit of full and perfect Evidence, is This: That *Hilary* once Abbot of *Lerins*, and next Biſhop of *Arles*, about the year 430 compoſed *The Expoſition of Faith* which now bears the Name of the *Athanaſian Creed*. It was drawn up for the uſe of the *Gallican* Clergy, and eſpecially for the Dioceſs, or Province of *Arles*. It was eſteemed by as many as were acquainted with it, as a valuable Summary of the Chriſtian Faith. It ſeems to have been in the Hands of *Vincentius*, Monk of *Lerins*, before 434, by what He has borrow'd from it; and to have been cited in part by *Avitus* of *Vienne* about the year 500, and by *Cæſarius* of *Arles* before the year 543. About the year 570, it became famous enough to be commented upon like the *Lord's-Prayer*, and *Apoſtles Creed*, and together with Them. All this while, and perhaps

haps for ſeveral years lower, it had not yet acquired the Name of the *Athanaſian Faith*, but was ſimply ſtiled *the Catholick Faith*. But before 670, *Athanaſius*'s admired Name came in to recommend and adorn it; being in it ſelf alſo an excellent Syſtem of the *Athanaſian* Principles of the *Trinity*[a] and *Incarnation*, in Oppoſition chiefly to *Arians*, *Macedonians*, and *Apollinarians*. The Name of *The Faith of Athanaſius*, in a while, occaſion'd the Miſtake of aſcribing it to Him, as his Compoſition. This gave it Authority enough to be cited and appealed to as Standard, in the Diſputes of the middle Ages, between *Greeks* and *Latins* about the *Proceſſion:* And the ſame admired Name, together with the intrinſick worth and value of the Form it ſelf, gave it Credit enough to be received into the *Publick* Service in the *Weſtern* Churches; firſt in *France*, next in *Spain*, ſoon after in *Germany*, *England*, *Italy*, and at length in *Rome* it ſelf; while many other excellent Creeds drawn up in *Councils*, or recommended by *Emperors*, yet never arrived to any ſuch Honour and Eſteem as This hath done. The truly good and great *Author* (as I now ſuppoſe Him) tho' ill uſed by the then Pope of *Rome*, and not kindly treated, with reſpect to his Memory, in after Ages, has nevertheleſs been the Mouth of all the *Weſtern* Churches, and ſome *Eaſtern* too, for a long Tract of Centuries, in celebrating the Glories of the Coeternal Trinity. And ſo may He ever continue, till the Chriſtian Churches can find out (which They will not eaſily do) a juſter, or ſounder, or more accurate Form of Faith than This is.

a Romanæ ego Eccleſiæ quaſi *Symbolum*, incerto Autore, exiſtimem, hinc *Athanaſii* dictum & putatum quod diluciđe *Catholicam* ipſamque *Athanaſii* Fidem (de *Trinitate*, maxime) complecteretur; cujus inter Catholicos ſic ſpectata Fides, ut ejus Communio velut Teſſera Catholici eſſet; cenſereturque *Ejus* condemnatio ipſa *Nicænæ* & *Catholicæ* Fidei ejuratio; uti ſe res habuit in *Liberio* Romano Antiſtite &c. *Combefiſ.* not. in *Calec.* Nov. Auctar. Patr. Tom. 2. p. 296.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

The Creed it ſelf in the Original Language with Parallel Paſſages from the Fathers.

MY Deſign in this Chapter, is;

1. To exhibit the Creed in its Native Language, that is, in *Latin*, according to the moſt antient, and moſt correct Copies. The *Various Lections* will be placed at the Bottom, under the Creed: The Manuſcripts therein referred to ſhall be denoted by ſuch Names, or Marks as appear above in the *Table* of Manuſcripts.

2. Oppoſite to the Creed, in another Column, I place *parallel* Paſſages, ſelected from Authors that lived and wrote before 430, principally from St. *Auſtin:* And this with deſign to inforce and illuſtrate my main Argument before inſiſted on; namely, that the Creed contains nothing but what had been aſſerted, in as full and expreſs Words as any Words of the Creed are, by Church Writers before the Time ſpecified.

3. I ſubjoin under theſe, at the Bottom of the Page, ſome farther ſelect Paſſages from Church Writers before or after the Time mention'd; partly to ſerve as *Comments* upon ſome Places of the Creed, and partly to ſhow how ſome Writers of the Vth Century, *Vincentius* eſpecially, expreſs'd themſelves on the ſame Heads, that the Reader may from thence judge whether They appear *prior* to the Creed, or the Creed *prior* to Them.

I ought to ask my *Engliſh* Reader's Pardon for This Part; which He may pleaſe to paſs over, and to go on to the next *Chapter*, intended chiefly for his Satisfaction, and to make Him ſome amends for the preſent Interruption: For, my Deſign in ſubjoining an *Engliſh Commentary* is to ſerve much the ſame purpoſes with what is here intended by the *Latin*; tho' not all of them, but as many as the Nature of the Thing will allow.

Loca

Loca parallela excerpta ex Variis; Ante An. 430.

1. Catholicæ *Disciplinæ majestate institutum est, ut accedentibus ad Religionem* Fides *persuadeatur* ante omnia.

Augustin. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 64.

Hæc est Fides nostra, quoniam hæc est Fides recta, quæ etiam Catholica *nuncupatur.* *Tom.* 8. 729.

2. *Hæretici* —— *Simplici* Fide Catholica *contenti esse nolunt; quæ* una *parvulis* Salus *est.*

Augustin. *Tom* 4. *p.* 60.

3. Νῦν δὲ δίδασκε τοσοῦτον εἰδέναι μόνον· μονάδα ἐν τριάδι, καὶ τριάδα ἐν μονάδι προσκυνουμένην, παράδοξον ἔχουσαν καὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν καὶ τὴν ἕνωσιν.

Greg. Nazian. Orat. 23. p. 422.

4. *Et Hæc omnia nec* confuse *unum sunt, nec* disjuncte *tria sunt.*

Augustin. *Tom.* 2. *p.* 609.

5. *Impietatem* Sabellii *declinantes, Tres*

Excerpta ex Patribus.

1. Credamus ergo Fratres: Hoc est *primum* præceptum, Hoc est *Initium* Religionis & vitæ nostræ, fixum habere Cor in *Fide.* Augustin. Tom. 5. p. 195.

2. Catholicorum Hoc fere proprium, deposita sanctorum Patrum & commissa servare, damnare profanas novitates: & sicut dixit, & iterum dixit Apostolus; *si quis annunciaverit, præterquam quod acceptum est,* anathemare. *Vincent.* c. 34. p. 111.

3. Catholica Ecclesia unum Deum in Trinitatis plenitudine, & item Trinitatis æqualitatem in una Divinitate veneratur. *Vincent.* c. 22. & c. 18.

4 Ut neque singularitas substantiæ personarum confundat proprietatem, neque item Trinitatis distinctio unitatem separet Deitatis. *Vincent.* c. 22.

5. Quia scilicet alia est persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus sancti *Vincent,* c. 19.

FIDES CATHOLICA.

1. Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam Fidem.

2. Quam nisi Quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit.

3. Fides autem Catholica Hæc est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate, & Trinitatem in unitate veneremur:

4. Neque confundentes personas, neque Substantiam separantes.

5. Alia est enim persona

Variantes Lectiones.

1 (*salvus esse.*) esse salvus. Cod. *Ambros,* & *Fortunat.* in MS. *Ambros.*

2. (*Quisque*) Quis. Cod. *Ambros.* (*inviolatamque*) inviolabilemque. Cod. *San-germ.* (*absque dubio*) deest in Cod. *Reg. Paris.* (*in æternum peribit*) peribit in æternum. *San-germ.*

5. (*alia Filii*) alia *Persona* Filii. Cod. *Ambros.* item *Fortunat.* (*alia Spiritûs*) alia *Persona* Sp. sanct. Cod. *Ambros.*

personas

perſonas expreſſas ſub proprietate diſtinguimus — Aliam *Patris*, aliam *Filii*, aliam *Spiritûs ſancti* — perſonam.
Pelagii *Symbol. p.* 274. *apud* Lambec. *Catal. Bibl. Vindob.*

Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritûs ſancti.

6. *Confutantes* Arium, *unam eandemque dicimus Trinitatis eſſe Subſtantiam.*
Pelag. Symb.

6. Sed Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus ſancti, una eſt Divinitas, æqualis gloria, coæterna Majeſtas.

Patris, & Filii & Spiritus ſancti unam Virtutem, unam Subſtantiam, unam Deitatem, unam Majeſtatem, unam Gloriam.
Auguſt. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 744.

7. Qualis *eſt Pater ſecundum Subſtantiam*, Talem *genuit Filium: & Spiritus ſanctus — eſt ejuſdem & Ipſe Subſtantiæ cum Patre & Filio.* Fauſtini. Fid.

7. Qualis Pater, Talis Filius, Talis & Spiritus ſanctus.

8. *Quicquid* ad Seipſum *dicitur Deus, & de ſingulis perſonis* ſingulariter *dicitur, & ſimul de ipſa Trinitate.*
Auguſt. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 838.

8. Increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus & Spiritus ſanctus.

9. *Magnus Pater, magnus Filius, magnus Spiritus ſanctus.*
Auguſt. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 837.

9. Immenſus Pater, immenſus Filius, immenſus & Spiritus ſanctus.

10. *Hoc & de* Bonitate, *& de* Æternitate,

10. Æternus Pater, æternus

6. Sed tamen Patris & Filii, & Spiritus ſancti non alia & alia, ſed una eademque natura. *Vincent.* c, 19.

6. (*Coæterna*) Codd. nonnulli habent *Et* Coæterna. Deeſt *Et* in Cod. *Ambroſ.* & in *Fortunat.* & *Brunon.* aliiſque multis.

7 (*Talis & Spiritus Sanctus*) Ita Codd. *Ambroſ. Reg: Pariſ.* C. C. C. C. 1. *Cotton.* 1. *Jacob.* 1. *Fortunat.* item *Cæſarius Arelat.* antiquiſſimus. MSS. recentiores, & editi omittunt *Et.*

8 Illud præcipue teneamus, quicquid *ad ſe* dicitur præſtantiſſima illa & divina ſublimitas, *ſubſtantialiter* dici; quod autem *ad aliquid* non *ſubſtantialiter*, ſed *relative*: Tantamque vim eſſe *ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ* in Patre & Filio & Spiritu ſancto, ut quicquid de ſingulis ad ſeipſos dicitur, non *pluraliter* in ſumma, ſed *ſingulariter* accipiatur. *Auguſtin.* Tom. 8. p. 837.

8 (*Et Spiritus Sanctus.*) Deeſt vocula *Et* in recentioribus Codicibus: retinent plerique *antiquiores* hoc in loco, & ſimiliter in ſubſequentibus, ante *Spiritus Sanctus.* Quæ lectio, opinor, vera eſt, ab Autore *Symboli* profecta; ſcilicet, ad majorem Emphaſim, propter Hæreſim *Macedonianam* nondum penitus exſtinctam. Noſtrum autem eſt *Symbolum* exhibere quale ſe primitus habuit.

nitate,

nitate, *& de* Omnipotentia *Dei dictum ſit.* Auguſt. *ibid. p.* 839.

Æternus Pater, coæternus Filius, coæternus Spiritus ſanctus. Aug. *Tom.* 5. *p* 543.

12. *Non tamen tres magni, ſed unus magnus.* Auguſt. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 837.

13. *Itaque Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus ſanctus.* Aug. de Trin. *l.* 5. *c.* 8.

14. *Nec tamen Tres omnipotentes, ſed unus omnipotens.* Aug. *ibid.*

15. *Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus ſanctus.* Auguſt. Trin. *l.* 8. *c.* 1. *& Serm.* 105. *p.* 542. *Tom.* 5.

16. *Nec tamen tres Dii —— ſed unus Deus.* Auguſt. *ibid.*

17. *Sic &* Dominum *ſi quæras, Singulum Quemque reſpondeo ——* Aug. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 729.

Filius, æternus & Spiritus ſanctus.

11. Et tamen non Tres æterni, ſed unus æternus.

12. Sicut non tres increati, nec tres immenſi, ſed unus increatus, & unus immenſus.

13. Similiter, omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens & Spiritus ſanctus.

14. Et tamen non tres omnipotentes, ſed unus omnipotens.

15. Ita Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus & Spiritus ſanctus.

16. Et tamen non tres Dii, ſed unus eſt Deus.

17. Ita Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus & Spiritus ſanctus.

12. Nec magnos tres dicimus, ſed magnum unum, quia non participatione magnitudinis Deus magnus eſt, ſed ſeipſo magno magnus eſt, quia ipſe ſua eſt magnitudo. *Auguſt.* de Trin. l. 5. c. 10.

13 Sed ne *duos omnipotentes* intelligas præcavendum eſt: licet enim & Pater ſit *omnipotens*, & Filius, tamen *unus eſt omnipotens*, ſicut & unus eſt Deus, quia Patris & Filii *eadem Omnipotentia* eſt, ſicut & eadem Deitas. *Fauſtin.* p. 123.

14. Sicut ſimul illi Tres *unus Deus*, ſic ſimul illi Tres *unus omnipotens* eſt, & *inviſibilis unus*, Deus Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus eſt. *Auguſtin.* Tom. 8. p. 654. *Vid.* p. 865.

16 *Unus Deus* propter *inſeparabilem* Divinitatem; ſicut *unus Omnipotens* propter *inſeparabilem* Omnipotentiam. *Auguſt* de Civit. Dei. p. 290.

In illa ſumma Trinitate, quæ incomparabiliter rebus omnibus antecellit, tanta eſt *inſeparabilitas*, ut cum Trinitas Hominum non poſſit dici *unus Homo*, Illa *unus Deus* & dicatur & ſit. *Aug.* de Trin. l. 15. c. 23.

12. (*Unus increatus, & unus immenſus*) Unus immenſus, & unus increatus. Cod. *Ambroſ.*

14. (*Et tamen*) deeſt *tamen* in Cod. *Ambroſ.*

16. (*eſt Deus*) deeſt *eſt* in MS. *Ambroſ.*

18. *Sed*

18. *Sed ſimul omnes non tres Dominos Deos, ſed unum Dominum Deum dico.* Auguſt. *ibid.*

19. *Cum de* ſingulis *quæritur, unuſquiſque eorum & Deus, & omnipotens eſſe reſpondeatur; cum vero de omnibus ſimul, non Tres Dii, vel tres omnipotentes, ſed unus Deus omnipotens.* Auguſt. de civit. Dei. *l.* 11. *c.* 24. *p.* 290.

20. *Dicimus Patrem Deum* de nullo. (Auguſt. *Tom.* 5. *p.* 680.)

Non enim habet de quo ſit, aut ex quo procedat. Aug. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 829.

21. *Filius* Patris ſolius — *Hunc quippe de ſua Subſtantia* genuit, *non ex nihilo fecit.* Aug. *Ep.* 170, *alias*, 66.

22. De Filio *Spiritus ſanctus* procedere *reperitur.* (Auguſt. de Trin. *l.* 15. *c.* 17.) *Neque natus eſt ſicut Unigenitus, neque factus,* &c. Id. *l.* 5. *c.* 15. *p.* 841.

18. Et tamen non Tres Domini, ſed unus eſt Dominus.

19. Quia ſicut ſingillatim unamquamque Perſonam & Deum & Dominum confiteri Chriſtiana veritate compellimur; ita tres Deos, aut Dominos dicere Catholica Religione prohibemur.

20. Pater a nullo eſt factus, nec creatus, nec genitus.

21. Filius a Patre ſolo eſt, non factus, nec creatus, ſed genitus.

22. Spiritus ſanctus a Patre & Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus eſt, ſed procedens.

18. Non ſunt enim duo Domini ubi *Dominatus unus* eſt; quia Pater in Filio, & Filius in Patre, & ideo *Dominus unus*, Ambroſ. de Sp. S. l. 3. c. 15. p. 686.

22. Spiritus quoque ſanctus non, ſicut creatura, ex nihilo eſt factus; ſed ſic a Patre Filioque procedit, ut nec a Filio, nec a Patre ſit factus. *Auguſt.* ep. 170.

18. *(Eſt Dominus)* deeſt *eſt.* Cod. *Ambroſ.*

19. *(Et Deum & Dominum)* Ita MS, *Ambroſ.* & MS. Oxon. *Fortunat.* rectiſſime. Cod. *Fortunat. Ambroſ.* aliique, tum MSS. tum impreſſi, habent *Deum* & *Dominum.* Brunonis Cod. *Deum ac Dominum.* San germanenſis, *Dominum & Deum* Plerique editi, *Deum aut Dominum.* Quæ lectio, me judice, omnium peſſima eſt.

(Prohibemur) MS. *Ambr.* legit. *prolibemus*: male.

22. *(Sed procedens)* Cod. *Ambroſ.* adjecta habet iſta; *Patri & Filio coæternus eſt.* G'oſſa, uti videtur, ex margine in Textum immiſſa: Niſi forte Librarius verba illa ex *Bachiarii Fide*, quam ſimul deſcripſerat, huc tranſtulerit; ſive oſcitanter, ſive majoris elucidationis gratiâ. Vid. *Bachiar. Fid* apud *Murator.* Tom. 2. p. 16. 18.

23. *Unus eſt Pater, non duo vel tres; & unus Filius, non duo vel tres; & unus amborum Spiritus, non duo vel tres.* Auguſt. Contr. Maxim. *p.* 729.

24. *In hac Trinitate, non eſt aliud alio majus, aut minus.* Auguſt. *Tom.* 5. *p.* 948.

Nec enim prorſus aliquis in Trinitate Gradus: nihil quod inferius, ſuperiuſve dici poſſit. Pelagii *Symb.*

25. *Vid. ſupra, in Articulo* 3.

26. *Vide ſupra. Artic.* 2.

27. *Dominus autem manens cum diſcipulis per quadraginta Dies, ſignificare dignatus eſt quia per iſtud Tempus* neceſſaria eſt omnibus Fides Incarnationis Chriſti; *quæ infirmis eſt neceſſaria.* Auguſt. *Serm.* 264. *Tom* 5. *p.* 1077.

23. Unus ergo Pater, non tres Patres; unus Filius, non tres Filii; unus Spiritus ſanctus, non tres Spiritus ſancti.

24. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut poſterius, nihil majus aut minus, ſed totæ tres perſonæ coæternæ ſibi ſunt, & coæquales.

25. Ita ut per omnia, ſicut jam ſupra dictum eſt, & unitas in Trinitate, & Trinitas in unitate veneranda ſit.

26. Qui vult ergo ſalvus eſſe, ita de Trinitate ſentiat.

27. Sed neceſſarium eſt ad æternam Salutem, ut Incarnationem quoque Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti fideliter credat.

23 Οὔτε ἓν τρεῖς πατέρες, οὔτε τρεῖς υἱοὶ, οὔτε τρεῖς παράκλητοι· ἀλλ' ἓς πατὴρ, ὁ ἓς υἱὸς, καὶ ἓς παράκλητος. *Pseud-Ignat.* ad *Philipp.* c. 2. p. 118. *Cotel.* ed.

24. Increata & inæſtimabilis Trinitas, quæ unius eſt æternitatis & Gloriæ, nec Tempus nec Gradum vel poſteriorıs recipit vel prioris. *Ambroſ.* de Fid. L. 4. c. 11. p. 547.

25. Ita Tota Deitas ſui perfectione æqualis eſt, ut exceptis vocabulis quæ proprietatem indicant Perſonarum, quicquid de una perſona dicitur, de tribus digniſſime poſſit intelligi. *Pelag.* Symb.

26. Si quis hanc Fidem non habet, *Catholicus* dici non poteſt, quia *Catholicam* non tenet Fidem; & ideo alienus eſt ac profanus, & adverſus veritatem rebellis Fides S. *Ambroſ.* apud *Lambec.* Catalog. Bibl. Vindob. L. 2. p. 268.

27. Ideo Converſatio ipſius in Carne poſt Reſurrectionem per quadraginta dies erat neceſſaria, ut demonſtraret tam diu eſſe neceſſariam Fidem Incarnationis Chriſti quamdiu in iſta vita docetur Arca in diluvio fluctuare. *Auguſt.* Tom. 5. p. 1078.

24. (*Et in hac*) deeſt *et* in Cod. *Sax. germ.*

28. *Pro-*

28. *Proinde, Chriſtus Jeſus, Dei Filius, eſt & Deus & Homo.* Auguſt. Enchir. *Tom.* 6. *p.* 210.

28. Eſt ergo Fides recta, ut credamus & confiteamur, quod Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus, Dei Filius, Deus pariter & Homo eſt.

29. *Deus ante omnia ſæcula: Homo in noſtro ſæculo — unus Dei Filius, idemque Hominis Filius.* Auguſt. *ibid.*

29. Deus eſt ex Subſtantia Patris ante ſæcula genitus: Homo ex Subſtantia Matris in ſæculo natus.

30. *Confitemur in Chriſto unam eſſe Filii perſonam, ut dicamus duas eſſe* perfectas *atque integras Subſtantias, id eſt,* Deitatis, *&* Humanitatis *quæ ex anima continetur & corpore.* Pelag. *Symb.*

30. Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo ex anima rationali & humana carne ſubſiſtens.

31. *Æqualem Patri ſecundum Divinitatem, Minorem autem Patre ſecundum Carnem, hoc eſt, ſecundum Hominem.* Auguſt. *Epiſt.* 137. *p.* 406.

31. Æqualis Patri ſecundum Divinitatem: Minor Patre ſecundum Humanitatem.

32. *Agnoſcamus geminam Subſtantiam*

32. Qui licet Deus ſit &

28. *Confiteamur quod)* Ita Cod. *Ambroſ.* atque *editi* nonnulli. Plures habent *quia*: *Ambroſiana* Lectio præferenda.

(Deus pariter & Homo eſt) Ita Codd. Bened. 1. *Colbertin. Jacob.* 1. & *Fortunat.* Ambroſ. & San germ. legunt, *& Deus pariter & Homo eſt.* Editi, *Deus & Homo eſt.*

29. *Ex ſubſtantia)* Colbertin. *de ſubſtantia:* & infra, *de ſubſtantia matris. (Homo)* Ambroſ. Cod legit *& Homo eſt.* Fortunat. *Et Homo.* Poſt, *matris,* San germ. Cod. habet. *in ſæculo genitus perfectus Homo.*

30. *(Rationali) rationabili.* Codd. *Ambroſ. Colbert.* & *San-germ.*

29. Idem ex Patre ante ſæcula genitus, idem in ſæculo ex matre generatus: *Vincent.* c. 19.

30 Adverſus *Arium,* veram & perfectam *Verbi* Divinitatem; adverſus *Apollinarem,* perfectam Hominis in Chriſto defendimus veritatem. *Auguſt.* Op. Tom. 5. Append. p. 391.

Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo: in Deo ſumma Divinitas, in Homine plena Humanitas: quippe quæ Animam ſimul habeat & Carnem. *Vincent.* c. 19.

32. *Caro* Chriſtus, & *Anima* Chriſtus, & *Verbum* Chriſtus: nec tamen tria Hæc tres Chriſti, ſed unus Chriſtus. *Auguſt.* in *Johan.* p. 612.

Chriſti; divinam ſcilicet qua æqualis eſt Patri, humanam qua major eſt Pater: Utrumque autem ſimul non duo, ſed unus eſt Chriſtus. Aug. Tract. in Joh. *p.* 699.

33. *Verbum caro factum eſt, a Divinitate carne ſuſcepta, non in carnem Divinitate mutata.*

Auguſt. Enchirid. *c.* 35.

34. *Idem Deus qui Homo, & qui Deus idem Homo: non confuſione naturæ, ſed unitate perſonæ.* Auguſt. *Tom.* 5. *p.* 885.

35. *Sicut enim unus eſt Homo Anima rationalis & Caro; ſic unus eſt Chriſtus Deus & Homo.*

Auguſt. Tract. in Joh. *p.* 699.

36. *Deſcendit ad inferna, tertia die reſurrexit a mortuis.*

Symb. Aquileiæ, apud Ruffin.

Homo, non duo tamen, ſed unus eſt Chriſtus.

33. Unus autem, non converſione Divinitatis in Carnem, ſed adſumptione Humanitatis in Deum.

34. Unus omnino, non confuſione Subſtantiæ, ſed unitate Perſonæ.

35. Nam ſicut Anima rationalis & Caro unus eſt Homo; ita Deus & Homo unus eſt Chriſtus.

36. Qui paſſus eſt pro Salute noſtra, deſcendit ad Inferos, tertia die reſurrexit a mortuis.

33. Nemo ergo credat Dei Filium *converſum* & commutatum eſſe in Hominis Filium; ſed potius credamus, & non conſumptâ divinâ, & perfecte aſſumptâ humanâ ſubſtantiâ, manentem Dei Filium factum Hominis Filium. *Auguſt.* Tom. 5 p 887.

Deus ergo Hominem aſſumpſit, Homo in Deum tranſivit: non naturæ verſibilitate, ſicut *Apollinariſtæ* dicunt, ſed Dei dignatione. *Gennad.* Eccl. Dogm. c. 2.

36. Quis ergo, niſi infidelis, negaverit fuiſſe *apud Inferos* Chriſtum? ——

Quamobrem teneamus firmiſſime quod fides habet fundatiſſima Auctoritate firmatum——& cætera quæ de illo teſtatiſſima veritate conſcripta ſunt; in quibus etiam Hoc eſt, quod *apud Inferos fuit.* Auguſt. ep. 164. p. 574, 578.

33. (*In carnem*) *in carne.* MSS. *Ambroſ. Colbert. San germ.* aliique plurimi, & vetuſti. Habent etiam *in Deo*, pro, *in Deum.* At multi etiam Codices, cum *Fortunati* Cod. *Ambroſiano*, receptam lectionem præferunt; quæ utique præferenda videtur. Cod. *San-germ.* pro *converſione* habet *converſatione.* Cod. Colbert: totam hanc pericopen ſic exhibet; *Unus autem, non ex eo quod ſit in carne converſa Divinitas, ſed quia eſt in Deo adſumpta dignanter Humanitas.*

34. (*Unus omnino*) *unus Chriſtus eſt.* Colbert.

35. (*Nam ſicut &c.*) Totum omittit Cod. *Colbertinus*. Scilicet, uti credo, ne *Simile* illud in erroris ſui patrocinium arriperent *Monophyſitæ.* (*Rationalis*) rationabilis. *Ambroſ.*

36. (*ad inferos*) *ad infernos.* Cod. San-germ. *ad inferna deſcendens.* Cod. *Colbertin.* (*Tertia die*) deeſt in Cod. Ambroſ. San-germ. Cotton. 1. Jacob. 1. (*reſurrexit*) ſurrexit: Cod. *Ambroſ. Fortunat.*

37. *Aſcend-*

37. *Aſcendit ad cælos, ſedet ad dexteram Patris; inde venturus judicare vivos & mortuos.*

Symb. Roman. Vet.

38. *Reſurrectionem etiam carnis confitemur & credimus, ut dicamus nos in eadem qua nunc ſumus veritate membrorum eſſe reparandos.*

Pelag. *Symb.*

39. *Et procedent qui bona fecerunt, in Reſurrectionem vitæ, qui vero mala egerunt in Reſurrectionem judicii.* Joh. 5. 28.

Ibunt Hi in ſupplicium æternum, juſti autem in vitam æternam. Matt. 25. 46.

40. *Cavete, dilectiſſimi, ne quis vos ab* Eccleſiæ Catholicæ *Fide ac unitate ſeducat. Qui enim vobis aliter Evangelizaverit præterquam quod accepiſtis, Anathema ſit.* Auguſt. *Tom.* 5. *p.* 592.

37. Adſcendit ad Cælos, ſedet ad dexteram Patris; inde venturus judicare vivos & mortuos.

38. Ad cujus adventum omnes Homines reſurgere habent cum corporibus ſuis, & reddituri ſunt de Factis propriis rationem.

39. Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam æternam, qui vero mala, in Ignem æternum.

40. Hæc eſt Fides Catholica, quam niſi Quiſque fideliter, firmiterque crediderit, ſalvus eſſe non poterit.

38. Si id reſurgere dicitur quod cadit, caro ergo noſtra in veritate reſurget, ſicut in veritate cadit. Et non ſecundum *Origenem*, immutatio corporum erit *&c. Gennad.* Eccl. Dogmat. c. 5.

39. Poſt Reſurrectionem & judicium, non credamus reſtitutionem futuram, ſicut *Origenes* delirat, ut Dæmones vel impii Homines poſt Tormenta quaſi ſuppliciis expurgati, vel *Illi* in *Angelicam* qua creati ſunt redeant Dignitatem, vel *Iſti* juſtorum Societate donentur. *Gennad.* ibid. c. 9.

40. Ὁ πᾶσι πιστεύσας ὡς ἔχει, ὡς γεγένηται, μαηάριος· ὁ πᾶσι μὴ πιστεύων σύαγὴς οὐχ ἥηον τῶ τ κύριον σταυρωσάντων. *Pſeud.*—*Ignat.* ad *Philipp.* p. 118.

37. (*Sedet.*) *Sedit.* Cod. Ambr. (*Dexteram Patris*) Ita Codd. Ambroſ. & Fortunat, & Symb. Roman. Vet. *Dexteram Patris Omnipotentis.* Cod. San germ. *Dextram Omnipotentis.* Cod. Brunonis. *Dexteram Dei Patris ſedet, ſicut vobis in Symbolo traditum eſt.* Cod. Colbert. *Dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis.* Codd. recentiores, cum excuſis.

38. (*Reſurgere habent cum corporibus ſuis, &*) deſunt in Cod. Ambroſ. *Colbertinus* legit; *ad cujus adventum erunt omnes Homines ſine dubio in ſuis corporibus reſurrecturi.* Sed nihil mutamus.

39. (*Egerunt*) egerint. Cod. *Ambroſ.* Totum hunc Articulum ſic legit *Colbertinus*; *Ut qui bona egerunt, eant in vitam æternam; qui mala in ignem æternum.*

(*Qui vero*) Cod. *Ambroſ.* & *Cotton.* 1. omittunt *vero.* Codices nonnulli legunt, *& qui vero:* alii, *& qui mala.*

40. (*Quiſque*) Cod. Ambroſ. *unuſquiſque*: Colbertinus ſic. pergit; *Hæc eſt Fides ſancta & catholica, quam omnis Homo, qui ad vitam æternam pervenire deſiderat, ſcire integre debet, & fideliter cuſtodire.*

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

A Commentary on the Athanaſian *Creed*[a].

1 *WHOSOEVER will be ſaved, before all Things it is neceſſary that He hold the Catholick Faith.*

By the Words, *before all Things*, is meant *in the firſt Place*. Faith goes before *Practice*; and is therefore *firſt* in *Order*, tho' *Practice* may be, comparatively, more conſiderable, and *firſt* in *Value*, as the *End* is above the *Means*.

2. *Which Faith except every one do keep whole*[b] *and undefiled, without doubt He ſhall periſh everlaſtingly.*

Which Faith, that is, the *Catholick Faith* before ſpoken of, which is another Name for the *true* and *right* Faith as taught in *Scripture*; called *Catholick*, or *Univerſal*, as being held by the *Univerſal* Church of Chriſt, againſt which the *Gates of Hell* ſhall never *prevail*. The meaning then is, that every one is obliged, under pain of *Damnation*, to preſerve, as far as in Him lies, the *true* and *right* Faith, in oppoſition to Thoſe that endeavor to *corrupt* it either by taking from it, or adding to it. That Men ſhall periſh Eternally for *unbelief*, for *rejecting* the Faith in the Lump, cannot be doubted; when it is expreſsly ſaid (*Mark* 16. 16.) *He that believeth not ſhall be damned:* And as to rejecting any particular Branch, or Article of it, it muſt of conſequence be a Sin againſt the *Whole*; againſt *Truth*, and *Peace*, and therefore *damnable* in it's own Nature, as all *wilful* Sins are without Repentance. As to the Allowances to be

a *In* K. Edward's *Prayer book*, A. D. 1549. *it is barely intituled*, This Confeſſion of our Chriſtian Faith: *And it was ordered to be* ſong, *or* ſayed, *upon Six Feaſts in the year. At the Reviſal of the* Common-Prayer, *under* Q. Eliz. *it was appointed to be uſed on ſeveral Feaſts in the year, the whole Number Thirteen. But the* Title *ſtill continued the ſame, till the laſt Review under* Charles *the* Second; *when were added thereto*, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanaſius: *From which Time the running Title has been* S. Athanaſius's *Creed, as before* Quicunque vult, *in our Prayer Books.*

b *In* K. Edward's *Prayer Book, it was read* holy, *inſtead of* whole, *by a miſtake, I ſuppoſe, of the* Printer: *which miſtake was continued through ſeveral Editions afterwards. I have obſerved it in an Edition of the year* 1600, *by the* Queen's *Printer. I ſuppoſe, the old way of writing* hoole, *and* hole, *for* whole, *might occaſion it.*

made

made for *invincible* Ignorance, Prejudice, or other unavoidable Infirmities; as they will be pleadable in the Caſe of any other Sin, ſo may they, and will they alſo be pleadable in This: But it was foreign to the purpoſe of the Creed to take notice of it in This caſe *particularly*, when it is *common* to all caſes of like Nature, and is always *ſuppoſed*, and *underſtood*, tho' not ſpecially mention'd.

3. *And the Catholick Faith is This; that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.*

One of the Principal Branches of the Catholick Faith, and which is of neareſt Concernment (ſince our *Worſhip* depends upon it, and the main Body of the Chriſtian Religion is bound up in it) is the Doctrine of a *Trinity* in *Unity*, of *Three Perſons* and *one God*, recommended in our Baptiſm as the Object of our *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Worſhip*. He that takes upon Him to corrupt, or deprave This moſt Fundamental part of a Chriſtian's Faith, cannot be *innocent*; it being his bounden Duty to maintain and preſerve it, as He will anſwer it another Day.

4. *Neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the Subſtance.*

Here would be no need of theſe particular Cautions, or critical Terms, in relation to This Point, had Men been content with the plain primitive Faith in it's native Simplicity. But, as there have been a Set of Men, called *Sabellians*, who have erroneouſly taught that the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt are all *one Perſon*, who was incarnate, and *ſuffered*, and roſe again; making the *Father* (and Holy-Ghoſt) to have *ſuffered*, as well as the *Son* (from thence call'd *Patripaſſians*) hence it becomes neceſſary to caution every pious Chriſtian againſt *confounding* the Perſons as Thoſe Men have done. And as there have been Others, particularly the *Arians*, who have pretended very falſely, that the Three Perſons are *Three Subſtances*, and of *different* Kinds, *divided* from each other, one being *before* the other, exiſting when the other two were not, as alſo being *preſent*, where the other two are not preſent; Theſe falſe and dangerous Tenets having been ſpread abroad, it is become neceſſary to give a Caution againſt *dividing the Subſtance*, as Theſe have,

have done, very much to the Detriment of Sobriety and Truth.

5. *For there is one Perſon of the Father, Another of the Son, and Another of the Holy-Ghoſt.*

The *Sabellians* therefore were extremely to blame in *confounding* the Perſons, and running them into one, taking away the *Diſtinction* of Perſons plainly taught in Scripture.

6. *But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghoſt is all one, the Glory equal, the Majeſty coeternal.*

The *Arians* therefore were equally to blame for *dividing* the *Subſtance*, and *Godhead* in the manner before hinted. To be a little more particular on this Head, we may go on to open and explain This *Unity* of Godhead, *equality* of *Glory*, and *coeternity* of Majeſty.

7. *Such as the Father is, ſuch is the Son, and ſuch is the Holy-Ghoſt.*

That is, as to their *Subſtance*, and *Godhead*, there is no Difference or Inequality amongſt them; tho' there is a Difference in reſpect of ſome *perſonal* Acts, and Properties, as ſhall be obſerved in it's Place. In real *Dignity*, and *Perfection* They are *equal*, and *undivided*, as in the Inſtances here following.

8. *The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy-Ghoſt uncreate.*

Theſe Three Perſons were never brought into Being by the will of another; They are no *Creatures*, nor *Changeable*, as Creatures are; They are all infinitely removed from *dependence* or *precarious* Exiſtence, one as much as another, and every one as much as any one: They exiſt in the higheſt, and moſt emphatical Senſe of Exiſting, which is called *Neceſſary-Exiſtence*, oppoſed to *contingent* or *precarious* Exiſtence. In a word; every Perſon muſt, and cannot but exiſt; and all muſt exiſt together, having the ſame unchangeable Perfections.

9. *The Father incomprehenſible, the Son incomprehenſible, and the Holy-Ghoſt incomprehenſible.*

Theſe Words are not a juſt Tranſlation of the *Latin* Original, tho' containing as true and juſt a Propoſition as the *Latin* Words do. *Immenſus* ſignifies *omnipreſent*, rather than *incomprehenſible*,

prehenſible in the modern Senſe of incomprehenſible. But if by *incomprehenſible* be underſtood, not to be comprehended within any Bounds, it will then anſwer to the *Latin* pretty nearly. The Tranſlator here followed the *Greek* Copy [a], taking perhaps the *Greek* to be the *Original* Language wherein the Creed was written. However, ſome *Latins* have underſtood by *immenſus, incomprehenſible* [b], in ſuch a Senſe as has been hinted.

10. *The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy-Ghoſt eternal.*

None of the Perſons ever began to be, nor ſhall ever ceaſe to be; They always were, they always will be, and muſt be; the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever.

11. *And yet They are not Three Eternals, but one Eternal.*

Some Account ought to be given of this manner of ſpeaking, becauſe it often occurs in the Creed, and may be thought moſt apt to offend the malicious, or to miſlead the unwary. The way of ſpeaking came in a little after the middle of the fourth Century, and then only into the *Latin* Church; for the *Greeks* never uſed it, but taught the *ſame* Things under a *different* Form of Expreſſion. What *Greeks* and *Latins* Both intended was, that as the Three Perſons are *one Subſtance* and *one God*, ſo every *divine* Perfection, and every *ſubſtantial* Attribute, belonging to any one Perſon, is *common* to all; and there is nothing *peculiar* to any one but the divine *Relations:* To the Father, *Paternity* and whatever it implies or carries with it; to the Son, *Filiation*; to the Holy-Ghoſt, *Proceſſion*. In This Account, *Eternity, Immenſity, Omnipotence*, and the like, being ſubſtantial Attributes, are common to all the Three Perſons; who have therefore *one Eternity, one Immenſity, one Omnipotence*, and ſo on, as *one Subſtance* and *one Godhead:* Thus far *Greeks* and *Latins* agreed both in *Doctrine*, and *Expreſſion*. But the *Latins*, building hereupon,

a *There are two printed* Greek *Copies, which read* ἀκαταλήπτου, Stephens's *firſt printed by* Bryling, *and* Baſilius's *firſt printed by* Genebrard: *which two Copies are in the main one. Our Tranſlators, in* 1548 *could have ſeen none but* Bryling's, *that is*, Stephens's *Copy. The* Conſtantinopolitan *Copy publiſh'd by* Genebrard, *reads* ἄπειρος; *The* Palatine *Copy, by* Felckman, ἀμέτρος. *The* Saxon, French, *and old* Engliſh *Verſions exactly follow the* Latin *original.*

b *Immenſus Pater:* non mole, ſed poteſtate omnia concludente. Vel immenſus, id eſt, *incomprehenſibilis.* Abaelard. *in Symb. Athanaſ.* p. 368.

thought it very allowable to go a little farther, (which the *Greeks* did not) and to expreſs the ſame Thing by ſaying, of the Three Perſons, that They are *one Eternal, one Immenſe, one Omnipotent, one Holy, one Uncreated,* &c. And This was the current Language at the making, and before the making of this Creed. The *Arians* were the ſole Occaſion of introducing Both Kinds of Expreſſion, which muſt therefore be interpreted accordingly. *Two* Things were deſign'd by them: One, to obviate the *Arian* Tenet, that the Three Perſons were differing in *kind,* and in *degree,* as being of *unequal* Perfections; the other to obviate the *Arian* Charge, or Calumny, upon the Church as making *Three Gods.* In regard to the former, when the Catholicks ſpeak of *one Divinity,* they intend *equal* Divinity, not Divinities differing in *kind,* or *degree:* And in regard to the latter, They further mean *undivided* and *inſeparable* Divinity, not *Many* Divinities. The true meaning then, and the full meaning of the Expreſſions of the Creed will be very clear and obvious. The Three Perſons are *equal* in Duration, and *undivided* too; one Eternity, (one, becauſe *undivided,* and inſeparable) is *common* to all, and therefore They are not *Three Eternals,* but *one Eternal.*

The oldeſt Writers who have uſed this way of Expreſſion, are, ſo far as I have obſerved, *Ambroſe, Fauſtinus,* and *Auſtin:* And their meaning in it is very plain and certain from the Places themſelves where They make uſe of it. *Fulgentius,* who came not long after them, ſometimes falls into the ſame manner of Expreſſion [a]; but ſparingly, as if He either did not fully attend to it, or had ſome ſcruple about it: For his general way is to ſay, *not three eternal Gods, but one eternal God* [b], in-

a *Relativa* nomina Trinitatem faciunt, *eſſentialia* vero nullo modo triplicantur. Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus ſanctus. Bonus Pater, bonus Filius, bonus Spiritus ſanctus. Pius Pater, pius Filius, pius Spiritus ſanctus. Juſtus Pater, juſtus Filius, juſtus & Spiritus ſanctus. Omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens & Spiritus ſanctus. Et tamen non dicimus nec *Tres Deos,* nec *Tres bonos,* nec *Tres pios,* nec *Tres juſtos,* nec *Tres omnipotentes,* ſed unum Deum, bonum, pium, juſtum, omnipotentem, Patrem & Filium & Spiritum ſanctum. *Fulgent.* de Trin. c. 2. p. 330.

b Æternus eſt ſine initio Pater, æternus eſt ſine initio Filius, æternus eſt ſine initio Spiritus ſanctus: nec tamen tres *Dii* æterni ſed unus æternus *Deus. Fulgent.* ad *Ferrand.* p. 234.

ſtead

ſtead of the other in the Creed; and ſo in the like Caſes. Which indeed is a very inſipid and dull way of Expreſſing it, and if applied to every Article in the *Athanaſian* Creed, would make it a very flat compoſition in compariſon to what it is. It is true, that all at length reſolves into This, that the Three Perſons are *not Three Gods*, but *one God:* This is the Ground and Foundation, and the other is the Superſtructure. But then it is a fine and elegant, as well as a ſolid Superſtructure; improving the Thought, and carrying on a Train of new and diſtinct Propoſitions, and not meerly a jejune and ſapleſs Repetition of the ſame Thing.

12. *As alſo there are not Three Incomprehenſibles, nor Three Uncreated; but one Uncreated, and one Incomprehenſible*[a].

Not Three Incomprehenſibles, *&c.* as not differing either in *kind*, or *degree* of Incomprehenſibility, nor yet *divided* in thoſe Perfections: But one Incomprehenſible, and one Uncreated, one as to the *kind* and *degree* of thoſe Attributes, or Perfections; and one in *number* too, as much as *Union*, and *Inſeparability*, infinitely cloſe and perfect, can be conceived to make, or do really make *one*.

13. *So likewiſe the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy-Ghoſt Almighty.*

Equally Almighty every one, without any *Difference*, or *Inequality* in *Kind*, or *Degree*.

14. *And yet They are not Three Almighties, but one Almighty.*

One Omnipotence, or Almightineſs is common to all Three One in *kind* as being of *equal* extent, and equally reaching over all; and one alſo in *number*, becauſe of the inſeparable Unity among the Three, in the inward Perfection, and outward Exerciſe, or Operation.

Immenſus eſt Pater, ſed immenſus eſt Filius, & immenſus eſt & Spiritus ſanctus. Nec tamen tres *Dii* immenſi, ſed unus *Deus* immenſus. *Fulgent* ibid. p. 242.

Omnipotens eſt Pater; ſed omnipotens eſt Filius, omnipotens eſt Spiritus ſanctus; Nec tamen tres *Dii* omnipotentes, ſed unus *Deus* omnipotens eſt Pater, & Filius, & Spiritus ſanctus. *Fulgent.* ibid.

a *Here again, one may perceive what Copy our Tranſlators followed, namely,* Bryght's *Greek Copy. All the other Copies,* Greek *and* Latin, *place the words in a different order.* Not three uncreated, nor three incomprehenſibles, but one uncreated &c. *Only the* Ambroſian *Latin Copy reads,* not three uncreated, nor three incomprehenſibles (*immenſe*) *but one* incomprehenſible (*immenſe*) and one uncreated.

15. *So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy-Ghoſt is God.*

The whole Three Perſons equally *divine*, and enjoying every Perfection belonging to the Godhead.

16. *And yet They are not Three Gods, but one God.*

Becauſe the *Godhead*, or *Divinity* which belongs to one, belongs to all: The ſame in *kind* becauſe of the Equality, and the ſame in *number* becauſe inſeparably one.

17. *So likewiſe the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy-Ghoſt Lord.*

Having the ſame right of *Dominion*, and of *equal* Dominion; and equally exerciſing it, when, and where They pleaſe.

18. *And yet not Three Lords, but one Lord.*

Becauſe one Dominion is *common* to all Three, jointly poſſeſſing, and jointly exerciſing every Branch of it; undividedly, and inſeparably bearing ſupreme Rule over all.

19. *For, like as we are compelled by the Chriſtian Verity to acknowledge every Perſon by Himſelf to be God and Lord: So are we forbidden by the Catholick Rèligion to ſay, there be Three Gods or Three Lords.*

That is to ſay, The whole Foundation of what hath been before taught, reſts upon This, that the ſame Chriſtian *Verity*, or *Truth*, laid down in Scripture, obliges us to acknowledge every Perſon diſtinctly conſider'd to be *God* and *Lord*; and at the ſame Time to reject the Notion of *Three Gods* or *Three Lords*: which being ſo, all that has been here taught, muſt of Courſe be admitted as true, right, and juſt. And now, having conſider'd the *Equality*, and *Union* of the Three Sacred Perſons, it may next be proper to conſider their *Diſtinction*, as it is ſet forth to us in Scripture by the ſeveral *perſonal* Characters belonging to the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy-Ghoſt*.

20. *The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten.*

Were I at liberty to make conjectural Emendations, I wou'd here read, *Pater a nullo eſt: neque factus, nec* &c. *The Father is of none: neither made, nor created,* &c. And thus the next Article (*The Son is of the Father* alone) wou'd better anſwer, and the whole would be more elegant. But having met with no Copy[a] to

a Lazarus Baïfius's *Copy, in* Genebrard, *reads* ὁ πατὴρ ἀπ' ἀδινός ἐστι. *But then it intirely omits* ποιητὸς, *which, as is plain from what follows in the Creed, ought not to be omitted.*

counte-

countenance ſuch a Correction; I muſt not pretend to it, leſt it ſhould appear like correcting the *Author*. However, the Senſe is very plain, and obvious. All the Three *Negatives* here predicated of the Father amount to This one, That He is abſolutely *of None:* This is his peculiar Property, his diſtinguiſhing Character, to be *firſt* in *order*, and the *Head* of every thing; to whom even the *Son* and Holy-Ghoſt are refer'd, but diverſly and in different manner.

21. *The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created, but begotten.*

The Son is here ſaid to be of the Father *alone*, in contradiſtinction to the Holy-Ghoſt, to be named after, who is not of the Father *alone*, but of *Both*. The *Greeks* that ſtruck out the words, *and of the Son*, below, and left the word *alone* here, were not aware of it. This Conduct of Theirs betray'd a Shortneſs of Thought, and at the ſame Time ſerved to ſhow that the *Latins* had not been *Interpolators* of the Creed, but that the *Greeks* had been *Curtailers*. It muſt however be own'd, that the *Greeks* who drew up that Form which Biſhop *Uſher* printed from *Junius*, were wiſe enough to obſerve how this Matter ſtood; and therefore ſtruck out the word *alone* here, as well as *and of the Son* below.

22. *The Holy-Ghoſt is of the Father, and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.*

The peculiar and diſtinguiſhing Character of the Holy-Ghoſt is to *proceed*, and to proceed both from *Father and Son*. Indeed, the Son and Holy-Ghoſt are Both *of the Father*, but in a different manner, to us inexplicable; one by the way of *Generation*, the other by *Proceſſion*, tho' the word *Proceſſion*, in a lax Senſe, has been ſometimes applied to Either. However, to proceed *from the Father* and *the Son*, or, as the *Greeks* will needleſsly cavil, *from the Father* by *the Son*; That is peculiar to the *Holy-Ghoſt*. The *Greeks* and *Latins* have had many, and tedious

Had the Copy run thus, ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων ἐστι. ἅπ μὲν ποιητὸς, ἅπ κτιστὸς &c. *it would have anſwer'd my meaning. Indeed, the firſt Greek Copy in* Labbe's *Councils, and third in* Montfaucon, *run in ſuch a way as I ſuppoſe: But then I take them to have been patch'd up from ſeveral diſtinct Copies, at the pleaſure of the Editor, or Editors: And none of the* Latin *Copies will warrant ſuch a Reading.*

Diſputes

Diſputes about the *Proceſſion*. One Thing is obſervable, that tho' the *Antients*, appeal'd to by Both Parties, have often ſaid that the Holy-Ghoſt proceeds *from the Father*, without mentioning the *Son*, yet They never ſaid that He proceeded from the Father *alone*; ſo that the *modern Greeks* have certainly innovated in That Article, in *Expreſſion* at leaſt, if not in real Senſe and Meaning. As to the *Latins*, They have This to plead, that none of the *Antients* ever condemn'd their Doctrine; that *Many* of them have expreſsly aſſerted it; that the *Oriental* Churches themſelves rather condemn their taking upon them to add any thing to a Creed form'd in a *general Council*, than the *Doctrine* it ſelf; that thoſe *Greek* Churches that charge their Doctrine as Hereſy, yet are forced to admit much the ſame Thing, only in different Words; and that Scripture it ſelf is plain that the Holy-Ghoſt proceeds at leaſt *by the Son*, if not *from Him*; which yet amounts to the ſame Thing.

I ſhould here obſerve, that ſome time before the compiling of This Creed, the uſual Catholick way of ſpeaking of the Holy-Ghoſt, was to ſay, that He was *nec genitus, nec ingenitus*, neither *begotten* nor *unbegotten*, while This Creed by barely denying Him to be *begotten*, ſeems to leave Room to think that He is *unbegotten*. This raiſed a Scruple in the Minds of Some, here in *England*, concerning that part of the Creed, above 700 years ago; as we learn from *Abbo Floriacenſis* of That Time. For *Gregory*'s *Synodicon* admitted here, as well as this Creed, had the very Expreſſion concerning the Holy-Ghoſt, *nec ingenitus, nec genitus*. It might have been eaſy to end the Diſpute, only by diſtinguiſhing upon the *equivocal* meaning of the word *ingenitus*. It had been taken from the *Greek*, ἀγέννητος, which ſignified not barely *unbegotten*, but abſolutely *underived*: in This Senſe the Holy-Ghoſt could not be ſaid to be *ingenitus*. But if it barely means *not begotten*, it may be applied to Him, as it is in the Creed. The whole Difficulty then aroſe only from the Scantineſs of the *Latin* Tongue, in not affording a ſingle word which ſhould fully expreſs the *Greek*, ἀγέννητος, *unoriginate*. *Ingenitus* might tolerably do it; but the word was more commonly taken in a narrower Conſtruction. *Peter Abelard* has hit

hit off the whole Difficulty very clearly; whoſe Words therefore I have thrown into the Margin[a].

23. *So there is one Father, not Three Fathers; one Son, not Three Sons; one Holy-Ghoſt, not Three Holy-Ghoſts.*

Whether This Paragraph be borrowed from St. *Auſtin*, or from an elder Writer under the Name of *Ignatius*, I know not. The Foundation of it was laid in 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *one God the Father*, and *one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; to which it was uſual to add, after reciting it, *and one Holy-Ghoſt*, to compleat the whole number of the divine Perſons. The intent and purport of the words, in This Creed, is to ſet forth the *Diſtinction* of the Three *Perſons*, and their ſeveral *Offices*, and *Characters:* That there is *one Father*, and that He *alone* is *unoriginate*, is *Firſt Perſon*, is *Head*, &c. and neither the *Son* nor *Holy-Ghoſt* have any ſhare in theſe Titles, or Characters, to make Three *Unoriginates*, Three *Heads*, &c. That there is *one Son*, and He alone *begotten*, and afterwards *incarnate*, &c. which *Characters* and *Offices* belong not to the other Two, but are *diſtinct*, and *appropriate* to one. And there is *one Holy-Ghoſt*, whoſe *Character* is to *proceed*, and whoſe *Office* is to *ſanctify*, which Character and Office are not to be aſcribed, in the ſame Senſe, to the other Two; for That would be *confounding* the perſonal Characters and Offices, and making *Three Holy-Ghoſts*, inſtead of one.

24. *And in This Trinity, none is afore or after other; none is greater or leſs than another; but the whole Three Perſons are coeternal together, and coequal.*

The Compiler of the Creed now returns to the *Equality* and *Unity* of the Perſons; that He may at length ſum up and throw into a ſhort Compaſs what He had ſaid upon the *Trinity*, before He ſhould paſs on to the other great Article, The *Incarnation*.

a Solum itaque Patrem *ingenitum* dicimus, hoc eſt, a ſeipſo non ab alio: unde *Auguſtinus* adverſus *Felicianum* Arianum; *Patrem ingenitum dico, quia non proceſſit ab altero.*——— Aliud itaque dicere eſt Patrem *ingenitum*, aliud *non genitum* ——— Spiritus vero ſanctus ipſe quoque eſt *non genitus* ———Nec tamen ideo eſt *ingenitus*, cum ipſe ab alio ſit, tam a Patre ſcilicet quam a Filio procedens. Solus itaque Pater *ingenitus* dicitur, ſicut ſolus Filius *genitus*: Spiritus vero ſanctus nec *genitus* eſt, nec *ingenitus*, ſed, ut dictum eſt, *non genitus*. *Abaelard.* Introd. ad Theolog. l. 1. p. 983.

When

When it is ſaid, *none is afore or after other*, we are not to underſtand it of *Order*; for the Father is *Firſt*, the Son *Second*, and the Holy-Ghoſt *Third* in Order. Neither are we to underſtand it of *Office*; for the Father is *ſupreme* in Office, while the Son and Holy-Ghoſt condeſcend to *inferior* Offices. But we are to underſtand it, as the Creed it ſelf explains it, of *Duration*, and of *Dignity*; in which reſpect, none is *afore or after*, none *greater* or *leſs*, but the whole Three *Perſons coeternal*, and *coequal*.

25. *So that in all Things, as is aforeſaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worſhipped.*

In all Things, (*per omnia*,) *as is aforeſaid*. One of the *Greek* Copies tacks theſe words to the former Article, making them run thus; *coequal in all Things, as aforeſaid*. Another *Greek* Copy reads them thus, *coequal in all Things: ſo that in all Things, as is now ſaid*, &c. Both interpret the *all Things* of the Coequality in *all Things*. And indeed *Venantius Fortunatus* in his Comment, long before, ſeems to have underſtood, *per omnia*, in the ſame way, to ſignify that the Son is what the Father is, in all *eſſential*, or *ſubſtantial* Perfections. And it is favoured both by what goes before and after: For from ſpeaking of the *Coeternity* and *Coequality*, the Author proceeds to ſay, *ſo that* in all Things, as aforeſaid, *the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worſhip'd*; namely, on account of their perfect *Coeternity*, and *Coequality*: to which He ſubjoins, *He therefore that will be ſaved*, &c. Wherefore I incline to the moderate Opinion of Thoſe who think that the Author here does not lay the ſtreſs upon every little nicety of Explication before given, but upon the main Doctrine, of a *Coequal* and *Coeternal* Trinity [a].

a Le Quien's *ingenuous, and handſom Reflection, upon the Conduct of Pope* Gregory *the IXth's Legates, may deſerve a recital here.*

Quamquam non poſſum quin ingenue fatear Nuncios Apoſtolicos conſultiùs facturos fuiſſe, ſi ab ejuſmodi Sententia pronuntianda ſibi temperaſſent; *Qui credit Spiritum Sanctum non procedere ex Filio, in via perditionis eſt:* Tunc quippe Temporis Eccleſia Catholica in nulla Synodo Generali hoc de Capite judicium definitorium tulerat. *Panopl.* contr. Schiſm. Græcor. p. 360.

Wickliff's *Comment on this Paragraph, put into modern* Engliſh, *will not appear contemptible: It is thus:*

"*And ſo we conclude here, as it is before ſaid, that there is both an* Unity *of* Godhead,

26. *He*

26. *He therefore that will be ſaved, muſt thus think of the Trinity.*

Thus, as conſiſting of Three Perſons, *coeternal* and *coequal*, and all *one God*; diſtinct enough to be *Three*, united enough to be *One*; diſtinct without Diviſion, united without Confuſion.

27. *Furthermore, it is neceſſary to everlaſting Salvation, that He alſo believe rightly* [a] *the Incarnation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

Much depends upon our having true and juſt Sentiments of the *Incarnation*, in which the whole Oeconomy of our Salvation is nearly concern'd. To corrupt and deprave This Doctrine, is to defeat and fruſtrate, in a great meaſure, the Goſpel of Chriſt which bringeth Salvation: Wherefore it is of great Moment, of everlaſting Concernment to us, not to be guilty of doing it our ſelves, nor to take part with Thoſe that do.

28. *For, the right Faith is, that we believe and confeſs, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, is God and Man.*

There have been Hereticks who would not allow that our Saviour Chriſt was *Man*, but in ſuch a Senſe as a Shadow, or a Picture of a Man, may be called a Man: And there have been others who would not allow that Chriſt is *God*, but in ſuch a Senſe as any *Creature* whatever might be called, or may be made a God. But all good Chriſtians have ever abhorr'd thoſe vile Tenets, and conformably to Scripture, rightly and juſtly interpreted, have believed and confeſs'd that Chriſt is both really God, and really Man, one *God-man*.

29. *God, of the Subſtance of the Father begotten before the Worlds; and Man, of the Subſtance of his Mother, born in the World.*

We are forced to be thus particular, and expreſſive, in the wording of this Article, becauſe of the many Wiles, Equivocations, and Diſguiſes of Thoſe, who endeavor to corrupt the Faith. The *Arians* make of Chriſt a *created* God, and call Him *God* on account only of his *Office*, and not of his *Nature*, or

" *and a* Trinity *of* Perſons; *and that the* Trinity *in This* Unity is to be worſhipp'd *above* " *all other things*: *And* whoſoever will be ſaved muſt thus think of the Trinity; *if not* " *thus explicitely* (*or in every particular*) *yet thus in the* general, *or implicitely.*

a Ὀρθῶς πιστεύῃ. *So* Bryling's *Greek Copy. The* Latin *Copies have*, Fideliter credat. *Some Greek Copies read* πιστῶς, *or* βεβαίως, *tho' Two, beſides* Bryling's, *have alſo* ὀρθῶς.

unchangeable Subſtance. For this reaſon, we are obliged to be particular in expreſſing his *Subſtance*, as being not *frail, mutable, periſhing*, as the Subſtance of Creatures is, but eternal and unchangeable, and all one with the Father's. On the other Hand, the *Apollinarians* and other Hereticks have pretended, either that Chriſt had no Human Body at all, or that He brought it with Him from Heaven, and took it not of the Virgin-Mother: We are therefore forced to be particular in this Profeſſion, that He was Man *of the Subſtance of his Mother:* which, tho' it be not taught in *expreſs* words, yet is very plainly the Senſe and Meaning of Holy Scripture on this Article; and was never queſtion'd till, conceited Men came to pervert the true Doctrine of Sacred Writ, by falſe Gloſſes and Comments of their own.

30. *Perfect God, and perfect Man of a reaſonable Soul, and Human Fleſh ſubſiſting.*

Here again, the Perverſeneſs of Hereticks has made it neceſſary to guard the Faith by ſtrong and expreſſive Words that cannot eaſily be eluded. Chriſt is *perfect God*, not ſuch a *nominal* imperfect God as *Arians*, and *Photinians* pretend. He is moreover *perfect Man*, which it is neceſſary to inſiſt upon againſt the *Apollinarians*, who pretended that He had a *Human* Body only without any *Rational* Soul; imagining the *Logos* to have ſupplied the Place of the *rational*, or *reaſonable* Soul: whereas in reality He had both a *Soul* and *Body*, as all Men have, and was therefore *perfect Man.*

31. *Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead; and Inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood.*

Which needs no Comment.

32. *Who altho' He be God and Man, yet He is not Two, but one Chriſt.*

This is ſaid, to guard againſt Calumny and Miſ-conſtruction. For, becauſe the Church aſſerted *Two Natures* in Chriſt, whereby He is both *perfect God*, and *perfect Man*, the *Apollinarians*, having an Hypotheſis of their own to ſerve, pretended that This was making *Two Chriſts*, a *Divine Chriſt*, as to one Nature, and a *Human Chriſt* in the other: Which was a vain Thought,

ſince

ſince Both the Natures join'd in the one *God-man*, make ſtill but *one Chriſt*, both God and Man.

33. *One, not by Converſion of the Godhead into Fleſh, but by taking of the Manhood into God.*

The *Apollinarian* way of making *one Chriſt* by confounding the two Natures in one, and by ſubjecting the Godhead to *Change*, is here condemn'd. There is no need of running theſe injudicious, and abſurd Lengths, for ſolving the Difficulty how the two Natures make *one Chriſt:* He did not change his *divine* Nature, or convert it into *Fleſh*, tho' He be ſaid to have been *made Fleſh*; He took Fleſh upon Him, He aſſumed human Nature, took Man into an Union with God, and thus was He *One Chriſt.*

34. *One altogether, not by Confuſion of Subſtance, but by Unity of Perſon.*

We are thus forc'd to diſtinguiſh, with the utmoſt Nicety and Accuracy, to obviate the Cavils, and Pretences of Hereticks. Chriſt then is *one altogether*, intirely one, tho' his two Natures remain *diſtinct*. He is not one by *confounding*, or *mingling* two Natures or Subſtances, into one Nature or Subſtance; (as the *Apollinarians* pretended) but by uniting them Both in *one Perſon*; one I, one He, one Chriſt, as Scripture every where repreſents.

35. *For, as the reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is one Man; ſo God and Man is one Chriſt.*

That is to ſay, There are two very diſtinct, and different Subſtances in Man, a *Body* and a *Soul*; one material, the other immaterial, one mortal, the other immortal; and Both theſe Subſtances, nevertheleſs, make up but *one Man*. Not by *confounding* or *mingling* thoſe two different Subſtances (for they are intirely *diſtinct*, and *different*, and will ever remain ſo) but by uniting them in *one Perſon*. Even ſo, may the Two diſtinct Natures *Divine* and *Human* in Chriſt, make *one Perſon*; And This is really and truly the Caſe in Fact.

36. *Who ſuffered for our Salvation, deſcended into Hell, roſe again the third day from the Dead,*

The Author having finiſh'd his Explication of the great Article of *God incarnate*, now goes on to other Parts of the

Creed, ſuch as were commonly inſerted in the Creeds before. The Article of *The Deſcent into Hell* had not indeed, at This Time, come into the *Roman*, otherwiſe called the *Apoſtles* Creed: But it had been inſerted in the Creed of *Aquileia*, and had been all along the ſtanding Doctrine of the Church. I ſhall leave it, as our Church has left it, without any particular Interpretation; referring the Reader to Thoſe who have commented on the *Apoſtles* Creed, and particularly to the much admired Author of *The Hiſtory of it*, who hath exhauſted the Subject.

37. *He aſcended into Heaven, He ſitteth on the right Hand of the Father, God Almighty, from whence He ſhall come to judge the Quick and the Dead.*

Theſe are all ſo many Articles of the *Roman* Creed, and probably taken from it: excepting only, that the words, *God Almighty*, appear not in the moſt antient Manuſcripts; and, very probably, were not originally in This Creed, any more than in the antient *Roman*.

38. *At whoſe Coming, all Men ſhall riſe again with their Bodies; and ſhall give account for their own Works.*

Here are Two very expreſſive Phraſes, *All Men*, All that have died, or ſhall die, to obviate the falſe Opinion of a *partial* Reſurrection; and *with their Bodies* to obviate the Notion of thoſe, who either thought that the *Soul* only ſhould continue for ever, while the Body ſhould be left to periſh, or that the *Reſurrection-Body* ſhould be quite of another *Matter*, *Form*, or *Kind*, than what our Bodies are here. I have hinted in my *Latin* Notes above, that ſome Words are wanting in the *Ambroſian* Manuſcript; and I may here obſerve farther, that in the words of the Creed, as they commonly run, there is not all the *Accuracy* that might have been: For *All Men* ſhall not riſe, but only All that *die*. However, it ſeems that about that Time, there was ſome Variety of Sentiments in reſpect of That Article, as we may learn from *Gennadius*[a]; which was owing to

a Omnium Hominum erit Reſurrectio: Si omnium erit, ergo omnes moriuntur, ut mors ab *Adam* ducta omnibus filiis ejus dominetur, & maneat illud privilegium in Domino, quod de eo ſpecialitur dicitur: *non dabis Sanctum tuum videre Corruptionem*. ——Hanc rationem maximâ patrum turbâ tradente ſuſcepimus. Verùm quia ſunt & the

the different Reading of 1. *Cor.* 15. 51. from whence, probably, aroſe ſome Variation in the Copies of this Creed. See *Pearſon* on the *Apoſtles*, Creed. *Artic.* 7.

39. *And They that have done Good ſhall go into Life everlaſting, and They that have done Evil into everlaſting Fire.*

This is the expreſs Doctrine of Scripture, and appears almoſt in the ſame Words, *Joh.* 5. 28. *Matt.* 25. 46. to ſay nothing of many other Texts to the ſame Effect. Yet This Article, or rather theſe two Articles had not gain'd Admittance into the *Apoſtles* Creed ſo early as the IVth Century, the latter of 'em not at all. But, I ſuppoſe, the Opinion ſaid to have been ſtarted by *Origen*, that wicked Men and even Devils, after a certain Revolution, ſhould have their Releaſe and Reſtoration, might make it the more neceſſary, or convenient at leaſt, to inſert theſe Articles in the Creeds, and to expreſs the Puniſhment of the damn'd by the words *eternal Fire:* For the *Origeniſts*, at That Time, denied both the *Eternity* of the *Fire*, and alſo it's *Reality*, as appears from *Oroſius* in St. *Auſtin*[a].

40. *This is the Catholick Faith, which except a Man believe faithfully*[b], *He cannot be ſaved.*

This is to be underſtood, like all other ſuch general Propoſitions, with proper Reſerves, and qualifying Conſtructions. As for Inſtance, if after laying down a Syſtem of Chriſtian Morality, it be ſaid, *This is the Chriſtian Practice, which except a Man faithfully obſerve and follow, He cannot be ſaved*; it would be no more than right, and juſt thus to ſay: But no

Alii, æque Catholici & eruditi viri, qui credunt, anima in Corpore manente, mutandos ad incorruptionem & immortalitatem Eos qui in Adventu Domini *vivi* inveniendi ſunt, & Hoc eis reputari *pro reſurrectione* ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem immutatione deponant, non morte; quolibet quis adquieſcat modo, non eſt Hæreticus, niſi ex contentione Hæreticus fiat. Sufficit enim in Eccleſiæ Lege, Carnis Reſurrectionem credere futuram de morte. *Gennad.* Eccleſ. Dogm. c. 7.

a Ignem ſane æternum, quo peccatores puniantur, neque eſſe *ignem verum*, neque *æternum* prædicaverunt, dicentes dictum eſſe ignem propriæ Conſcientiæ punitionem, *æternum* autem, juxta etymologiam Græcam, non eſſe *perpetuum*, &c. Epiſt. *Oroſii* ad Auguſt. inter *Aug. Op. Tom.* 8. p. 607.

b Πιστὸς πιστεύσῃ. *So* Bryling's *Copy, which our Tranſlators followed.*

The Latin *Copies have*, fideliter, firmiterque crediderit. *And the other* Greek *Copies*, Πιστός τε ἐ βεβαίως πιστεύσῃ. Or, ὃν πίστεως βεβαίως πιστεύσῃ.

one

one could be ſuppoſed hereby to exclude any ſuch merciful Abatements, or Allowances, as ſhall be made for Men's particular Circumſtances, Weakneſſes, Frailties, Ignorance, Inability, or the Like; or for their *ſincere* Intentions, and *honeſt* deſires of knowing, and doing the whole will of God; accompanied with a *general* Repentance of their *Sins*, and a firm Reliance upon God's Mercy, through the ſole Merits of Chriſt Jeſus. There can be no doubt, however, but that Men are accountable for their *Faith*, as well as for their *Practice*: And eſpecially if They take upon them to inſtruct and direct others, truſting to their own Strength and Parts, againſt the united Judgment and Verdict of *whole Churches* antient and modern.

CHAP. XI.

The Church of England vindicated, both as to the Receiving, and Retaining the Athanaſian Creed.

THERE would be no Occaſion for this Chapter, had not a late Author[a] of Name and Character, out of his abundant Zeal to promote *Arianiſm*, taken upon Him to diſparage this excellent Form of Faith; nay and to apply, with ſome earneſtneſs, to *The Governors of our Church*, to get it laid aſide. He thinks, *it may well deſerve the moſt ſerious and deliberate Conſideration of the Governors of the Church, whether it would not be more advantagious to the true intereſt of the Chriſtian Religion, to retain only thoſe more indiſputable Forms*[a]; that is, to have This wholly taken away, or at leaſt not impoſed in our *Articles*, or Liturgy. Then He ſubjoins his *Reaſons*: Which becauſe They may be preſumed to be the cloſeſt, and ſtrongeſt that can be offered on That Side, and becauſe They have hitherto ſtood without any particular Confutation on one Hand, or Retractation on the other, I ſhall here take upon me to anſwer them, as briefly as may be.

a *Clarke's Scrip. Doctr.* Edit. 1ſt. p. 446, 447.

1. The

OBJECTION. I.

The first is, that *This Creed is confessed not to be* Athanasius's, *but the Composition of an uncertain obscure Author, written in one of the darkest and most ignorant Ages of the Church; having never appear'd till about the Year* 800, *nor been received in the Church till so very late as about the Year* 1000.

ANSW. As to the *false Facts* contain'd in This Article, I need only refer to the preceding Sheets. As to the Creed being none of *Athanasius*'s, which is certainly *true*, it is to be consider'd, that our Church receives it not upon the *Authority* of its Compiler, nor determines any thing about its *Age*, or *Author*: But We receive it because the Truth of the Doctrines contained in it, *may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy-Scripture*, as is expressly said in our VIIIth Article. I may add, that the *early* and *general* Reception of this Creed by *Greeks* and *Latins*, by all the *Western* Churches, not only before, but since the *Reformation*, must needs give it a much greater *Authority* and *Weight* than the single Name of *Athanasius* could do, were it ever so justly to be set to it. *Athanasius* has left some Creeds and Confessions, undoubtedly his, which yet never have obtain'd the Esteem and Reputation that This hath done: Because none of them are really of the same intrinsick Value, nor capable of doing the like Service in the Christian Churches. The use of it is, to be a standing Fence and Preservative against the wiles and equivocations of most kinds of Hereticks. This was well understood by *Luther*, when He called it, *A Bulwark to the Apostles Creed*;[a] much to the same purpose with what has been above cited from *Ludolphus Saxo*.[b] And it was this and the like Considerations that have all along

a *Athanasii* scilicet *Symbolum* est paulo prolixius, & ad confutandos *Arianos* Hæreticos, aliquanto uberius declarat, & illustrat Articulum alterum de Divinitate Christi Jesu ——— estque Hoc velut Propugnaculum primi illius *Apostolici* Symboli. *Luther.* de Trib. Symbol. Oper. Tom. VII. p. 138.

b *Thus also* Alexander *of* Hales, 100 *years before* Ludolphus.

Causa multiplicationis *Symbolorum* fuit triplex: *Institutio Fidei, veritatis explanatio, erroris exclusio.* ——— Erroris exclusio, propter Hæreses multiplices pullulantes, causa fuit *Symboli Athanasii*, quod cantatur in Prima. *Alex. Ad. Alens.* Part. 3. Q. 69. Membr. 2. p. 541. Johan. Januensis *in his* Catholicon, (*An.* 1286) *under* Symbolum, *says the same Thing.*

made

made it to be of ſuch high Eſteem among all the *Reformed Churches*, from the Days of their great Leader.

OBJECT. II.

The ſecond reaſon aſſign'd for laying this Form aſide, is, *that it is ſo worded, as that many of the* common People *cannot but be too apt to underſtand it in a Senſe favouring either* Sabellianiſm, *or* Tritheiſm.

ANSW. This Objection is not particularly level'd againſt This Creed, but againſt all Creeds containing the Doctrine of a *Coeternal Trinity in Unity:* It is therefore an Objection rather againſt the *Faith* of the *Church*, (which thoſe Gentlemen endeavor conſtantly to run down, under the notion of *Sabellianiſm*, or *Tritheiſm*) than againſt This particular Form of Expreſſing it.

I may further add, that the *Common-People* will be in no danger of running either into *Sabellianiſm*, or *Tritheiſm*, if They attend to the *Creed it ſelf* (which fully obviates and confutes Both thoſe Hereſies) inſtead of liſtening to Thoſe who firſt induſtriouſly labour to *deceive* them into a falſe Conſtruction of the Creed, and then complain of the *Common-People*'s being *too apt* to miſ-underſtand it. This is not ingenuous, nor upright dealing with the *Common People*.

OBJECT. III.

A Third reaſon is, that *there are in* This Creed *many Phraſes, which —— may ſeem to give* Unbelievers *a needleſs Advantage of objecting againſt Religion; and among* Believers *themſelves, cannot but to the* Vulgar *have too much the appearance of Contradictions: And ſometimes (eſpecially the Damnatory Clauſes) have given offence to the piouſeſt and moſt learned Men, inſomuch as to have been the principal Reaſon of Mr.* Chillingworth's *refuſing to ſubſcribe the* 39 *Articles.*

ANSW. As to *Unbelievers*, and their *Objections*, the *Church* has been always able, and willing to anſwer them; ſorry at the ſame time to find, that Any, who call themſelves *Chriſtians*; ſhould join with the *Unbelievers* in the ſame trifling Objections, thereby giving the *Unbelievers* a very *needleſs Advantage*, and the moſt pernicious

cious Encouragement. As to *vulgar* Believers, they ſuſpect no *Contradictions*, till Some, who think themſelves above the *Vulgar*, labour to create ſuch a Suſpicion in Them. Leave the *Vulgar* to their *better* Guides, and their true *Orthodox* Paſtors, without endeavouring to *corrupt* or *ſeduce* them; and then all will be ſafe, and eaſy.

As to Mr. *Chillingworth*, He had for a while, 'tis owned, ſome Scruples upon Him, about the *Fourth Commandment as appertaining to Chriſtians*, and about the *Damnatory Clauſes* in the *Athanaſian* Creed; and therefore refuſed to *ſubſcribe* for a Time. This was in the year 1635. But within Three years after, upon more mature Conſideration, He happily got over his Difficulties, and *ſubſcribed*, July the 20th, in the year 1638; as ſtands upon record in the *Office* of *Sarum*, where He was inſtituted *Chancellor* of the Church. [a]

Object. IV.

A Fourth reaſon offered, not for laying aſide this Creed, I ſuppoſe, but for the Governors taking it into conſideration, is, that *the Preface to the Book of Common-Prayer declares that particular Forms of Divine-Worſhip, and Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be uſed therein, being Things in their own Nature indifferent and alterable, may, upon the various exigency of Times and Occaſions*, be changed or alter'd.

Answ. No doubt but the Church may, if it be thought proper or expedient, throw out all the Creeds out of her *daily Service*, or *Articles*, and retain one only in the *Office* of *Baptiſm*, as formerly. But, I ſuppoſe, the Authors of the *Preface* to the *Book of Common-Prayer*, had no thought of excluding any of the *three Creeds* among their *alterable Forms* of worſhip, or *Rites* and *Ceremonies*: Nor will the revival of *Arianiſm* be ever look'd upon as one of thoſe *Exigencies of Times* that ſhall make it expedient

a Ego Gulielmus Chillingworth, Clericus, in Artibus Magiſter, ad Cancellariatum Eccleſiæ Cathedralis Beatæ Mariæ Sarum, una cum Præbenda de Brinworth, alias Brickleſworth, in Comitatu Northampton Petriburgenſis Diœceſeos in eadem Eccleſia fundata, & eidem Cancellariatui annexa, admittendus & inſtituendus, omnibus hiſce Articulis, & ſingulis in eiſdem contentis volens & ex animo ſubſcribo, & conſenſum meum eiſdem præbeo, viceſimo die Julii, 1638. *Gulielmus Chillingworth.*

to part with our Creeds; but, a reaſon rather for retaining them the more firmly, or even for taking them in again, had any of them ever been unhappily thrown out.

Object. V.

A further reaſon pleaded, is, that *Scripture alone is ſufficient*; that *the Primitive Church was very cautious* about *multiplying Creeds*; *that the Council of* Epheſus *forbad, under the penalty of an Anathema, any other Creed after That of* Nice *to be propoſed, or received in the Church.*

Answ. The whole deſign and end of *Creeds* is to preſerve the *Rule of Faith*, as contain'd in the holy *Scriptures*, and not in the *falſe* gloſſes, and corrupt *Inventions* of Men. And when Endeavors are uſed to *poiſon* thoſe Fountains of Truth, by ill *Comments*, and forc'd Conſtructions; *Preſervatives* muſt be thought on to keep the Fountain *pure*, and the Faith *ſound* and *whole*.

As to the *Primitive* Churches, their conſtant way was to inlarge their Creeds in proportion to the Growth of *Hereſies*; that ſo every *Corruption* ariſing to the *Faith* of *Chriſt*, might have an immediate *Remedy*: without which prudent and wiſe Caution, The Faith would have been loſt, in a little Time, through the Wiles and Artifices of ſubtle, intriguing Men.

The Council of *Epheſus* made no order againſt *new Creeds*, that is, Creeds ſtill more and more inlarged, if there ſhould be occaſion, but againſt a *new Faith* (ἑτέραν πίστιν) a Faith *different* from and *repugnant* to that of *Nice*, ſuch as was offer'd by the *Neſtorians* in That Council. This is the *literal* conſtruction, and real *intended* meaning of That Decree of the *Epheſine* Council:[a] Tho' had They intended it againſt the receiving any *other Form* but the *Nicene*; all that follows from it is, that They thought no more neceſſary at *That Time*; or that *Definitions* in Councils (as in the Council of *Chalcedon* afterwards) or *Condemnation* of Heretical Tenets might ſuffice, leaving the *Baptiſmal* Creed (all Creeds were ſuch at That Time) juſt as was before. How-

a Vid. *Stephan.* de *Altimura* (i.e. *Le Quien*) Panopliam contra Schiſm. Græc. p. 130, 158. & Diſſertat. *Damaſcen.* p. 14. &c.

ever

ever, the Practice of the Church afterwards, in *multiplying* Creeds as need required, at the same Time that They acknowledg'd the *Ephesine* Council, shows fully how they understood it. Nay the constant Reception of the *Constantinopolitan* Creed (which is the *Nicene interpolated*, and yet was never understood to be excluded by the *Ephesine* Canon) shews plainly the Sense of the *Synod* in That matter. It is to be noted, that the *Ephesine* Council, by *Nicene Creed*, meant the *Nicene* strictly so called,[a] and which had already been *interpolated* by the *Constantinopolitan* Council.

OBJECT. VI.

Another Plea offer'd, is, that in the year 1689, many wise and good Prelates of our own (commission'd to *review* and *correct* our Liturgy) *unanimously agreed*, that *the use of the* Athanasian *Creed should no longer be imposed.*

ANSW. There may be reason to question the Truth of this Report. There are two Accounts which I have seen of This matter; one of Dr. *Nichols*, the other of Dr. *Calamy* which He received of a Friend. Dr. *Nichols*'s Account runs thus. "*Atha-* "*nasius*'s Creed being disliked by many, because of the *Dam-* "*natory* Clauses, it was left to the *Minister*'s choice, either to "use it, or to change it for the *Apostles* Creed.[b] Dr. *Calamy*'s Account is thus: "About the *Athanasian* Creed, They came "at last to this Conclusion: That lest the wholly rejecting it "should by unreasonable Persons be imputed to them as *Soci-* "*nianism*, a *Rubrick* shall be made, setting forth, or declaring "the *Curses* denounced therein not to be restrain'd to every par- "ticular Article, but intended against Those that deny the sub- "stance of the Christian Religion in general.[c] Now, from these Two Accounts compared, it may be reasonable to believe that those wise and good Prelates had once drawn up a Scheme to be debated and canvass'd, in which Scheme it was proposed

a Vid. *Le Quien*: ibid. p. 230. & Dissert. *Damescen.* p. 18.
b *Nicholsii* Apparat. ad Defens. Eccl. Angl. p. 95.
c Calamy's *Life of* Baxter. *Vol.* 1. *p.* 455.

to leave every *Miniſter* at liberty with reſpect to the *Athanaſian* Creed: But, upon more mature conſideration, *They came at laſt to this concluſion*, to impoſe the Creed as before, and to qualify the ſeeming Harſhneſs of the *Damnatory* Clauſes by a ſoftning *Rubrick*. They were therefore, at length *unanimouſly agreed* ſtill to *retain*, and *impoſe* This Creed; quite contrary to the *Objector*'s Report. And indeed it muſt have appear'd very Aſtoniſhing in the eyes of all the *Reformed* Churches, *Lutheran* and *Calviniſt* (who have the greateſt Veneration for This Creed) to have ſeen it wholly rejected by the *Engliſh* Clergy, when there had been no precedent before of any one Church in Chriſtendom that had done the like. All that ever received it, have conſtantly retain'd it and ſtill retain it. It is further to be conſidered, that what Thoſe very worthy Prelates at that time intended, ſprung from a juſt and becoming Tenderneſs to the *Diſſenters*, becauſe of their long *Scruples* againſt the *Damnatory* Clauſes. But there is not the ſame reaſon at This Day: The wiſer and more moderate Part of the *Diſſenting Miniſters*[a] ſeem very well reconciled to the *Damnatory* Clauſes, *modeſtly expounded*; as Dr. *Wallis* particularly has expounded them, *juſtly* and *truly*, as well as *modeſtly*. And I am confident, the ſoberer *Diſſenters* would not, at *this Time*, wiſh to ſee ſo excellent, and ſo uſeful a Form of Faith laid aſide, only to ſerve the Intereſts of our new *Arians*. However, ſince the *Damnatory* Clauſes were the main difficulty, a better way might have been contriv'd than was then thought on; namely, to have preſerved the whole Creed except thoſe Clauſes, which are ſeparable from it. But the beſt of all, as I humbly conceive, is what has prevailed, and ſtill obtains, to let it ſtand as before; ſince the *Damnatory* Clauſes have been often and ſufficiently

a *This Creed by whomſoever framed, hath been long received in the church, and look'd on as agreeable to the Scriptures, and an excellent Explication of the Chriſtian Faith.* Conſtantinople, Rome, *and the* Reformed *Churches have owned it* ——— *our pious and excellent Mr.* Baxter, *in his* Method *of Theol. p.* 123, *Speaks thus of it:* "*In a word, the damnato-*" *ry Sentences excepted, or modeſtly expounded* (ſuch a modeſt Explication of the Damna-" tory Clauſes ſee in Dr. *Wallis &c.*) *I embrace the Creed commonly called* Athanaſius's, *as* " *the beſt explication of the Trinity.* And in Vol. II. of his works p. 132. ſays He, *I un-*" *feignedly account the Doctrine of the Trinity, the ſum and kernel of the Chriſtian Religion,* " *as expreſs'd in our Baptiſm, and* Athanaſius's *Creed, the beſt Explication of it I ever read.* Doctrine of the Trinity ſtated &c. *by ſome* London Miniſters. p. 62, 63.

vindi-

vindicated by the *reformed* Churches abroad,[a] as well as by our own here.

OBJECT. VII.

It is pleaded farther, moſtly in the words of Biſhop *Taylor*, that the *Apoſtles Creed is the Rule of Faith*, that This only is *neceſſary to Baptiſm*, that what was once *ſufficient to bring Men to Heaven, muſt be ſo* now; that there is no occaſion for being ſo *minute* and *particular* in the matter of *Creeds*; with more to the like purpoſe.

ANSW. 1. Dr. *Taylor* goes upon a falſe ſuppoſition that the Creed called the *Apoſtles* was compiled by the Apoſtles.

2. He has another *falſe* preſumption, appearing all the way in his reaſonings on this Head, that the *Apoſtles* Creed has been always the *ſame* that it is now: whereas learned Men know that it was not brought to its preſent Form till about the year 600, is nothing elſe but the Baptiſmal Creed of one particular Church, the Church of *Rome*, and deſignedly *ſhort* for the eaſe of thoſe who were to repeat it at Baptiſm. Now, when we are told of the *Apoſtles* Creed containing all that is *neceſſary to Salvation*, and *no more than is neceſſary*; we would gladly know whether it be meant of the *old ſhort Roman Creed*,[b] or of the *preſent one*, conſiderably *larger:* And if They intend the *old one*, why Application is not made to our Governors to lay the *new one* aſide, or to curtail, and reduce it to its primitive ſize; by leaving out

a Tentzelius, *a* Lutheran, *is very ſmart upon this Head, againſt the* Arminians, *for their objecting to the* Damnatory *Sentences.*

Verum injuſte, atque impudenter accuſant initium *Symboli*, quod pridem vindicarunt noſtrates Theologi: *Dannhawerus* in Stylo vindice p. 200. *Hulſemannus* de Auxiliis Gratiæ p. 218. *Kromayerus* in Theologia poſitivo polemica. p. 98, 99. & in Scrutinio Religionum p. 205. aliique paſſim. *Tentzel.* p. 110. *To theſe which* Tentzelius *has mention'd, I may add* David Pareus (*a Calviniſt*) *in his comment upon this Creed, publiſh'd at the end of* Urſinus's *Catechiſm. A. D.* 1634. *by* Philip Pareus.

b *The old* Roman (*or* Apoſtles) *Creed was no more than This, as may be ſeen in Biſhop* Uſher, *de Symbol.* p. 6. *and* 9.

" *I believe in God the Father Almighty: And in Jeſus Chriſt his only Son our Lord; who* " *was born of the Holy-Ghoſt and the Virgin Mary; crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried,* " *roſe again the third day from the dead, aſcended into Heaven, ſitteth at the right Hand of the* " *Father, from whence He ſhall come to judge the Quick and Dead. And in the Holy-Ghoſt,* " *the Holy Church, the Remiſſion of Sins, The reſurrection of the Body.* Amen.

the

the Belief, or Profeſſion of God's being *Creator of Heaven and Earth*, and of Chriſt's being *dead*, and of his *Deſcent into Hell*, and of the Church being *Catholick*, and of the *communion of Saints*, and *Life everlaſting*, as unneceſſary Articles of Faith. For why may not That ſuffice *now*, which was *once* ſufficient? or how can any thing be *neceſſary* at This Day, that was not ſo from the Beginning?

3. To ſet this whole matter right, it ought to be conſidered, that *Creeds* were never intended to contain, as it were, *a certain Quantity of Faith*, as neceſſary to bring Men to Heaven, and no more than is neceſſary. Were This the Caſe, All Creeds ought preciſely to have conſiſted of an *equal* number of Articles, and the *ſame individual* Articles: Whereas there are no two Creeds any where to be found which anſwer to ſuch exactneſs. A plain Argument that the Church, in forming of Creeds, early and late, went upon no ſuch view, but upon quite another principle. The Deſign of all was, to keep up as ſtrictly as poſſible the whole *Compages*, or *Fabrick* of the Chriſtian Faith as it ſtands in *Scripture*: And if any *Part* came to be attack'd, They were then to bend all their Cares to ſuccour and relieve That Part, in order ſtill to ſecure the *Whole*. Some few of the main *Stamina*, or chief Lines, were taken care of from the firſt, and made up the firſt Creeds: particularly, the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* briefly hinted, and ſcarce any thing more, becauſe the Form of Baptiſm led to it. As to other *Articles*, or larger Explications of *This*, They came in occaſionally, according as This or That part of the Chriſtian Faith ſeem'd moſt to be endanger'd, and to require preſent Relief. And as This varied in ſeveral Countries, or Churches (ſome being more diſturbed than others, and ſome with one kind of Hereſy, others with another) ſo the Creeds likewiſe varied; ſome inſiſting particularly upon This Article, others upon That, as need required, and all ſtill endeavouring to keep up and maintain one whole and intire Syſtem of the Chriſtian Faith, according to the true and full meaning of ſacred Writ. There is nothing more in it than the very nature and circumſtance of the Thing neceſſarily leads to. I may illuſtrate the caſe a little farther by an eaſy parallel between

tween matters of *Faith*, and matters of *Practice*. The ſum of Chriſtian Practice is contain'd in Two brief Rules, To *love God*, and *to love one's Neighbour*; which comprehend all. No one needs more than This; nor indeed can there be any thing more. But then a perverſe Man may poſſibly underſtand by *God*, not the *true God*, the God of *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, but ſome other of his own deviſing, or ſuch as has been received by *Pagans*, or Hereticks: And He may underſtand by *Neighbour* one of his own *Country* only, or *Tribe*, or *Sect*, or *Family*. Well then, to obviate any ſuch method of undermining *Chriſtian Practice*, it will be neceſſary to be a little more *particular* than barely to lay down in brief To *love God*, and *one*'s *Neighbour*. We muſt add, The *true God*, the God of *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, That very God and none elſe: And as to *Neighbour*, we muſt inſiſt upon it, that it means, not This or That *Sect*, *Tribe*, *Party*, &c. but all Mankind. And now our *Rule* of *Practice* begins to extend and inlarge it ſelf beyond its primitive Simplicity; but not without reaſon. To proceed a little farther; Miſtakes, and perverſe Sentiments may ariſe in the interpreting the word *Love*, ſo as thereby to evacuate and fruſtrate the Primary, and Fundamental Rule: To correct and remove which, it may be neceſſary ſtill farther to *inlarge* the *Rule* of *Practice*, and to branch it out into many other particulars; which to mention would be needleſs. Now if ſuch a method as This will of courſe be neceſſary to preſerve the *Eſſentials* of *Practice*; let it not be thought ſtrange if the like has been made uſe of to preſerve the *Eſſentials* of *Faith*. There is the ſame Reaſon, and the like Occaſion for Both: And if due care be taken in Both, to make all the Branches hang naturally upon the Primary and Fundamental Rules, and to adopt no *foreign* ones, as belonging thereunto when they really do not; then there is nothing in this whole Affair but a juſt and prudent Care about what moſt of all deſerves it, and ſuch as will be indiſpenſably required in every faithful Miniſter, or Steward of the Myſteries of God. To return to our point in Hand: As more and more of the ſacred Truths, in proceſs of Time, came to be oppoſed, or brought in Queſtion; ſo Creeds have been inlarged in proportion; and an explicite

Pro-

Profeſſion of more and more Articles required of every Candidate for Baptiſm. And becauſe This was not ſecurity ſufficient, ſince many might forget, or not know, or not attend to what They had profeſs'd in their Baptiſm (by Themſelves or by their Sureties) it was found highly expedient, and neceſſary to inſert one or more Creeds in the ſtanding, and daily Offices of the Church; to remind people of That Faith which They had ſolemnly ingaged to maintain, and to guard the unwary againſt the wily Attempts of Hereticks to pervert Them. This is the plain and true Account of *Creeds*, and of their *uſe* in the Chriſtian Churches. And therefore, if any Man would talk Senſe againſt the *uſe* of This, or That Creed in any Church; He ought to ſhow, either that it contains ſuch *Truths* as no Man ever did, or in all probability never will oppoſe; (which will be a good Argument to prove the Creed *ſuperfluous*) or that it contains Articles which are *not true*, or are at beſt *doubtful*; which will be a good Argument to prove ſuch a Creed *hurtful*. Now, as to the *Athanaſian* Form, it will hardly be thought *ſuperfluous*, ſo long as there are any *Arians*, *Photinians*, *Sabellians*, *Macedonians*, *Apollinarians*, *Neſtorians*, or *Eutychians* in this part of the World: And as to its being *hurtful*, That may then be proved when it can be ſhown that any of thoſe forementionn'd *Hereſies* were no *Hereſies*, or have not been juſtly condemn'd.

If it be pleaded, that the *Vulgar*, knowing little of any of thoſe *Hereſies*, will therefore know as little of what the *Creed* means; and ſo to Them it may be at leaſt dry and inſipid, if not wholly uſeleſs: To This I anſwer; that there are no kinds of *Hereticks* but hope to make the *Vulgar* underſtand *their* Tenets reſpectively, and to draw them aſide from the *received* Faith of the Church: And therefore it behoves the Paſtors of the Church to have a *ſtanding* Form, to guard the People againſt any ſuch Attempts. The *Vulgar* will underſtand, in the general, and as far as is ordinarily to Them neceſſary, the main Doctrines of a *Trinity in unity*, and of *God incarnate:* And as to particular Explications, whenever they have occaſion to look farther, they will find the *true ones* laid down in this Creed; which will be uſeful to prevent their being impoſed upon at any time with

with *falſe* ones. If They never have occaſion to go farther than generals, there is no Hurt done to Them by *abundant* Caution: If they have, here's a Direction ready for them to prevent Miſtakes. It is not pretended that all are capable of ſeeing through every nicety, or of perceiving the full Intent and Aim of every part of This Form, and what it alludes to. But, as many as are capable of being *ſet wrong* in any one Branch, (by the ſubtlety of Seducers) are as capable of being *kept right* by This *Rule* given them: And They will as eaſily underſtand *one ſide* of the Queſtion, as they will the *other*. The Chriſtian Churches throughout the World, ever ſince the Multiplication of *Hereſies*, have thought it neceſſary to guard their people by ſome ſuch Forms as theſe in ſtanding uſe amongſt them. The *Oriental* Churches, which receive not this Creed into their Conſtant Offices, yet more than ſupply the want of it, either by other the like Creeds,[a] or by their ſolemn ſtated Prayers in their *Liturgies*, wherein they expreſs their *Faith* as fully, and particularly (or more ſo[b]) as This Creed does: And They are not ſo much afraid of *puzling* and *perplexing* the *Vulgar* by doing it, as They are of *betraying*, and *expoſing* them to the Attempts of Seducers, ſhould they not do it. For which reaſon alſo They frequently direct their Prayers to God the *Son*, as well as to God the *Father*; being in That caſe more ſolicitous than the *Latin* Churches have been, becauſe They have been oftner diſturbed by *Arians*, and other Impugners of Chriſt's Divinity.[c]

Upon the whole, I look upon it as exceeding *uſeful*, and even *neceſſary*, for every Church to have ſome ſuch *Form* as This, or ſomething equivalent, open and common to all its Members; that none may be led aſtray for want of proper Caution, and previous Inſtruction in what ſo nearly concerns the whole Stru-

a *See the Creed of the* Armenians *in Sr. P.* Ricaut. p. 411. &c.

b *See* Ludolphus *Hiſtor. Æthiop.* l. 3. c. 5. *and* Renaudot's *Orient. Liturg.* paſſim.

c Nam cum omnes Orationes *Latini Canonis*, ex vetuſtiſſima Traditione, ad Deum *Patrem* dirigantur; in *Oriente* plures ad *Filium:* Nempe, quia magis conflictata eſt *Arianorum*, & aliorum qui ejus Divinitatem impugnabant, contentionibus *Orientalis*, quam *Occidentalis* Eccleſia. *Renaudot.* de Oriental. Liturg. Vol. 1. p. 262.

cture and Fabrick of the Chriſtian Faith.[a] As to This particular Form, it has ſo long prevailed, and has ſo well anſwer'd the uſe intended, that, all Things conſider'd, there can be no ſufficient reaſon for *changing* any part of it, much leſs for *laying* the whole *aſide*. There are ſeveral other Creeds, very good ones, (tho' ſomewhat larger) which, had They been made choice of for *common* uſe, might poſſibly have done as well. The Creeds I mean (of which there is a great number) drawn up after the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and purpoſely contriv'd to obviate all the *Hereſies* that ever had infeſted the Chriſtian Church. But, Thoſe that diſlike This Creed, would much more diſlike the other; as being ſtill more *particular*, and *explicite* in regard to the *Neſtorian*, *Eutychian*, and *Monothelite* Hereſies, and equally full and clear for the Doctrine of the *Trinity*.

To conclude; ſo long as there ſhall be any Men left to *oppoſe* the *Doctrines* which This Creed contains, ſo long will it be *expedient*, and even *neceſſary* to continue the *Uſe* of it, in order to preſerve the reſt: And, I ſuppoſe, when we have none remaining to find fault with the *Doctrines*, there will be none to object againſt the *Uſe* of the Creed, or ſo much as to wiſh to have it laid aſide.

a *To this purpoſe ſpeaks* Johannes Pappus, *in the name of the* Lutheran *Churches, commenting on the* Augsburg *Confeſſion*.

Semper in Eccleſia ſcriptorum quorundam publicorum uſus fuit, quibus Doctrinæ Divinitus revelatæ de certis Capitibus Summa comprehenderetur, & contra Hæreticos, alioſque Adverſarios defenderetur. Talia ſcripta, licet perbrevia, ſunt *Symbola* illa totius Eccleſiæ, omnium Hominum conſenſu recepta, *Apoſtolicum*, *Nicænum*, *Athanaſianum*. *Joan. Papp.* Comm. in Confeſſ. Auguſt. fol. 2.

I take This upon the Credit of Nic. Serarius, *who quotes the paſſage from* Pappus. *Serar.* in Symb. Athanaſ. p. 9. Tom. 2.

An

An APPENDIX to Chapter the Third, which treats of Antient Comments.

I intimated above, p. 34, that *Fortunatus*'s Comment upon 570
the *Athanaſian* Creed, tho' before publiſh'd, might deſerve a ſecond publication, and be made much more correct than it appears in *Muratorius*'s 2d Tome of *Anecdota:* This gave me the firſt Thought of ſubjoining an *Appendix* to the foregoing Sheets. But having withal received ſome farther informations relating to other *Comments* upon the ſame Creed, I am willing to impart them alſo to the Reader, at the ſame Time.

The next intire Comment, after *Fortunatus*'s, is *Bruno*'s, as 1033
may be ſeen in the Table of Comments, p. 45. I have in Pages 36th, and 37th, numbred up ſeveral manuſcript Copies of *Bruno*'s Comment: The doing of which will, I conceive, be of This uſe, at leaſt, to the Publick, that the ſeveral Manuſcripts hitherto conceal'd under general Titles, as anonymous Pieces, may be better known hereafter, and referr'd to their proper Author. For which reaſon alſo I think it worth the mentioning, that ſome other Copies of the ſame Comment may be added to the former, being in ſeveral Libraries as here ſpecified.

1. There is one in the Library of St. *John Baptiſt*'s College, Oxon; N. 1874 of the *Oxford* Catalogue, mark'd G. 42. Title, *Commentarius in Symbolum Athanaſii.* By the beginning and concluding Words of That Commentary (a Tranſcript of which has been ſent me by a worthy Member of That Society) I am well aſſured that it is *Bruno*'s Comment.

2. In the *Bodleian.* Catal. N. 994. Laud. E. 71. *Athanaſii Symbolum cum Gloſſa.* This alſo, as I am certified by a Learned Gentleman who examin'd it, is *Bruno*'s Comment. The Title, *Fides Sancti Athanaſii Epiſcopi.*

3. In *Baliol* College. Catal. N. 210. mark'd B. 9. *Athanaſii Symbolum cum Commentario*: Another Copy of *Bruno*'s Comment.

4. In *Merton* College (Catal. N. 675——208.) *Symbolum Athanaſii cum Gloſſa.* This alſo is *Bruno*'s Comment, and may be reckon'd among the more antient Copies of it.

There are, very probably, ſeveral other Copies of *Bruno*'s Comment in our Libraries here in *England* (as I judge from the *Oxford* Catalogue) under the like general Titles with thoſe above; or perhaps among the *Pſalteria gloſſata.* But I contente my ſelf at preſent with Thoſe already mention'd; not having Leiſure or Opportunity to make further Inquiries.

As to the other Comments below *Bruno*'s, I have nothing farther to add till I come to *Alexander Neckham*'s. I mention a Comment of his in the 39th Page above. I referr'd to a manuſcript Copy of it in the *Bodleian.* E. 7. 8. Oxon. Catal. N. 2339. There is Another Copy of the ſame Comment, in the *Bodleian* alſo. E. 6. 11. N. 2330. The Title of the Comment is *Expoſitio Fidei Catholicæ a Magiſtro Alexandro edicta.* This Copy is thought to be about 50 years later than the former. It may be of uſe to note down the firſt words[a] of the *Comment*, that if there be any other anonymous Copies of the ſame, it may be known, by comparing, to what Author they belong. I ſhould take notice that E. 7. 8. makes about 10 Leaves in *Folio*, with double Columns in each page. E. 6. 11 makes 4 Leaves in *folio*, with three Columns in every page, and in a ſmaller Hand than the other. From hence ſome judgment may be made of the Size, or Length of the Comment: The Character in Both is ſmall, and full of Abbreviations; ſo that one may imagine the Comment to be a pretty large one.

I ſhall next take notice of Another Comment, a printed One, which before eſcaped me. It is of the famous *Alexander Hales*, in his *Third Part* of his *Summa*, under Quæſt. 69. After treating on the *Apoſtles* and *Nicene* Creeds, He comes to the *Athanaſian*; upon which He raiſes ſeveral Queſtions and Doubts, as He goes through it, and anſwers them all-along in the Scholaſtick way, referring ſometimes to the elder Writers, and particularly to St. *Auſtin*, to whom He attributes *Gennadius*'s Trea-

a Hæc eſt enim Victoria quæ vincit mundum, Fides noſtra. Signanter dicit *vult*, & non dicit *quicunque ſalvus erit.*

tiſe

tiſe *de Eccleſiaſticis Dogmatibus*, according to the Error of That Time; But I proceed.

I took notice above (p. 39) of a *Latin* Comment aſcribed 1340
to *Richard Hampole*. I intimated (p. 44.) ſome Doubts I had concerning the Author of That Comment; having reaſon to believe that the three Copies mention'd by *Tentzelius* are nothing elſe but ſo many Copies of that very Comment which paſſes under the name of *Hampole:* And yet one of 'em is judged to be above 500 years older[a] than 1686, which is 150 years before *Hampole*'s Days. It is poſſible that *Joachim Fellerus*, the Compiler of the Catalogue of the *Leipſick* Library, might miſtake in judging of the Age of the Manuſcript: But it appears much more probable that the Editors of That Comment were miſtaken in aſcribing it to *Hampole*. However That be, I would here obſerve, that there is in *Magdalen* College, in *Oxford*, a Comment intituled *Expoſitio in Symbolum Athanaſianum per Januenſem* (N. Catal. 2256. —— 115) which is no other than This very Comment that paſſes in the Prints under the name of *Rich. Hampole*. The Catalogue's aſcribing it to *Januenſis*, was owing, I ſuppoſe, to an occaſional Paſſage, in that Manuſcript, relating to the *Athanaſian* Creed, cited from *Johannes Januenſis*'s Catholicon, or Dictionary, under the word *Symbolum*. The Comment however, I ſay, is the ſame with that which paſſes for *Hampole*'s, as may plainly appear from the Beginning of it, which I have tranſcrib'd into the margin;[b] only filling up an *Omiſſion* in it, occaſion'd, as is very common, by

a Tentzelius *writes thus.*

Opportune ad manus meas pervenit Reſponſio Ampl. *Felleri*, qua rationem Codicis latini *Lipſienſis* in Præfatione a me citati prolixius expoſuit. Ait enim, membranaceum iſtum Codicem ante CCCCC annos & ultra, eleganter ſcriptum videri; additas etiam eſſe non interlineares tantum notas, ſed & marginales utrinque; in *dextro* videlicet & *ſiniſtro* paginarum latere: *Rubricam* autem *Symboli* noſtri ita ſe habere; *Fides Anaſtaſii Papæ.* In *dextro* primæ paginæ hæc legi verba: *Hæc ratio Fidei Catholicæ traditur in veteribus Codicibus*, & reliqua, quæ antea ex MS. Bibliothecæ Ducalis attuli. Unde patet, eaſdem plane Gloſſas in utroque Codice reperiri; præſertim quum in *Siniſtro* alterius margine, hæc etiam verba legi referat Fillerus: *Hic beatus Anaſtaſius liberum arbitrium poſuit* &c. Tentzel. p. 225.

b Hæc ratio Fidei Catholicæ traditur etiam in veteribus Codicibus a Beato *Athanaſio Alexandrino* conſcripta. Et puto, quod idcirco tam plano & brevi Sermone tradita ſit, ut omnibus Catholicis, & minus eruditis, Tutamen Defenſionis præſtaret adverſus illam

the

the repetition of the ſame word. There may be a good uſe made of That Manuſcript in *Magdalen* College, for correcting the printed Copy, which is very faulty, both in *words*, and *order*. The Comment ought to begin as it begins in That Manuſcript; and not with the words, *Hic beatus Athanaſius*, as in the Prints. The Editors did not underſtand, or did not conſider, the nature and compoſition of That Comment. The Author, whoever He was, had made Two Columns, one on each hand, with the *Athanaſian* Creed in the middle. On the *Left-hand*, which is the firſt place, He ſet *Bruno*'s Comment, and on the *Right-hand*, in the other Column, He carried down another Comment, either of his own, or borrow'd. The firſt Note on the *Right-hand* was plainly deſign'd for an introduction to the reſt, and therefore ought to be ſet firſt; tho' the Editors, conſidering only the poſition of the Notes, began from the *Left-hand*, with the firſt words of *Bruno*'s Comment. The *Oxford* Copy obſerves the true natural Order, and may very probably be of good uſe all the way through, for the better digeſting and methodizing that Comment, or Comments, being in reality Two Comments mix'd and blended together.

I ſhould obſerve of the *Oxford* Copy, that after the Comment there is in the ſame Hand, This Note: *Hæc conſcripta ſunt a quodam antiquo Libro.* Poſſibly, This may be of ſome uſe for the determining whether that Comment be really *Hampole*'s, or no. For, if the Manuſcript be not much later than 1415 (it muſt be ſo late, ſince it fixes That very Date to Dr. *Ullerſton*'s Expoſition of the Six Pſalms) it may be probably argued that any thing of *Hampole*'s, who flouriſhed but about 80 years before, would not have been called *antiquus Liber*, an antient Book. But This I leave to farther inquiries, not inſiſting upon it, ſince the Argument is but probable at the beſt; and I do not know but the Manuſcript may be ſeveral years later than 1415,

Tempeſtatem [quam contrarius ventus, hoc eſt, Diabolus, excitavit per *Arrium*; quam Tempeſtatem] qui fugere deſiderat, hanc Fidei unitatem (al. *veritatem*) integram & inviolabilem teneat. Ita enim incipit ipſum opuſculum, dicens, *Quicunque vult ſalvus* &c. Hic beatus *Athanaſius* liberum arbitrium poſuit. *&c.*

tho'

tho' hardly later than the middle of that Century. *Ullerſton* is undoubtedly the lateſt Author in That Collection. *Petrus Floriſſienſis*, or *Floreffienſis* (otherwiſe called *Petrus de Harentals*) wrote in 1374:[a] *Januenſis*, *Gorrham*, *Lyra*, and *Hampole* are all older than He: The laſt therefore is *Ullerſton*, who was probably ſtill living when that Manuſcript was written. But enough of This.

There remains one Comment more to be ſpoken to, and 1380
That is the Comment which I have aſcribed to *Wickliff*, above p. 39. I before took notice of *three* manuſcript Copies of it: To which I would now add a *Fourth*, which is in the *Bodleian* (N. 668. Laud. C. 16.) under the general Title of *a Gloſs upon Quicunque vult*. I have nothing further to obſerve concerning it but This, that whereas I had before a Suſpicion that This Comment might be *Hampole*'s, being annex'd ſometimes to *Hampole*'s Engliſh *Commentary* on the *Pſalms* and *Hymns*, I am now the leſs inclinable to ſuſpect it, having ſeen, in *Sidney* College in *Cambridge*, a very old Copy of *Hampole*'s Commentary, which runs through the *Pſalms*, and all the common *Hymns* and *Canticles*, but has not this Comment on the Creed in it; tho' the Manuſcript appears to be very whole and intire, and no Leaves, or Leaf cut out. This confirms me the more in my firſt Thought, that the Comment is really *Wickliff*'s.

I have a few things to add about *Fortunatus*'s Comment, which is to ſhut up the *Appendix*, and for the ſake of which chiefly the *Appendix* hath been added.

I have made frequent uſe of it in the preceding Sheets: And now my deſign, in reprinting it, is to let the Reader ſee what the Comment is which I ſo frequently refer to; that ſo He may judge for Himſelf whether it really be what I ſuppoſe, and I think, with good reaſon, A Comment of the 6th Century, and juſtly aſcribed to *Fortunatus*. I have endeavour'd to make it as correct as poſſible, by ſuch Helps as I could any where procure; which are as follow.

1. The printed Copy of it, publiſh'd by *Muratorius* from a Manuſcript of the *Ambroſian* Library, about 600 years old.

a *See* Oudin. *Tom.* 3. p. 1218.

2. A

2. A manuſcript Copy from *Oxford*, found among *Franciſcus Junius*'s MSS, which appears, by the *Character*, to be above 700 years old, or near 800. As it is older than *Muratorius*'s, ſo is it alſo more faithful; and tho' it has a great many Faults both in the *Orthography*, and *Syntax*, owing either to the Ignorance of the *Age*, or of the *Copiſt*, yet it does not appear to have been *interpolated*, like the other, or to have been induſtriouſly altered in any part.

3 Beſides thoſe Two Copies of the intire Comment, I have had ſome Aſſiſtance from ſuch *Parcels* of it as are to be met with in Writers that have borrowed from it. *Bruno*'s Comment furniſhes us with ſome parts which He had taken into his own. But there is, among the Suppoſititious Works aſcribed to St *Auſtin*, a Treatiſe intituled *Sermo de Symbolo*,[a] which has ſeveral ſcatter'd Fragments of this very Comment in it. The whole Treatiſe is a *Farrago*, or Collection from ſeveral other Writers; as *Ruffinus*, *Cæſarius*, Pope *Gregory* 1. and *Ivo Carnotenſis*. By the laſt mention'd, one may be aſſured that The *Collection* is not older than the Cloſe of the XIth Century; it may be later. It will be ſerviceable however, ſo far as it goes, for reſtoring the true readings where our Copies are corrupt; which is the uſe I make of it.

In my 34th Page, above, I threw in a Remark about *Pareus*'s quoting a part of *Fortunatus*'s Comment under the name of *Euphronius Presbyter*, which I wonder'd at. I ſhould obſerve to the Reader, that thoſe words of *Pareus* are not in the older Edition of his Comment A. D. 1627, but in the later one of 1634. and was probably not thought on by *David Pareus* the Father, but added by *Philip Pareus* the Son. But I am ſtill at a loſs to know whence He had it, and who is meant by *Euphronius Presbyter*. *Fortunatus* had ſome intimacy with *Euphronius*, Biſhop of *Tours*, of that Time. Whether his name appearing among the manuſcript Copies of *Fortunatus*'s pieces might occaſion ſuch a Miſtake, I know not. I may obſerve that *Bruno*'s Comment has the very ſame paſſage in it, only under a diffe-

a *Auguſtin.* Oper. Tom. 6. in Appendice. p. 278. Ed. Bened.

rent

rent Order of the words: But neither will this help us to account for its being cited under the name of *Euphronius Presbyter*, which has no ſimilitude with the name of *Bruno*, who was Biſhop of *Wurtzburg*. But to return to our *Comment*.

This Comment of *Fortunatus*'s, if of no other uſe, will at leaſt be valuable for its *Age*, and as bearing Teſtimony to the *Antiquity*, and *early* Reception of the Creed. We have no other Comment upon That Creed till near 300 years after, in the Time of *Hincmar:* And his is rather a *Paraphraſe* than a Comment; and not upon the intire Creed, nor digeſted into any juſt and regular order, but only ſcatter'd Hints, here and there, upon ſome parts of the Creed as He had occaſion to cite Them. Now I am mentioning *Hincmar*, I may cite one paſſage from Him upon a part of the Creed, which may ſeem to want explication as much as any, and which I have ſpent ſome Thoughts upon in Page 144. The words are[a] very appoſite to the purpoſe, and the more valuable as ſhowing how that part of the Creed was underſtood ſo long agoe as 900 years upwards, or nearly.

Nothing now remains but to lay before the learned Reader *Fortunatus*'s Comment in its native Language, and therewith to cloſe up our Inquiries concerning the *Athanaſian* Creed.

The *Various Lections*, all that are properly ſuch, are carefully noted at the Bottom of the Page; that ſo the Reader may judge whether the *Text* be what it ſhould be, or correct it, if it appears otherwiſe. But I ſhould hint, that there are ſeveral little Variations in the *Oxford* Manuſcript, which I take no notice of, as not being properly *Various Lections*.

1. Such as are merely *Orthographical:* As a permutation of Letters; uſing *d* for *t*, in *capud* and *reliquid*, for *caput* and *reliquit*; *e* for *i*, in *Trea* for *Tria*; and *i* for *e*, in *calit* for *calet*, and the like: *o* for *u* in *ſervolis*, *p* for *b* in *optenit* for *obtinet*; *v* conſonant

a Et in hac Trinitate nihil eſt prius, nihil poſterius; nihil majus, aut minus; ſed totæ tres perſonæ coæternæ ſibi ſunt & coæquales: ita ut *per omnia* & unitas Deitatis in Trinitate Perſonarum, & Trinitas Perſonarum in unitate Deitatis veneranda eſt. *Hincm.* de non Trin. Deit. Tom. I. p. 540.

for *b*, in *enarravit* for *enarrabit*; tho' ſuch as this laſt is might be noted among *Various Lections*, in caſes more diſputable.

To This Head may be referred ſome antique, and now obſolete Spellings: *immenſus* for *immenſus*, *inmortalis* for *immortalis*, *inleſus* for *illæſus*, *conlocavit* for *collocavit*, *dinoſcitur* for *dignoſcitur*, and the like.

2. *Active Terminations* of Verbs, for *Paſſive*: as *finire* for *finiri*, *cogitare* for *cogitari*; tho' theſe may be referr'd to the former Head, being only changing the letter *i* for the letter *e*. *Dominat* for *dominatur* I take notice of among the *Various Lections*.

3. Faults in the *Formation* of *Verbs*: As *abſtuleret* for *tolleret*, *vivendos* for *viventes*; to which may be added *morſit*, for *momordit*, having been long out of uſe.

4. *Manifeſt* Faults in Concord: As *humani Carnis*, for *humanæ*; *eodem Captivitate*, for *eâdem*. But where there can be any doubt of the Conſtruction, I mark ſuch among the *Various Lections*, leaving the Reader to judge of them.

Theſe and other the like Niceties are generally neglected in Editions of Authors; it being both needleſs, and endleſs to note them. But I was willing to hint ſomething of them in this place, becauſe They may be of uſe to Scholars for the making a judgment of the *value* of a Manuſcript; and ſometimes of the *Time*, or *Place*; as alſo of the *manner* how a Copy was taken, whether by the *Ear* or by the *Eye*, from word of Mouth, or meerly from a *Writing* laid before the Copiſt. Beſides that if we can diſtinguiſh in the preſent Caſe, as perhaps a good Critick may, the *Particularities* of the *Author* from thoſe of his *Tranſcribers*; They may poſſibly afford ſome additional Argument for the aſcertaining the *Author* of the Comment.

Expo-

Expositio Fidei Catholicæ FORTUNATI[a].

Scripta anno circiter 570.

QUICUNQUE *vult salvus esse*,[b] *ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam Fidem: Quam nisi quisque integram, inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit*[c].

Fides dicitur Credulitas, sive Credentia.[d] [*Primo ergo omnium Fides necessaria est, sicut Apostolica docet auctoritas dicens*; sine Fide impossibile est placere Deo. *Constat enim neminem ad veram pervenire posse Beatitudinem, nisi Deo placeat; & Deo neminem placere posse, nisi per Fidem. Fides namque est Bonorum omnium Fundamentum, Fides humanæ salutis initium. Sine hac nemo ad Filiorum Dei potest Consortium pervenire*; *quia sine ipsa nec in hoc seculo quisquam Justificationis consequitur Gratiam, nec in futuro vitam possidebit æternam. Et si quis huic non ambulaverit per fidem, non perveniet ad Speciem beatam Domini nostri Jesu Christi*[e]] Catholica universalis dicitur, id est, recta, quam Ecclesia univer'a[f] tenere debet. Ecclesia[g] dicitur Congregatio Christianorum, sive conventus Populorum. [*Non enim, sicut Conventicula Hæreticorum, in aliquibus Regionum partibus coarctatur, sed per totum terrarum Orbem dilatata diffunditur*[h].]

a Ita se habet Titulus in Codice *Muratorii*. Aliter in Oxoniensi. viz. *Expositio in Fide Catholica:* pro *in Fidem Catholicam*, ex corrupta loquendi ratione apud Scriptores Ætatis mediæ.

b *Esse salvus*. Cod. Murat.

c Posterior hæc Symboli Clausula, incipiens a *Quam nisi*, non habetur in Cod. *Oxoniensi*.

d Ita *Cod. Oxon.* prima hæc pericope deest in *Murator*. Conf. *Brun.* in Symb.

e. Quæ uncinulis includuntur, non comparent in MS *Oxoniensi*. Nec enim *Fortunati* videntur esse, sed *Alcuini* potius; apud Quem eadem fere verbatim leguntur. (De Fid. Trin. l. 1. c. 1. p. 707.) *Alcuinus* vero maximam partem mutuatus est a *Fulgentio*. (de Fid. ad Petrum. Prolog. p. 500. ed. Paris.) Sed varia Exemplaria varie Sententiam claudunt. *Fulgentius* legit, *non perveniet ad speciem*; nec quicquam ultra. Alcuinus, *non perveniet ad speciem beatæ visionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. Ab utrisque abit Lectio *Muratorii*.

f Universa Ecclesia. *Cod. Mur.* & *Brunonis*.

g Cod. *Muratorii* habet *quippe*, post *Ecclesia:* quam voculam, utpote ineptam, saltem otiosam, expunximus, Fide Cod. *Oxoniensis*. Conf. *Brunon*. in hoc loco.

h Uncis hic inclusa non habentur in Codice *Oxoniensi*. Verba nimirum sunt, non *Fortunati*, sed *Isidori Hispal:* Orig. l. 8. c. 1. Alio proinde Charactere imprimenda curavimus.

Ut unum Deum in Trinitate, & Trinitatem in unitate veneremur: Et credamus, & colamus, & confiteamur [*Trinitatem in personis, Unitatem in substantia. Hanc quoque Trinitatem personarum, atque unitatem naturæ Propheta* Esaias *revelatam sibi non tacuit, cum se dicit Seraphim vidisse clamantia,* Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth. *Ubi prorsus in eo quod dicitur tertio* Sanctus, *personarum Trinitatem; in eo verò quod semel dicimus* Dominus Deus Sabaoth, *divinæ naturæ cognoscimus unitatem* [a].]

Neque confundentes personas: Ut Sabellius errat, qui ipsum dicit esse Patrem in Persona quem & Filium, ipsum & Spiritum Sanctum. Non ergo confundentes Personas, quia tres omnino personæ sunt [b]. Est enim gignens, genitus, & [c] procedens. *Gignens* est Pater, qui genuit Filium; Filius est *genitus,* quem genuit Pater; Spiritus Sanctus est *procedens,* quia a Patre & Filio procedit. Pater & Filius coæterni sibi sunt & coæquales; & cooperatores, sicut scriptum est: *verbo Domini Cali firmati* [d] *sunt,* id est, a Filio Dei creati, *Spiritu* [e] *oris ejus, omnis virtus eorum.* Ubi sub singulari numero, *Spiritus* [f] *ejus* dicit [g], [unitatem substantiæ deitatis ostendit; ubi sub plurali numero, *omnis virtus eorum* dicit [h],] Trinitatem personarum aperte demonstrat, quia tres unum sunt, & unum tres.

Neque substantiam separantes: Ut *Arius* garrit, qui sicut tres personas esse dicit, sic & tres substantias esse mentitur [i]. Filium dicit minorem quam Patrem, & creaturam esse; Spiritum sanctum adhuc minorem quam Filium, & Patri & Filio eum esse Administratorem

a Quæ uncis comprehensa hic legere est, non comparent in Codice *Oxoniensi.* Verba sunt *Alcuini* (de Trin. l. 1. c. 3. p. 709.) in quo eadem plane, simillique ordine invenias. Sunt porro eadem, uno vocabulo dempto, apud *Fulgentium* (de Fid. ad Petrum. p. 503.) ordine etiam tantum non eodem. Verba autem illa introductoria; (viz. *Trinitatem in personis, unitatem in substantia*) non leguntur in *Fulgentio,* nec quidem in *Alcuino.* Interpolator ipse, uti videtur, ex proprio illa penu deprompta præmisit cæteris, Connexionis forte aliqualis conservandæ gratiâ.

b Tres Personæ omnino sunt. *Murat.*

c Deest & in Cod. *Oxon.*

d Formati *Cod. Oxon.* Vid. Symb. *Damasi* dictum (apud *Hieronym.* Tom. 5. p. 122.) unde hæc *Noster,* mutatis mutandis, desumpsisse videtur.

e Spiritus. *Cod. Oxon.*

f Leg. *Spiritu.* uterque vero codex habet *Spiritus.*

g Dicitur. *Cod. Murat.*

h Lacunam in *Muratorio* manifestam (quippe cum desint ea verba uncis inclusa) ex Codice *Oxoniensi* supplevimus. Scilicet, vox *dicit* proximè recurrens Librarii oculos (uti fit) fefellit.

i Ita clare *Cod. Oxon.* Aliter *Muratorius* ex vitioso codice; *quia tres personas esse dicit, si & tres substantias esse mentitur.* Sensus impeditus, aut nullus.

a adse-

[a] adſerit. Non ergo *Subſtantiam ſeparantes*, quia totæ tres Perſonæ in Subſtantia Deitatis [b] unum ſunt.

Alia eſt enim Perſona Patris: Quia Pater ingenitus eſt, eo quod a nullo eſt genitus. *Alia perſona Filii*, quia Filius a Patre ſolo eſt [c] genitus. *Alia Spiritus ſancti*, quia a Patre & Filio Spiritus ſanctus [d] procedens eſt.

Sed Patris & Filii & Spiritus ſancti una eſt Divinitas: Id eſt, Deitas. *Æqualis Gloria:* id eſt, Claritas. *Coæterna Majeſtas:* Majeſtas gloria eſt, Claritas, ſive Poteſtas.[e]

Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis & Spiritus ſanctus. Id eſt, in Deitate, & Omnipotentia.

Increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus & Spiritus ſanctus. Id eſt, a nullo creatus [f].

Immenſus Pater, immenſus Filius, immenſus & Spiritus ſanctus Non eſt menſurabilis in ſua natura, quia inlocalis eſt, [g] incircumſcriptus, ubique totus, ubique præſens, ubique potens.

Æternus Pater, æternus Filius, æternus & Spiritus ſanctus. Id eſt, non tres æterni, ſed in tribus perſonis unus Deus æternus, qui ſine initio, & ſine fine æternus permanet.

Similiter omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens & Spiritus ſanctus. Omnipotens dicitur, eo quod omnia poteſt, & omnium obtinet poteſtatem [h]. Ergo, ſi omnia poteſt, quid eſt quod non poteſt? Hoc non poteſt, quod Omnipotenti non competit poſſe [i]. Falli non poteſt [quia veritas eſt; infirmari non poteſt,] quia Sanitas

a Et Patris & Filii eum Adminiſtratorem eſſe adſerit. *Cod. Murat.* Conf. *Brunon.*

b Divinitatis. *Cod. Oxon.*

c A patre eſt ſolo. *Cod. Oxon.*

d Deſunt *Spiritus ſanctus* in *Cod. Murat.* quæ tamen retinuimus, tum Fide *Cod Oxonienſis*, tum quia in antecedentibus *Pater*, & *Filius* bis ponuntur, ſicut & hic *Sp. ſanctus.*

e *Cod. Oxonienſis.* legit *Claritatis*, ſive Poteſtas.

f *Cod. Oxonienſis* legit *creati.*

g *Muratorii* exemplar inſertum habet *et*, quod delendum eſſe cenſui, cum abſit a codice *Oxon.* & otioſum videatur.

h *Fortunatus*, in ſua *Expoſit. Symb. Apoſtolici*, hæc habet; *Omnipotens vero dicitur, ec quod omnia poſſit, & omnium obtinet Potentatum.* ed. Baſil. *obtineat poteſtatem.* ed. Lugd. Præluſerat *Ruffinus*, in Symbolum.

i S. *Bruno*, hunc opinor locum præ oculis habens, his verbis utitur: *Ergo, ſi omnia poteſt, quid eſt quod non poteſt? Hoc non poteſt, quod non convenit omnipotenti poſſe.* Brun. in Symb. Athanaſ.

eſt

est [a]; mori non potest, quia immortalis vita est; finiri non potest, quia infinitus & perennis est.

Ita, Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus & Spiritus sanctus. [Deus nomen est Potestatis, non Proprietatis [b].] Proprium nomen est Patris *Pater*; & proprium nomen est [c] Filii *Filius*, & proprium nomen est Spiritus sancti *Spiritus sanctus*.

Ita, Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus & Spiritus sanctus. Dominus dicitur, eo quod dominetur creaturæ cunctæ, vel quod creatura omnis dominatui ejus deserviat [d].

Quia sicut singillatim (id est, sicut distinctim [e]) *unamquamque Personam & [f] Deum & Dominum confiteri Christiana veritate compellimur.* Quia si me interrogaveris quid sit [g] Pater, ego respondebo; Deus, & Dominus. Similiter, si me interrogaveris [h] quid sit [i] Filius, ego dicam; Deus, & Dominus. Et si dicis [k], quid est Spiritus sanctus? Ego dico [l]; Deus, & Dominus. Et in his tribus Personis, non tres Deos, nec tres Dominos, sed in [m] his tribus, sicut jam supra dictum est, [n] unum Deum, & unum Dominum confiteor.

Unus ergo Pater, non tres Patres: Id est, quia [o] Pater semper Pater, nec aliquando Filius. *Unus Filius, non tres Filii:* Id est, quia Filius semper Filius, nec aliquando Pater. *Unus Spiritus sanctus, non*

a *Muratorius* sententiam mancam, vitiatamque exhibet: *Falli non potest, quia Sanctus est*; omissis intermediis. Scilicet, vocabulum proxime repetitum describentis oculum delusit: Et ne nullus inde eliceretur sensus, pro *Sanitas* substitutum est *Sanctus*. Hæc porro sibimet adoptavit S. *Bruno*, pauculis mutatis, vel interjectis, ad hunc modum: *Falli non potest, quia Veritas & Sapientia est; ægrotari aut infirmari non potest, quia Sanitas est; mori non potest, quia immortalis est; finiri non potest quia infinitus & perennis est.*

b Deest hæc Clausula in *Codice Murator:* Sed confer Symbolum *Damasi* dictum, quod *Gregorii Bætici* creditur, apud *August.* Tom. 5. p. 387. *Append.* item apud *Hieronym.* Tom. 5. p. 122.

c Deest *est.* Murator. conf. *Brun.*

d Ita Codex *Muratorii:* paulo aliter Cod. *Oxonienſis*; mens eadem. *Dominus dicitur eo quod omnia Dominat, & omnium est Dominus Dominator.* Dominat, pro *Dominatur*, & cum Accusativo, ex vitiata inferiorīs ævi Latinitate, vel ex Scribæ imperitia.

e *Distinctum.* Oxon. *distincte.* Murat. f Deest *&.* Cod. *Murator.*

g *Quid est.* Murator. Eandem sententiam expressit S. *Bruno*, his verbis; *Quia si me interrogaveris quid est Pater, ego respondeo; Deus, & Dominus.*

h Et si me rogaveris. *Cod. Oxon.*

i Est. *Murator.* Locum sic exhibet S. *Bruno*; *Similiter, si interrogaveris quid est Filius, ego dico, Deus & Dominus.*

k Dicas. *Murator.*

l Dicam. *Murator.* Apud *Brunonem* sic legitur; *Et si dicis, quid est Spiritus sanctus? Ego respondeo; Deus, & Dominus.* m Deest *in.* Oxon.

n Supra dixi. *Cod. Oxon.* Sed *Brunonis* lectio *Muratorii* lectionem confirmat.

o *Codex Oxon.* pro *quia* habet *qui*, in hoc loco, & in duobus proxime sequentibus. Utrumlibet elegeris, eodem fere res redit.

tres

tres Spiritus ſancti: Id eſt, quia Spiritus ſanctus ſemper eſt [a] Spiritu ſanctus, nec aliquando Filius, aut Pater. Hæc eſt proprietas Perſonarum.

Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius, aut poſterius. Quia ſicut nunquam Filius ſine Patre, ſic nunquam fuit Pater ſine Filio, ſic & nunquam fuit Pater & Filius ſine Spiritu Sancto [b]. Coæterna ergo Trinitas, & inſeparabilis unitas, ſine initio & ſine fine [c].

Nihil majus, aut minus. Æqualitatem Perſonarum dicit, quia [d] Trinitas æqualis eſt, & una [e] Deitas, Apoſtolo docente [f], & dicente: *Per ea, quæ facta ſunt, intellecta conſpiciuntur;* & per Creaturam Creator intelligitur, ſecundum has comparationes, & alias quamplures. Sol, Candor, & Calor, & tria ſunt vocabula, & tria unum [g]. Quod candet, hoc calet; & quod calet, hoc candet: Tria hæc vocabula res una eſſe dignoſcitur [h]. Ita [i] Pater & Filius & Spiritus ſanctus, tres Perſonæ, in Deitate Subſtantiæ [k] unum ſunt; & individua unitas recte creditur. Item de terrenis, vena, Fons, Fluvius, tria ſunt [l] vocabula, & tria unum [m] in ſua natura. Ita trium Perſonarum, Patris & Filii & Spiritus ſancti, Subſtantia & Deitas unum eſt [n].

Eſt ergo Fides recta, ut credamus & confiteamur, quia Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus [o]. Jeſus hebraïce, latine Salvator dicitur. [Chriſtus græce, latine unctus vocatur. Jeſus ergo dicitur [p]]

a In *Cod. Oxon.* deeſt *eſt.*

b Paulo aliter huncce locum expreſſit auctor Sermonis, inter *Auguſtini* opera (Append. Tom. 6. p. 281.) *Quia ſicut nunquam pater ſine Filio, nec Filius ſine Patre; ſic & nunquam fuit pater, & Filius ſine Spiritu Sancto.* Sed nihil mutandum contra Fidem Exemplarium.

c In *Appendice* prædicta, ſic legitur: *Coæterna ergo eſt Sancta Trinitas* &c.

d Sancta Trinitas. *Append.*

e Una eſt Deitas. *Append.* una Deitatis. *Oxon.* male.

f In Cod. *Oxonienſi.* deſunt illa *docente et.* Sed *Append.* Lectionem *Muratorii* tuetur, alio tamen verborum ordine; *dicente, atque docente.*

g Ita *Muratorius* cum *Appendice* prædict. Aliter *MS Oxon.* viz. *tria ſunt nomina, & res una.* quæ eodem recidunt.

h In *Appendice* ſic ſe habent; *tria hæc vocabula res una cognoſcitur.*

i *Et* poſt *ita* Oxon.

k Phraſis duriuſcula; *Deitate Subſtantiæ,* pro *Divinitate Subſtantiæ,* ſi tamen ita res habeat. At locus hic corruptus eſt fortaſſe, licet eandem lectionem Codex uterque præferat. *Appendix* omittit illud *Subſtantiæ.* Delendum forſan eſt *Subſtantiæ,* vel legendum, *in Deitatis Subſtantia,* aut ſimile quid. *Subſtantia, & Deitas* conjunctim leguntur paulo infra: quod quidem intuens, nollem *Subſtantiæ* hoc loco expungere; at corrigendum cenſeo.

l *Appendix* legit *hæc,* non *ſunt.* Oxon. *tria itemque ſunt.*

m Oxonienſis, *res una.* Append. cum Muratorio, *unum.*

n Ita Murat. & Append. Oxonienſis legit, *Subſtantia, Deitas una eſt.*

o Oxonienſis adjicit, *Dei Filius & Homo eſt.* inepte hoc loco, quod ex ſequentibus patebit.

p *Muratorii* Codex omittit verba illa intermedia, uncis incluſa. Scilicet, illud *dicitur* proximè repetitum Amanuenſi hic iterum fraudi fuit.

eo quod salvat Populum: Christus, eo quod Spiritu sancto divinitus sit [a] delibutus, sicut in ipsi s Christi [b] Persona *Isaias* ait; *Spiritus Domini super me, propter quod unxit me*, &c. Ita & Psalmista de Christo Domino dicit, [c] *unxit te Deus, Deus tuus, oleo lætitiæ præ Consortibus tuis.*

Dei Filius, Deus pariter & homo est. Filius a Felicitate Parentum dicitur: Homo ab humo dicitur; id est, de humo [d] factus est.

Deus est [e] *ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus.* Id est, Deus de Deo, lumen de lumine, splendor de splendore, fortis de forti, virtus de virtute, vita de vita, æternitas de æternitate: Per omnia, idem [f] quod pater in divina substantia hoc est & [g] Filius. Deus enim [h] Pater Deum Filium genuit, non voluntate, neque necessitate, sed natura. Nec quæratur quomodo genuit Filium [i], quod & Angeli nesciunt, Prophetis est incognitum: unde [k] eximius Propheta *Esaias* dicit; *generationem ejus quis enarrabit?* Ac si diceret, [l] Angelorum nullus, Prophetarum nemo [m]. Nec inenarrabilis, & inæstimabilis Deus [n] a servulis suis discutiendus est, sed fideliter credendus, [o] & pariter diligendus.

Et homo [p] *ex substantia matris, in sæculo natus.* Dei Filius, Verbum Patris, [q] Caro factum. [r] Non quod Divinitas mutasset deitatem, sed adsumpsit humanitatem. Hoc est, Verbum Caro factum est, ex utero Virginis veram humanam carnem traxit. Et de utero virginali verus Homo, sicut & verus Deus, est in sæculo natus, salva virginitatis gratia; [s] quia mater, quæ genuit, Virgo ante partum, & Virgo postpartum permansit [t].

a *Divinitus sit* desunt in Cod. Oxon.

b Deest *Christi*. Murator.

c Oxoniensis breviter, *Item in Psalmo, unxit* &c. Notandum porro, quod quædam habet *Fortunatus* noster, in Commentario suo in *Symbol. Apostol* hisce jam proxime descriptis perquam similia. Confer etiam *Ruffin.* in Symbol. inter Oper. *Hieronym.* (Tom. 5. p. 131.)

d De Humo *Terra*. Murator.

e Non habetur *est* in Murat.

f Pro *idem, id est*, Murator.

g Deest *et* Cod. Oxon. His quoque gemina fere habes in *Exposit.* in *Symbol. Apostolicum.*

h Deest *enim* Cod. Oxon. confer. Symb. *Damasi* dictum.

i *Quomodo genitus sit, quod Angeli*— Oxon. At *Muratorii* lectioni astipulatur Appendix ad Augustin. (Tom. 6. p. 279.) & *Fortunatus* ipse, *Expos. in Symb. Apostol.*

k Unde *& isdem*. Cod. Murat. conf. *Fortunat.* in Symb. Apostolicum.

l Muratorius habet *dixisset*.

m *Angelorum nemo, Prophetarum nullus*. Cod. Oxon. n Deest *Deus*. Oxon.

o Confer. *Fortunat.* in Symb. Apostol. & *Append.* apud August. p. 279. & *Ruffin.* Symb.

p *Homo est*: Cod. Oxon.

q *Dei Filius, verbum Caro*. Murat. *Dei Filius verbo Patris Caro*. Cod Oxon. Ex utrisque veram, opinor, lectionem restituimus.

r *Et non*. Cod. Murator. expunximus illud *et*, Fide Codicis Oxon.

s *salva virginitatis gratia*. desunt in Cod. Oxoniensi.

t Ita Cod. Oxon. Muratorius, *quia mater genuit, & virgo mansit ante partum, & post partum*.

In

In ſæculo. Id eſt, in iſto ſexto miliario, in quo nunc ſumus, [*ſæcula enim generationibus conſtant, & inde ſecula, quod ſequantur; abeuntibus enim aliis, alia ſuccedunt* [a].] " Deus & homo Chriſtus Jeſus, unus " Dei Filius & ipſe Virginis Filius. Quia dum Deitas in utero Vir- " ginis humanitatem adſumpſit, & cum eâ per Portam Virginis in- " tegram, & illæſam, naſcendo mundum ingreſſus eſt virginis Filius; & " Hominem (*leg.* Homo) quem adſumſit, id (*leg.* idem) eſt Dei Fili- " um (*leg.* Filius) ſicut jam ſupra diximus; & Deitas & Humanitas in " Chriſto; & Dei Patris pariter & Virginis Matris Filius.

Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo. Id eſt, verus Deus, & verus Homo. [b] *Ex anima rationali:* & non ut *Apollinaris* [c] Hæreticus dixit primum, quaſi Deitas pro anima fuiſſet in Carne Chriſti; poſtea, cum per evangelicam auctoritatem fuiſſet [d] convictus, dixit: *Habuit quidem animam quæ vivificavit corpus, ſed non rationalem.* [e] E contrario, dicit qui Catholice ſentit; *ex anima rationali & humana carne ſubſiſtens* [f]: id eſt, plenus homo, atque perfectus.

Æqualis Patri ſecundum Divinitatem; minor Patre ſecundum humanitatem. Id eſt, ſecundum formam ſervi quam adſumere dignatus eſt.

Qui licet [g] *Deus ſit & homo, non duo tamen, ſed unus eſt Chriſtus.* Id eſt, duæ ſubſtantiæ in Chriſto, Deitas & Humanitas, non duæ perſonæ, ſed una eſt perſona [h].

Unus autem, non converſione divinitatis in Carnem [h], *ſed adſumptione Humanitatis in Deum* [i]. Id eſt: non quod Divinitas,

a Non comparent in Codice Oxonienſi. Verba ſunt *Iſidori.* Orig. l. 5. c. 38. Quæ ſequuntur proxime, *Deus & Homo* &c. uſque ad *Matris Filius*, deſunt omnia in Codice *Muratorii:* ex *Oxonienſi* ſolo deſcripta dedimus. Videntur mihi *Fortunati* re vera eſſe, ſed Librarii culpa (ut alia multa) mirum in modum vitiata; quæ quidem ex *Conjectura* aliquatenus corrigere volui, ut *Syntaxis* ſaltem ſibi conſtet, donec certiora, & meliora ex Codicibus (ſi forte ſuperſint aliqui) eruantur. Cæterum, ut *Fortunato* noſtro hæc aſcribam, illud ſuadet maxime, quod in Expoſitione ſua in *Symbolum Apoſtolicum* gemina fere habet de *Porta virginis*, eiſdemque ibi nonnullis Phraſibus utitur quibus & hic uſus eſt. Confer *Symbolum Ruffini*, a Quo ſolenne eſt *Noſtro* (quippe qui & ipſe *Aquileiæ* olim Doctrina Chriſtiana initiatus fuerat) tum verba, tum ſententias mutuari.

b Deeſt hæc Clauſula in *Cod. Oxon.* ob vocabulum repetitum.

c *Paulinaris* Cod. Oxon. Lectio nata ex Sermone ſimplici & plebeio.

d *Fuit.* Cod. Oxon.

e *Et e contrario iſte dicit.* Murat. delevimus illa *et*, atque *iſte*, quæ ſententiam turbant, fide Codicis Oxonienſis.

f *Subſiſtit.* Cod. Oxon. g *certe*, loco *τῦ licet.* Cod. Oxon.

h *Eſt Perſona* deſunt in Cod. Oxon.

i Cod. Oxonienſis habet *Carne*, & *Deo:* errore, uti credo, pervetuſto, multiſque & antiquiſſimis exemplaribus communi. Quod ſi verbis in Commentario immediate ſequentibus (ex *Muratorii* lectione) ſteterimus, *Fortunatus* ipſe nobis Auctor erit, ut & *Deum*, & *Carnem*, pro genuina lectione habeamus.

quæ immutabilis est, sit conversa in Carnem [a]; sed ideo unus, eo quod Humanitatem adsumsit, cœpit [b] esse quod non [c] erat, & non amisit quod erat; cœpit esse Homo [d] quod antea non fuerat, non amisit Deitatem quæ incommutabilis in æternum permanet [e].

Unus omnino, non confusione substantiæ, sed unitate Personæ. Id est; Divinitas incommutabilis [f] cum Homine, quem adsumere dignata [g] est, sicut scriptum est; *verbum tuum, Domine, in æternum permanet.* Id est, Divinitas cum Humanitate; ut diximus duas substantias unam personam [h] esse in Christo: ut sicut ante adsumptionem [carnis, æterna fuit Trinitas, ita post adsumptionem [i]] humanæ naturæ, vera maneat Trinitas; ne propter adsumptionem humanæ Carnis dicatur esse quaternitas, quod absit a Fidelium cordibus, vel sensibus, dici, aut cogitari, cum, ita [k] ut supradictum est, & Unitas in Trinitate, & Trinitas in Unitate veneranda sit.

Nam sicut Anima rationalis, & Caro unus est Homo; ita Deus, & Homo unus est Christus. Etsi Deus [l], Dei Filius, nostram luteam & mortalem carnem, nostræ Redemptionis conditionem [m] adsumpserit, se tamen nullatenus [n] inquinavit, neque naturam Deitatis mutavit. Quia si Sol, aut Ignis aliquid immundum tetigerit, quod tangit purgat, & se nullatenus coinquinat: ita Deitas Sarcinam quoque [o] nostræ Humanitatis adsumsit, se nequaquam coinquinavit, sed

a *Quæ immutabilis & inconvertibilis est, Caro; sed* &c. Cod. Oxon.

b *Incipit.* Cod. Oxon.

c Deest *non.* Cod. Murat. malè.

d Deest *Homo* in Cod. Oxon. perperam. item, *incipit*, pro *cœpit.*

e Muratorius legit, *quia incommutabilis in æternum permanet:* Cod. Oxoniensis, *quæ immutabilis in æternum permansit.* Ex utrisque tertiam lectionem confecimus; quæ, opinor, cæteris & venustior est, & aptior.

f *Immutabilis.* Cod. Oxon.

g *dignatus.* Cod. Oxon.

h *Personam* perperam omittit Cod. Oxoniensis.

i Desunt in Codice Oxoniensi: prætermissa scilicet festinantis Librarii incuriâ, ob vocem iteratam.

k Pro *cum ita*, habet Cod. Oxon. *nisi ita.*

l Murator. Cod. omittit *Deus.*

m Cod. Oxoniensis, *Nostri Redemptionis Conditionis adsumpsit.* Nescio an melius Muratorius; *nostram luteam, & mortalem Carnem nostræ Conditionis adsumserit.* Sed levi mutatione, rectè incedunt omnia. *Conditio*, apud Scriptores quinti & sexti Sæculi, est *servile* onus, opusve.

n Cod. Oxon. legit *se nullatenus.* Murator: *Sed tamen se nullatenus.* Noster vero in *Expositione in Symb. Apostol.* in simili causa, hac utitur Phrasi, *se tamen non inquinat.*

o Oxoniensis habet, *Deitas sarcinamque nostræ humanitatis adsumpsit, se nequaquam* &c. Muratorius hoc modo; *Deitas sarcinam, quam ex nostra Humanitate adsumpsit, nequaquam coinquinavit.* Lectio frigida prorsus, & inepta. Juvat huc conferre quæ *Fortunatus* noster ad Symb. Apost. in eandem sententiam breviter dictavit.

" Quod vero Deus Majestatis de *Maria* in Carne natus est, non est sordidatus nascendo
" de virgine, qui non fuit pollutus hominem condens de pulvere. Denique sol, aut Ignis,
" si lutum inspiciat, quod tetigerit purgat, & se tamen non inquinat. conf. *Ruffin.* Symb.
p. 133.

nostram

noſtram naturam carnis, [a] quam adſumpſit, purgavit, & a maculis, & ſordibus peccatorum, ac vitiorum expiavit: ſicut *Eſaias* ait; *ipſe infirmitates noſtras accepit, & ægrotationes portavit.* Ad hoc ſecundum humanitatem natus eſt, ut infirmitates noſtras acciperet, & ægrotationes portaret: non quod ipſe infirmitates, vel ægrotationes in ſe haberet, quia Salus mundi eſt; ſed ut eas à nobis tolleret, dum ſuæ ſacræ paſſionis Gratiâ, & Sacramento [b], Chirographo adempto, Redemptionem pariter & Salutem animarum nobis condonaret.

Qui paſſus eſt pro ſalute noſtra. Id eſt, ſecundum id quod pati potuit: quod eſt, ſecundum humanam naturam; nam ſecundum Divinitatem, Dei Filius impaſſibilis eſt.

Deſcendit ad Inferos [c]. Ut [d] Protoplaſtum Adam [e], & Patriarchas, & Prophetas, & omnes juſtos, qui pro Originali peccato ibidem detinebantur, liberaret; & de [f] vinculis ipſius [g] peccati abſolutos, de eadem captivitate, & [h] infernali [i] loco, ſuo ſanguine redemptos, ad ſuperna patriam, & ad perpetuæ vitæ gaudia revocaret. Reliqui, [k] qui ſupra Originale peccatum [l] principalia crimina [m] commiſerunt, ut adſerit Scriptura, in pœnali Tartaro remanſerunt: ſicut in perſona Chriſti dictum eſt per Prophetam; *Ero mors tua, O Mors*; id eſt, morte ſua Chriſtus humani generis inimicam Mortem interfecit, & vitam dedit. *Ero morſus tuus, inferne.* Partim [n] momordit infernum, pro Parte eorum quos liberavit: Partem reliquit, pro Parte eorum qui pro principalibus criminibus in Tormentis remanſerunt.

Surrexit a mortuis primogenitus mortuorum: Et alibi Apoſtolus dicit; *Ipſe primogenitus ex multis fratribus.* Id eſt, primus a mortuis reſurrexit. *Et multa corpora* [o] *Sanctorum dormientium cum eo ſurrexerunt,*

a *Noſtræ naturæ Carnem.* Murat.

b Muratorius legit; *dum ſuæ ſacræ paſſionis Gratiam, & Sacramenta:* nullo ſenſu. Oxonienſis, *dum ſuæ ſacræ paſſionis gratiæ* (pro *gratiâ*) *ac Sacramento.*

c *Ad inferna.* Cod. Oxon. quod & inter variantes *Symboli* Lectiones ſupra notatum oportuit. Q. annon vetuſtiſſima hæc fuerit lectio in Symbolo *Athanaſiano*, ſicut in *Apoſtolico*?

d *Qui*, loco τῦ *ut.* Cod. Oxon. At Sermo de Symbolo, in *Append. ad Auguſt.* (Tom. 6. p. 281.) legit, cum Muratorio, *ut.*

e *Adam Protoplaſtum.* Append.

f *Et ut de.* Append.

g *Ipſius* deeſt: Append.

h Deeſt *et* Cod. Oxon.

i *Inferni.* Append.

k Muratorius habet *vero*, poſt *Reliqui.* Oxon. non agnoſcit, nec Append.

l Ita legitur in Appendice. Oxonienſis, *ſupra Originale peccato*: Muratorius, *ſupra Originali peccato.*

m *Principalem culpam.* Append.

n Muratorius, & Oxonienſis, in utroque loco, *Partem*: Appendix, in utroque, *Partim.* Media mihi lectio maxime arridet.

o Deeſt *corpora* in Cod. Oxon.

ſicut evangelica auctoritas [a] dicit: *Sed ipſe, qui Caput eſt, prius, deinde qui* [b] *Membra ſunt continuo.*

Poſtea *aſcendit ad cælos:* ſicut Pſalmiſta ait; *aſcendit* [c] *in altum, captivam duxit captivitatem*, id eſt, humanam naturam, quæ prius ſub peccato venundata fuit, & captivata; eamque redemptam captivam [d] duxit in cæleſtem altitudinem; & ad cæleſtis Patriæ [e] Regnum ſempiternum, ubi antea non fuerat, eam [f] collocavit, in gloriam ſempiternam.

Sedet ad dexteram Patris: Id eſt, Proſperitatem paternam, & in [g] eo Honore, quod [h] Deus eſt.

Inde venturus [i] *judicare vivos & mortuos.* Vivos dicit eos quos tunc adventus Dominicus in corpore viventes invenerit; [& mortuos, jam ante ſepultos. Et aliter dicit[k],] vivos *juſtos*, & mortuos *peccatores.* [l]

Ad cujus adventum omnes homines reſurgere habent cum corporibus ſuis; & reddituri ſunt de factis propriis rationem: Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam æternam; qui vero mala, in ignem æternum. Hæc eſt Fides Catholica, quam niſi quiſque fideliter, firmiterque crediderit, ſalvus eſſe non poterit.

a *In evangelica Autoritate.* Cod. Oxon.

b *Quæ membra.* Cod. Oxon.

c *aſcendens.* Murator.

d Conf. Tractatum Anonymi apud *Hieronym.* Tom. 5. p. 130. & apud *Auguſtin.* Tom. 8. p. 69. *Append.*

e *Cæleſtem Patriam.* Cod. Oxon.

f *Et* pro *eam.* Murator.

g *in* deeſt. Cod. Oxon.

h Mallem *quo*, ſi per Codices liceret; ſed & *quod*, adverbialiter hic poſitum pro *quia*, ſenſum non incommodum præ ſe ferre videtur.

i venturus *eſt.* Murator.

k Quantum hic uncis includitur, omittit Codex Oxonienſis. Deluſus eſt fortean Librarius per binas literulas *it* bis poſitas: Vel, ſimili errore deceptus, integram lineam præterierit, dum in proxime ſequentem oculos conjecerat.

l Operæ pretium eſt pauca hic ſubjicere, quæ *Noſter* habet in expoſitione ſua in *Symb. Apoſtolicum.* " *judicaturus vivos*, & *mortuos.* Aliqui dicunt vivos, juſtos; mortuos vero injuſtos: aut certe, vivos, quos in corpore invenerit adventus Dominicus, & mortuos, jam ſepultos. Nos tamen intelligamus vivos & mortuos, hoc eſt animas & corpora pariter judicanda. Confer. *Ruffin.* Symb. p. 140. & *Method.* apud *Phot.* Cod. 234. p. 932.

AN INDEX OF AUTHORS.

A.

ABBO, or Albo (Floriacenſis) 23. 68. 142.
Abelard. 38. 137. 143.
Adalbertus 22.
Adrian I. (Pope) 52. 83.
Æneas Pariſienſis 5. 22.
Agobardus 20.
Alcuinus 171. 172.
Alexander (of Hales) 26. 151. 164.
Alexander (Natalis) 12. 47. 82. 120.
Allatius (Leo) 6. 25. 97.
Alſtedius 81.
Ambroſe (St.) 75. 102. 109, 110. 129, 130.
Amerbachius. 66.
Anaſtaſius I. (Pope) 11. 123.
Anaſtaſius II. (Pope) 105.
Anaſtaſius (Antioch.) 57.
Anſcharius 10. 83. 84.
Anthelmius 10. 49. 58. 117. 118.
Aquinas 27. 88. 118.
Athanaſius (Alex.) 101.
Athanaſius (of *Spire*) 7.
Auguſtinus (Stus) 15. 59. 102. 104. 106. 111. 112. 115.—119. 126.—133. 164. 168.
Avitus Viennenſis. 79. 115.
Autun (Council of) 15. 78. 114.

B.

BAIFFIUS (Lazarus) 72. 74 76.
Baldenſal (William) 28.
Baluzius 18.
Baronius 7. 10. 81, 91.
Beleth 25.
Berno (Augienſis) 62.
Beveridge 9.
Bingham 12. 18.
Bona (Card.) 6. 28. 57. 60. 80. 86. 87. 90.
Bruno (Bp. of Wurtzb.) 34. 163. 173.
Brunſwick (Abbot) 24.
Bryling (Nicol.) 73. 75.

C.

CABASSUTIUS. 9. 18.
Cæſarius (of Arles) 115. 168.
Calamy (Dr.) 155.
Caleca (Manuel) 28. 70. 90.
Calviſius 81.
Cantilupe (Walter) 26.
Caſſian (John) 113.
Cave (Dr.) 8. 12.
Cazanovius 92.
Chalcedon (Council) 105.
Charles the Great. 52. 78. 83, 84, 85. 88.
Chillingworth 153.
Clarke (Dr.) 12. 150.
Claudianus Mamertus 106.
Cochleus (Joh.) 36.
Le Coint p. 18.
Combefis 28. 29. 60. 91. 103. 124.
Comber (Dr.) 8. 47.
Covel (Dr.) 7.
Cyparisſiota (Johannes) 29. 74.

D.

Danhawerus 157.
Dionyſius (*Milan.*) 74.
Dodwell 80.
Dupin 9. 18.
Durants (William) 27.

E.

EPIPHANIUS 101. 109.
Euphronius Presbyter. 34, 168.
Euſebius (Verceil) 28. 74.
Exeter (Council of) 27.

F.

FABRICIUS 6. 11. 18. 25. 75. 77.
Fauſtinus 102. 127. 128.
Felckman 58. 72. 76.

Fellerus

Fellerus (Joachim) 165.
Flavian (Cple) 105. 113.
Fortunatus (Venant) 11. 32. 114, 115. 163. 171. &c. Pref. p. 2.
Frankfort (Council of) 19. 83.
Fulgentius 105. 138, 139 171, 172.

G.

GAVANTUS (Barthol.) 81.
Gaudentius (Brix.) 15.
Genebrard 73. 75, 76. 89. 95.
Gennadius Maſſil. 118. 132, 133. 149. 164.
Gentilly (Council of) 69.
Gorrham 167,
Grabe (Dr.) 36. 51.
Gregory I. (Pope) 46. 168.
Gregory IX. (Pope) 5. 26. 46.
Gregory Nazianz. 15. 102. 106. 110. 126.
Gregory Nyſſen. 109.
Gregory of Tours. 35. 60.
Gualdo Corbeienſ. 24.
Gundling (Wolfg.) 8. 72. 74. 76. 91.

H.

HAMPOLE (Rich.) 39. 42. 44. 165. 167.
Harduin 15. 18. 22. 26, 27. 109. 113.
Harris (Dr.) 92. 93.
Hatto (Baſil) 20. 83. 90.
Heideggerus 8.
Helvicus 82.
Hermantius (Godfr.) 18.
Hickes (Dr.) 48. 69. 85. 97.
Hilary (of Arles) 117. 119.
Hilary (Poictiers) 58. 120.
Hildegarde 38.
Hincmar 5. 16. 20. 35. 66. 114. 169.
Hody (Dr.) 59. 60, 61, 62. 88.
Honoratus (of Arles) 119.
Honoratus (of Marſeilles) 118.
Honorius (Autun) 24.
Hormiſdas (Pope) 105.
Hulſemannus 157.
Hydruntinus (Nic.) 25. 70, 71. 96.

I.

JANUENSIS (Johan.) 151. 165. 167.
Jerom (St.) 60. 109. 111.
Ignatius 13. 133.
John (of Antioch) 112, 113.
John II. (Pope) 105.
Iſidorus Hiſp. p. 15. 171. 177.
Julianus (Cardin.) 168.
Ivo Carnotenſis 168.
Juſtinian (Emp.) 105.

K.

KROMAYERUS 157.

L.

LABBE (Phil.) 7. 18.
Lambecius. 52. 67. 84. 130.
Le Lande (Peter) 18.
Langbaine (Dr.) 40
Leo. I. (Pope) 7, 105, 108, 113.
Leo III. (Pope) 20. 88.
Leodegarius 15. 17.
Leporius 112. 116.
Lepuſculus (Sebaſtian) 76.
Livius (Poet) 217.
Le Long 35, 36. 40. 56. 59. 62. 65. 67.
Ludolphus (Job) 91. 98. 161.
Ludolphus Saxo. 28. 151.
Lupus (Troyes) 35.
Luther 151.
Lyra 167.

M.

MABILLON. 60. 62. 80. 82.
Martianay 59, 60.
Metrophanes Critopulus. 96.
Montfaucon 10. 18. 24. 37. 47. 50, 51, 52, 53. 56. 58. 67. 69. 73, 74. 82. 107. 115.
Muratorius 11, 16. 18. 32. 43. 47. 50. 82. 91. 115. 167. 171 &c.

N.

NEANDER (Mich.) 75.
Neckham (Alex.) 39. 164.
Neſſelius 71, 72. 77.
Nichols 155.
Nithardus 66.

O.

OLIVET mount (Monks of) 20. 85. 88.
Oroſius 149.
Otfridus 67. 83.
Otho (Friſiug.) 24. 27.
Oudin (Caſim) 8. 13. 17, 18, 21. 39. 40. 82. 115. 167.

P.

P.

PAGI. 10. 18. 56. 78.
Papebrochius. 16.
Pappus (Johan.) 162.
Pareus (David.) 34. 157. 168.
Pareus (Philip) 168.
Paululus (Rob.) 25.
Pearſon (Bp) 7. 149.
Pelagius I. (Pope) 105.
Pelagius (Monk) 111, 112. 127. 130, 131. 133.
Petavius 5. 107, 108, 109.
Petrus de Harentals 167.
Planudes (Max.) 71.
Piuſiadenus 29.

Q.

QUESNEL (Paſchaſ.) 7. 18. 56, 57. 78. 82. 107. 108. 118, 119, 120.
Le Quien 11. 20. 47. 79. 88. 107, 108. 109. 115. 144. 154, 155.

R.

RATHERIUS (Verona) 20. 85.
Ratram (Corb.) 5. 21. Pref.
Regino 18.
Rembertus. 22. 84.
Renaudot. 91. 93. 161.
Ricaut (Sr Paul) 98. 161.
Riculphius (Bp. Soiſſ.) 22.
Ruelius (Johan. Lud.) Pref. p. 4.
Ruffinus 132. 168. 176. &c.

S.

SANDIUS. 7.
Serarius (Nic.) 76. 162.
Simon (of Tournay) 38.
Sirmondus 17, 18. 20, 21. 114, 115.
Smith (Dr.) 49. 51. 55. 91.
Spondanus. 91.
Stephens (H.) 75.
Strabus (Walaf.) 60.
Suicer (Caſp.) 98.

T.

TAYLOR (Bp) 6. 157.
Tentzelius 6. 9. 18. 21. 24. 37. 43. 47. 58. 67. 76, 77. 93. 157. 165.
Thecaras (Monachus) 96.
Theodulphus 8. 19. 22.
Tillemont 10. 18. 47. 49. 82.
Toledo III. Council 80.
Toledo IV. Council 80. 81.
Treviſa (Joh.) 40.
Turribius 105.

V.

VIGILIUS Tapſenſis 7, 8. 107.
Vincentius Lirin. 10. 104. 106. 113. 117. 119. 126, 127. 131.
Ullerſton 167.
Voſſius (Gerard) 4. 19. 58. 91, 92.
Uſher 5. 36. 46. 48. 66. 74. 76. 77. 93. 96. 157.

W.

WALL (Dr.) 111, 112.
Wanley 36. 48. 54. 55. 67. 89.
Wharton 40, 41. 54. 66. 67.
Wickliff 27. 39. 40. 144.
Willehad 83.
Wotton (Dr.) 54. 68.

Z.

ZIALOWSKI (Euſtrat. Johannid) 8. 72.

AN

AN INDEX OF MSS.

AMBROSIAN. 1. Athanaſian Creed. 50, 64, 86, 126. *&c.*

AMBROSIAN. 2. Anonymous Comments on the Creed. 43, 45.

AMBROSIAN. 3. Fortunatus's Comment. 11, 32, 45. 167.

BAIFFIUS. Greek Copy of the Creed 72, 76.

BALIOL: OXON. Bruno's Comment 163.

BASIL. Bruno's *and* Hampoles Comment. 37, 43, 44, 165.

BENET. CAMBR. (N. X.) Athanaſian Creed. 53, 85, 127, 131.

BENET. (N. O. V.) Athanaſian Creed. 54, 60.

BENET. (K. 10.) Athanaſian Creed. 55.

BENET. (1—1.) Wickliff's Comment. 42.

BENET. (N. XV.) Gregory's Pſalter. 47.

BODLEIAN. (JUNIUS. 25.) Fortunatus's Comment. 33, 168.

BODLEIAN. (LAUD. H. 61.) Bruno's Comment. 37.

BODLEIAN. (LAUD. E. 71.) Bruno's Comment. 163.

BODLEIAN. (G. 39) Athanaſian Creed. 56.

BODLEIAN. (E. 6. 11.) Neckham's Comment. 164.

BODLEIAN. (E. 7. 8.) Neckham's Comment. 39, 164.

BODLEIAN. (LAUD. C. 16.) Wickliff's Comment. 167.

BRYLING. Greek Copy of the Creed. 73, 75, 139.

C. C. C. C. ——— *Vid.* Benet.

CAMBRIDGE. Athanaſian Creed. 55, 89.

CASSINENSIS. Athanaſian Creed. 56.

COLBERT. 1. Athanaſian Creed. 49, 52, 107. 131. *&c.*

COLBERT. 2. Athanaſian Creed. 53.

CONSTANTINOPOLITAN. Greek Copy of the Creed. 73, 76.

COTTON. 1. Athanaſian Creed in *Athelſtan's Pſalter.* 51, 60, 127, 232.

COTTON. 2. (Vitell. E. 18) Athanaſian Creed. 55.

COTTON. 3. (Veſp. A.) Athanaſian Creed. 47, 55.

COTTON. 4. (Nero. C. 4.) Gallican Verſion. 67.

DIONYSIAN. Greek Copy. See *Baiffius.*

EMANUEL CAMBR. Wickliff's Bible. 40.

FELCKMAN. Greek Copy of the Creed. 72.

FRIARS MINORS. Latino-Gallican Creed. 56.

GERMANS (St.) Athanaſian Creed. 52, 126.

GERMAN DE PREZ Bruno's Comment. 37.

GOTHA. Bruno's with Hampole's Comment. 37, 43, 44 165.

HARLEY. 1. Athanaſian Creed. 55.

HARLEY. 2. Athanaſian Creed. 56.

HARLEY. 3. Bruno's Comment. 37.

HILARIAN. Athanaſian Creed. 58.

JAMES's (St.) Athanaſian Creed. 54, 89, 127.

JAMES's 2. (St.) Athanaſian Creed. 56.

JOHN's (St.) CAMBR. Wickliff's Comment. 39.

JOHN's (St.) OXON. Bruno's Comment. 163.

LAMBETH. Athanaſian Creed. 54, 60, 68.

LEIPSICK. Bruno's with *Hampole.* 37, 43, 44, 165.

MAGDALEN. CAMBR. Wickliff's New-Teſtament. 41.

MAGDALEN. OXON. Hampole's Comment. 165.

MERTON. OXON. Bruno's Comment. 164.

NORFOLK. Athanaſian Creed. 55.

NORFOLK. Engliſh Goſpels. 49.

PALATINE. Greek Copy of the Creed. 72.

PATRICK YOUNG. Greek Copy of the Creed. 74, 96.

REGIUS PARIS. 1. Athanaſian Creed. 52.

REGIUS PARIS. 2. Greek Copy of the Creed. 73.

SARUM. Saxon Verſion of the Creed. 68.

SIDNEY. CAMBR. Hampole's Comment on the Pſalms, Engliſh. 167.

THUANUS. Athanaſian Creed. 57.

TREVES. Athanaſian Creed. 49, 107, 131.

TRINITY-COLL. CAMBR. Bruno's Comment. 36, 62.

TRINITY-COLL. CAMBR. Wickliff's Comment. 41.

VIENNA. 1. Athanaſian Creed. 52, 83, 84, 86.

VIENNA. 2. Greek Creed. 71.

VIENNA. 3. Greek Creed. 71.

VIENNA. 4. German Verſion. 67, 83.

USHER. 1. Athanaſian Creed. 46.

USHER. 2. Book of Hymns. 74.

WURTZBURG. Bruno's Comment. 36.

YORK. Bruno's Comment. 37.

FINIS.