

*THE ARTICLES OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.*

[THE following commentary on the Articles of the Apostles' Creed forms the second part of a pamphlet published by Professor Zahn in 1893. By way of introduction we have added the author's short summary of the history of the Creed. The translation has been made from the 2nd German edition. The Author has most kindly supplied some corrections and additional notes, which he has prepared for a 3rd edition. We wish to add that we do not necessarily agree with all the opinions expressed, but are confident that so eloquent a profession of belief in the great truths of the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost, will interest many readers, and may help to confirm their faith.—TRANS.]

The Apostles' Creed, which we profess to this day, has had an historical development extending over many hundred years. . . . It has its roots in Christ's command to baptize. Against the authenticity of that command no historical reasons worthy of consideration have been brought forward. It was necessary that the newly converted should confess their faith, both before and at their reception of Baptism. On this condition they were baptized, and out of the baptismal formula grew a baptismal confession, which had already assumed a more or less stereotyped form in early Apostolic times. At a somewhat later period, somewhere between 70-120, the original formula, which reminds us of the Jewish origin of Christianity, was reconstructed. Thus it appeared better suited to the needs of the baptized, who mostly came out of heathendom. This altered formula was very soon widely

known. We find it at Ephesus in 130, at Rome in 145, and again between 180-210 at Carthage, Lyons, and Smyrna. It also forms the groundwork of all the later baptismal confessions of the Eastern Churches.<sup>1</sup> Between the years 200-220, the first article was slightly altered in Rome (for the reasons mentioned on pp. 20-30, German ed.). This altered form was adopted by the Churches of Italy, of Africa, and probably also of the South of France. For many generations the Roman Church, and a few Churches closely united to Rome, held strictly to this form, which had been published in Rome early in the 3rd century. In all the other Churches the Creed was thenceforward developed with considerable freedom. In the East, where the Roman recension of 200-220 could not find an entrance, its course was other than in the West, in Carthage other than in Aquileia. The inner and outer factors, which determined these provincial developments, and the exchanges between the different Churches are for the most

<sup>1</sup> Our information about the Creed of Alexandria is particularly scanty. What Caspari (*Zeitschr. für kirchl. Wissensch.*, 1886, pp. 352-375) has said about the baptismal Creed of Clement needs fuller treatment. On the symbol of Antioch cf. Caspari, I, 73-99; Hahn, p. 64 f. Beside the defective narratives belonging to a later period, which are there discussed, these passages in the Didascalia (preserved to us only in Syriac, the basis of the Apostolic Constitutions), which resemble a creed, must be reckoned as witnesses of an older period. It was originally a Greek work, and saw the light in Antioch, or not far off in the 3rd century, perhaps even during its first half; cf. Funk. *Die Apost. Const.*, pp. 50-55. Apart from the doxology at the end of the Didascalia (Lagarde, p. 120 f.) special attention should be paid to the shorter but, in a certain sense, more complete formula, p. 81, 14 ff., and a third passage, p. 102, 5 ff., about which there will be something more to say at the end of this treatise. For the first article the constant use of the form Θεὸς πατοκράτωρ (p. 36, 21; 81, 8; 94, 3; 101, 16; 102, 8; 106, 8; 121, 7) is characteristic. Sometimes "the Lord" precedes it (p. 37, 23; 81, 15). We never read Θεὸς πατήρ πατοκράτωρ, for the word "Father" on p. 102, 8, has been inserted by a second hand. The passage 1, 8 ("you who have taken the liberty of calling God the Almighty Father") does not belong here. Also there is no emphasis laid on the Unity or Oneness of God. For the 2nd article note p. 85, 3; 87, 25; for the 3rd article p. 85, 4 ("the holy Church of God"), cf. p. 1, 4; 60, 16; 101, 28; 106, 11, 29 ("the Catholic Church"), and p. 55, 28; 106, 24, where both attributes of the Church are combined in a varying order.

part unknown to history. The Gallican Church of the 3rd and 4th centuries especially lies for us in utter darkness with regard to this as to many other points.<sup>1</sup> And yet it seems that it was in that very South Gallican Church during the 5th century that the revision of the Creed, which was to spread all over the West and supersede all the other forms, took its final impress.

Reviewing the whole argument, we may conclude that the legend that the Apostles before the beginning of their missionary journeys composed the Creed which was called after them, contains more historical truth and wisdom than the assertion that the Apostles' Creed was a production of the fifth or sixth century.

An attempt to investigate thoroughly the contents of the Creed, and to estimate its full value, would far exceed the limits assigned to this pamphlet and the strength which I have at my disposal. But a discussion may be of some use, though it does not pretend to be perfect, which compares with the separate articles of the Creed, the old Church doctrines, and the testimony of the New Testament. I shall place first the separate sentences as they are to be found in the received Latin text, which corresponds to the Latin edition of the Book of Concord of 1584, and to the Roman catechism of 1566. Next to it I shall place the German text given three times in the German Book of Concord of 1580, at the head of the collection under the title "The Three Chief Concord or Confessions of the Faith of Christ, as used unanimously by the

<sup>1</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, who praises the Baptismal Creed so highly, has (so far as I know) never reproduced that of his own Church. Moreover, on account of the geographical position of Poitiers, such a narrative would not be an authentic witness for the district of Arles, Marseilles, Riez. The same objection may be applied to the *Libellus fidei* of Phœbadius or Fœgadius of Agen, which contains none of the characteristic features of the later Apostles' Creed. Also a more exact investigation of its origin is needed. Alas! the *septem* "De fide et regulis fidei" libri of Syagrius (Gennadius, v. ill. 66), as distinguished from his book *De fide*, which Gennadius has previously described, has not come down to us.

Churches." It forms a constituent part of Luther's two catechisms.<sup>1</sup> Below I shall quote some other forms of the Creed to illustrate its development:—*Rom.* = the Greek text of the Roman Creed between the years 220–450; *Aquil.* = the Creed of Aquileia according to Rufinus; *Afr.* = the Creed of the African Church as it already existed in substance in Cyprian, first completely in Augustine, in several pseudo-Augustinian sermons, and in Fulgentius of Ruspe<sup>2</sup>; *Jerus.* = the Creed of Jerusalem according to a fragment of the Liturgy of James and the Catecheses of Cyril<sup>3</sup>; *Ant.* = the Creed of Antioch according to Cassian's Latin translation and a Greek fragment.<sup>4</sup>

## I.

Credo in Deum patrem omnipotentem, creatorem coeli et terræ. Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

*Rom.*: πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα.—*Aqu.*: Credo in Deo patre omnipotente, invisibili et impassibili.—*Afr.*: Credo (or credimus) in Deum patrem omnipotentem, universorum creatorem, regem sæculo-

<sup>1</sup> I quote the Latin and the German *Book of Concord*s from J. T. Müller, *Die symb. Bücher der ev.-luth. Kirche* (1848), p. 28; the *Catechismus Romanus*, in the first book of which the Creed is not found in a connected form, but in detached portions, from *Libri symbolici ecclesiæ romano-catholicæ*, ed. Danz (1836), p. 367 ff. In the catechisms, the German *Book of Concord*s (Müller, p. 357, 450) has "God the Father Almighty" (for "God Father Almighty"); in the second article the smaller catechism shows some variations of style.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Caspari, II. 245–282, esp. p. 253 f.; Hahn, pp. 29–35.

<sup>3</sup> The Liturgy of James from Morel's text in Daniel, *Codex liturg.*, iv. 99. Although the Creed immediately after the beginning of the second article breaks off with the words *καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τοῦ συμβόλου τῆς πίστεως*, it can be distinguished as differing from the Creed of Cyril and from the Nicene Creed. The fact that in four MSS. printed by Swainson (*The Greek Liturgies* (1884) p. 244 f.) the Creed is shrivelled up to the words *πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα Θεόν*, with the further addition in one MS of *πατέρα παντοκράτορα*, is of little or no importance. The Creed was plainly very old (Caspari, III. 200) and had long been out of date when those MSS. were written, and was for the most part so much curtailed by copyists that any favourite form of Creed served as a continuation. Caspari has discussed the Baptismal Creed of Cyril in his Norwegian *Historisk-Kritiske Afhandlinger* (1881), p. 95–277.

<sup>4</sup> Cassianus c. Nestorium, VI. 3 ff. (opp. ed. Petschenig, I. 327 ff.) and Caspari, I. 73–99, but cf. also p. 47, n. 1, *supra*, Germ. ed.

rum, immortalem et invisibilem.—*Jerus.*: πιστεύω (or πιστεύομεν) εἰς ἓν Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς.<sup>1</sup>—*Antioch.*: Credo in unum et solum verum Deum, patrem omnipotentem, creatorem omnium visibilium et invisibilium creaturarum.

It has been proved (on pp. 23 ff., German edition) that not one of these forms of article 1 was the original. Much more probably it was πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα without any addition. It was in the beginning of the third century that the first words of the Western Creeds, including our own, were formulated in Rome and spread from thence throughout the West. We must give the Oriental Churches credit for having consistently preserved the confession of the unity of God, in part with accentuated expression,<sup>2</sup> and for their tenacious holding to the original. No words need be wasted in discussing the usefulness of the original formula for new converts from heathenism, and of its agreement with the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles.<sup>3</sup> Must we therefore blame the Roman and other Western Churches, which joined her, for giving up the older form and introducing in its place that which has ever since been predominant in the West? Their reasons were

<sup>1</sup> Only so much in the Liturgy of James. Cyril adds ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.

<sup>2</sup> Rufinus (*Expos. Symb.*, 4, 5) speaks only of "almost all Eastern Churches" as having the *unum* in the 1st and 2nd articles. This limitation may refer to the fact that it was frequently wanting in the 2nd article of Oriental Creeds; e.g., in the Creed of the Smyrnæans, according to the testimony of Hippolytus, which alone comes into consideration (see p. 24, n. 1, *supra*, Germ. ed.), the Antiochian, according to Cassian, in *Const. Ap.*, vii. 41, etc. In the 1st article, on the contrary, it is lacking in none of the eastern symbols. For apparent exceptions, among which is to be reckoned the Didascalia (p. 47, n. 1, Germ. ed.), see Caspari, III. 50, n. 88. The free narrative of Aphraates (ed. Wright, p. 22) is to be judged in the same way. In the question to which a reply is here given the oneness of God is emphasized; in the reply this point is omitted without any intentional opposition.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 28, n. 2, Germ. ed. The reminiscence of John 17. 3 makes itself distinctly heard in many Eastern Creeds which accentuate the unity of God, e.g., *Const. Ap.*, vii. 41, and the Antiochian Creed. Also 1 Cor. 8. 4-6 and Eph. 4. 5 f., have had some influence, especially in cases where emphasis is also laid on the unity of the Lord Christ; cf. even Irenæus, I. 3, 6 (if the word κύριον, wanting in the Latin text is the true reading), and Clement, *Strom.*, vii. 107.

justifiable when they strove to render the work of trifling critics more difficult, and to shield the "simple," who always form the majority of the community (p. 26, Germ. ed.). Those critics sought, by an appeal to their baptismal confession, to foist upon them views which were as antagonistic to the Scriptures as to the development of Christian thought on the Person of Christ. In altering the form of confession they no more altered the confession of the Church than Luther, when he did not hesitate to expound our Creed in his Catechism and at the same time to lead the congregation in singing: "We all believe in one God, the Maker of heaven and earth." Just as little would one of us have made an alteration in the Creed if he repeated it aloud with the congregation every Sunday at Erlangen, though for years he had constantly sung Luther's metrical Creed instead of it at Leipsic. The path marked out by the Apostolic forms of speech was not forsaken. These alterations were made in order to protest against two opposing Monarchian heresies; and to protect two equally important elements of the Christian faith, the personal distinction of the Son from the Father disputed by Noetus and Praxeas, and the unreserved offering of faith and prayer to Jesus criticised by Theodotus and others as the idolizing of a man and the denial of Monotheism.

If the original Creed and also the altered Roman form were content to express the relation of God to the world in one word, *παντοκράτωρ*, only the fact that God had power over all was directly asserted. But as neither a Jew nor a Christian ever held this faith except in connection with the thought that God was the Creator of the world, this was taken for granted from the beginning. The manifold forms in which this thought has attained unequivocal expression in the Creeds are only amplifications of the original. No one can say exactly when such an addition was first incorporated into the baptismal con-

fession of a Church. The defenders of the faith of the Church from Justin onwards opposed Marcion and most of the Gnostics, who distinguished the Creator of the world, the Demiurge, from the God of the Christian faith. They were never weary of emphasizing this fact, and also inserted it in varying phrases in many free reproductions of the baptismal confession. On the other hand, it was as yet wanting in the oldest forms of the Creed, which can be traced with certainty. We may therefore conclude that it was inserted in consequence of this opposition. But this opposition, especially when directed against Marcion, was still keenly maintained far on into the 3rd century, and was kept alive in the consciousness of the whole Church from Persia to Spain by the similar tendencies of that later period. However, from the wide propagation of the confession of faith in God as Creator, and the many ways in which this was expressed in the baptismal Creeds of the 4th century, two statements may be proved without difficulty. First, this addition did not spring up in one place and spread from thence in all directions. Secondly, it was included in the baptismal confessions of most Churches before the Council of Nicæa, and long before there was any thought of giving up the shorter Roman form at Rome and Milan. Of the many varieties of this addition, that which we possess in our Creed is by far the simplest and most dignified. Nor is any injury done to the old Creed if, when the German Creed is repeated, the word "Almighty" is always connected with "Maker of heaven and earth," in spite of the history of the development of the Creed and the exegesis of the old interpreters, for God has made known His Omnipotence pre-eminently in the creation.<sup>1</sup> Faith in the one expression stands or falls with faith in the other.

<sup>1</sup> The original form (p. 28, Germ. ed.) must be translated "in one God the Almighty," in spite of the probability that an article was also wanting here.

## II.

Et in Jesum Christum, filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum.	And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.
---	---

*Rom.* : Καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (τὸν?) υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν. *Aqu.* : Et in Christo Jesu, unico filio ejus, Domino nostro. *Afr.* : Credo in Jesum Christum, filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum.<sup>1</sup>  
*Jerus.* : Καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ.<sup>2</sup>

*Antioch.* : Et in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum filium ejus unigenitum et primogenitum totius creaturae, ex eo natum ante omnia secula et non factum, Deum verum ex Deo vero, homousion patri, per quem et secula compaginata sunt et omnia facta.

We do not know whether the word "unicum," which corresponds with the Greek *μονογενῆ*, always formed part of the Creed (see p. 45, Germ. ed.), or whether it was first an addition, and then in conscious remembrance of John 1. 14, 18; 3. 16, 18. 1 John 4. 9 was accepted in most Churches. But it only states what every confessor of Jesus Christ has always meant when he called Him the Son of God; namely, that He was the Son in a peculiar manner, in a sense which could not be applied to the later born sons and children of God, who had first become so through Christ. The word in its constant application to Jesus may be a peculiarity of St. John's; the thought has been universally Christian ever since Jesus has had believing worshippers. For the same Hebrew word, which is translated in Greek *μονογενής*,<sup>3</sup> is also rendered by *ἀγαπητός*,

The Roman form had "in God (the) Father the Almighty." But even after "Creator of heaven and earth" was added there was no need to connect with it "omnipotentem," which is still separate in the *Catechismus Rom.*, l. i., p. 375, and is explained as an independent article.

<sup>1</sup> So according to Fulgentius in Caspari, II. 254; on the other hand, Augustine in *Sermo* 215 (ed. Bass, viii., 949), in which the African Creed is explained: *Credimus et in filium ejus, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.*

<sup>2</sup> So far the Liturgy of James. But as it breaks off here with "*et cetera*," it is possible that some of Cyril's additions may belong to the original form. That is not to say it is probable. If the words which follow in Cyril, *τὸν μονογενῆ*, had always stood in the Creed of Jerusalem, the copyist of the Liturgy would surely have put his "*etc.*" after rather than before them.

<sup>3</sup> Psalm 23. 21; 35. 17, of the only soul possessed by man; so Tobias 3. 15;



though perhaps not quite so correctly. But Christ was called the beloved Son<sup>1</sup> long before St. John wrote his Gospel. How Jesus is the only Son because He is the only begotten Son is not explained by any of these attributes. But the Creed explains it in that which follows. The other variations of this article in the old Creeds have no religious importance. If we had a free choice, we should give our Creed the preference over all the forms varying from it, in consideration of the natural sequence of the words and the rhythm of the sentences.

THEOD. ZAHN.

## CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT AND EVOLUTION.

### 1. NATURE OF THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED.

IRRESPECTIVE of Divine revelation, the minds of the more thoughtful and gifted men, inquiring as to the origin of the universe, have oscillated between the ideas of a Divine creative power planning and determining the cosmos, and a fortuitous concourse of particles or of energies working out unintelligently, and by an almost interminable series of trials and errors, the existing equilibrium of nature. The former has always appeared to the majority of men the more rational idea, because it postulates a First Cause akin to the only self-determining or primary power known by experience, viz. the human will and reason; and because

Luke 7. 12; 9. 38; Hebrews 11. 17 of the only child. In Genesis 22. 2, 16 which is quoted in Hebrews 11. 17, the LXX. gives the translation *ἀγαπητός*, as in many other cases. In Judges 11. 34 the same Hebrew word is translated in many MSS. of the LXX. by the double use of *μονογενής* and *ἀγαπητός*. The Vulgate has sometimes *unicus* (Psalm 22. 21; 35. 17; Luke 7. 12; 9. 38), sometimes *unigenitus* (Gen. 22. 2, 16; Judges 11. 34; Heb. 11. 17 and in the Johannine passages). St. Paul expresses what is in substance the same thought by *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ* (Rom. 8. 32, where Gen. 22. 16 is quoted), and by *τὸν αὐτοῦ υἱόν* (Rom. 8. 3).

<sup>1</sup> Matthew 3. 17 17. 5; Mark 1. 11; 9. 7; Luke 20. 13, cf. Ephesians 1. 6.