

κγρίότητος τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων καὶ προσήγαγεν αὐτὸ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ·
 ἐπειδὴ [γὰρ] ὁ μὲν ἐθέωσεν, ὁ δὲ ἐθεώθη, τουτέστι τὸ πρόσλημμα ὃ διὰ τὴν
 δξίαν τοῦ <προσενέγκαντος καὶ τὴν καθαρότηγα τοῦ> προσερχθέντος ἐδέξατο
 [αὐτὸ] ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ ὡς θγσίαν καὶ προσφοράν εὔαρεστον ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρω-
 5 πείου γένους· πρὸς δὲ καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Κγρίος τῷ Κγρίῳ μοι Κάθογ ἐκ δεξιῶν μοι,
 ἤθουν ὁ Πατὴρ τῷ Υἱῷ, ὃς καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν
 τοῖς ὕψηλοῖς· οὔτως ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν.

1. 1 Pet. iii 18 4. Eph. v 2 ; Rom. xii 1 5. Ps. cix 1 6. Heb. viii 1, 13
 7. S. Mt. xxvii 37 ; S. Io. xix 9 ; Heb. ix 11

2-3. διὰ τὴν . . . προσερχθέντος] M¹ : propter dignitatem offerentis et ob munditiam
 eius qui oblatus est 3. τοῦ προσερχθέντος] om. P^a 5. πρὸς δὲ κα] hinc est
 illud 6. ἤθουν . . . Τῷ] post Κυρίῳ μου P^a lat.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

[To be continued.]

THE CREED OF APHRAATES.

DOM CONNOLLY, whose researches in Syriac Patrology are familiar to the readers of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, has recently published an article on 'The Early Syriac Creed'.¹ The documents upon which he has mainly relied for evidence, he tells us, are (1) the *Homilies of Aphraates*, (2) the *Acts of Judas Thomas*, and (3) the *Doctrine of Addai*. In the course of his article he presents us with 'tentative reconstructions' of three creeds, based on actual expressions used by the writers of whom he is treating. By far the longest and most complete of these is the Creed reconstructed from the writings of Aphraates, and it will prove of special interest to those who have studied the *Homilies* of this writer, because opinion is divided as to whether there is anything in the writings of Aphraates which betrays knowledge of a creed. On the one hand it is stated by Dr Kattenbusch² that there is no such indication; on the other hand, Dr Bert, the German translator of the *Homilies*, holds the contrary view, and in this he is followed by Dr Hahn. But Dom Connolly differs from all these authorities; he refutes Kattenbusch by presenting us with the text of Aphraates' Symbol, but he entirely disagrees with Bert and Hahn, who consider that the Creed of Aphraates is contained in the passage from the first Homily, which Hahn has included in his *Bibliothek der Symbole*. It is not my purpose in this article to criticize Dom Connolly's 'reconstruction'—it would be somewhat early to attempt

¹ *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums*, 1906, pp. 202 ff.

² *Das Apostolische Symbol* i p. 249.

this : I should, however, like to state my belief that it is in the highest degree probable that the Church of Aphraates did possess a regular Baptismal Creed, and that Dom Connolly has not gone beyond the legitimate use of the material at his disposal. His treatment, however, of the so-called 'Creed' passage at the end of the first Homily requires some consideration. He is of opinion that in this passage Aphraates does not 'undertake to write out the text of his Creed'. In this Homily, 'faith' is 'considered from a totally different point of view'. 'Faith', says Aphraates, 'is like a building, and Christ is its foundation ; and since Christ also is to dwell in the building, it must be furnished with suitable adornments, to wit, good works, of which he gives a considerable list.' Dom Connolly's conclusion is as follows :—'I prefer, therefore,' he writes, 'to look upon the passage as a short summing up of the whole argument, wherein Aphraates mentions a few of the leading articles of the Faith, only to set over against them a list of moral obligations—the works of the faith.'

Thus far his argument is based on the nature of the contents of the first Homily ; but he has other and more weighty considerations to bring forward, this time of a literary character. Dom Connolly finds in this passage traces of the influence of the apocryphal correspondence between St Paul and the Corinthians, documents which, as we know, were received as part of the Syriac New Testament in the time of Aphraates and St Ephraim, and were certainly known to both these writers.¹ The errors which are enumerated in this correspondence are said by St Ephraim in his commentary to have been those 'of the following of Bardaisan', who for this reason 'did not place this letter in their Apostle'. Dom Connolly contends that we have here the *raison d'être* of the strange 'Creed' of Aphraates. In his opinion it contains a refutation of all the errors, except one, mentioned in the letter of the Corinthians to St Paul ; and in answer to his friend's request Aphraates, Dom Connolly thinks, 'must have had a special reason to state the Faith for him in the light of the errors of a particular school, probably that of the Syrian Bardaisan'. He concludes that 'the passage was composed by Aphraates himself . . . and that its contents are due to his selection'.

But Dom Connolly appears to have overlooked one very important fact. Aphraates composed his *Homilies*, as he tells us, at the request of a friend, and the letter containing this request is prefixed to them, and in this letter his friend makes a profession of his faith. Now the errors referred to in the letter of the Corinthians, and said by St Ephraim to be those of the school of Bardaisan, are six in number, and of these, five are refuted by the Creed of Aphraates. Now it is certain from the passage in the letters of Aphraates' correspondent, that he was quite

¹ Cp. Aph. *Hom.* xxiii, ed. Wright, p. 472.

orthodox on four of these five points, and if the theory of this article is correct he was orthodox with regard to all five of them.

On one, viz. the 'Virgin birth of Christ', he is silent, and on this Aphraates' Creed is equally silent. Therefore, while I am perfectly willing to agree with Dom Connolly that the passage in Aphraates is coloured by reminiscences of the pseudo-Pauline correspondence with the Corinthians, I cannot agree with him that Aphraates' friend appears to have had any special need of warning against the errors of the 'following of Bardaisan', and in order to throw some further light on the passage, I propose to make some investigation of the confession of faith contained in the letter prefixed to the *Homilies*. But before doing this it will be convenient to quote the passage from the first Homily which is under discussion.

In reply to his friend's request that he should write and instruct him 'concerning our Faith, how it is', Aphraates makes the following statement:—'This is the Faith, When a man shall believe—

(1) 'In God, the Lord of all, who made the heavens, and the earth, and the seas, and all that in them is,

(2) 'And He made Adam in His image,

(3) 'And He gave the Law to Moses,

(4) 'And He sent of His Spirit in the Prophets,

(5) 'And He sent His Christ into the world,

(6) 'And that a man should believe in the bringing to life of the dead,

(7) 'And further, that he believe also in the Mystery (Sacrament) of Baptism.'

'This', he adds, 'is the Faith of the Church of God'. Aphraates' correspondent asks another question: he desires to know 'what are the works required for it (the Faith)?'. In reply to this Aphraates continues, immediately after the words quoted above, as follows:—

'And that a man should separate himself,

'From observing hours, and Sabbaths, and months¹, and times,

'And enchantments, and divinations, astrology (Chaldeeism) and magic.

'And from fornication, and music², and from vain doctrines, the weapons of the evil one, and from flatterings, and from sweet words, and from blasphemy, and adultery.

'And that a man should not bear false witness, and that none should speak with double tongues.

'These are the works of faith'.³

¹ i. e. new moons.

² Burkitt 'revelling' (Rom. xiii 13).

³ Aph., ed. Parisot coll. 44, 45. Compare Burkitt *Early Eastern Christianity* p. 84 fol.

It is contended, in view of the fact that Aphraates uses the words 'This is the faith of the Church', that this is a formal creed.¹ And further, there is reason to believe, that the works which he enumerates form an integral part of his confession. Bert holds this view,² and with Bickell, who appears not to have done so, emphasizes the importance of this passage.³ The fact that 'the Creed' consists of seven articles is remarkable, considering that all other ancient symbols bear a threefold form. If it be compared with the Creed of Irenaeus, which he states was held by the Church dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth,⁴ it will be seen that the first clause is all they have absolutely in common. The fourth clause is of course represented in Irenaeus, but, apart from the first clause, the Creed of Irenaeus, like other ancient creeds, is practically an elaboration of the fifth clause of the Creed of Aphraates. The same may be said roughly of its relation to the *Regula Fidei* of Tertullian.⁵ How then are we to account for 'the Creed' of Aphraates? And can we find any parallel to it? Dr Bert quotes a creed used at the ordination of Waldensian preachers of the Middle Ages. It has very little in common with that of Aphraates, beyond the fact that it also consists of seven articles, a fact remarkable in itself, and that its third article runs 'Quod condidit legem moysi in monte Sinay', thereby agreeing with the third article of Aphraates' Creed.⁶ It is, however, quite unnecessary to look to such a remote quarter for the Faith of Aphraates. The true explanation, I believe, lies much closer to hand, and is contained in the letter of Aphraates' anonymous correspondent. This also contains a confession of faith.

The passage referred to runs as follows:—

'For I only firmly believe that,

(1) 'God is One, who made the heavens, and the earth from the beginning.

(2) 'And He adorned the world with His (possibly "its") works.

(3) 'And He made man in His image.

(4) 'And it was He who accepted the sacrifice of Abel.

(5) 'And He translated Enoch because of his pleasing (Him).

(6) 'And He protected Noah because of his righteousness.

(7) 'And He chose Abraham because of his faith.

(8) 'And He spake with Moses on account of his meekness.

¹ Hahn has included it in his *Bibliothek der Symbole*.

² Bert p. 16 n. 1.

³ Bickell p. 31.

⁴ Irenaeus *Contra Haer.* i 10 i, ii.

⁵ *De praescript. haer.* xiii.

⁶ The appearance of this clause in the Waldensian Creed is certainly remarkable. Perhaps it may help to account for the fact that, in the time of Innocent III, the charge was brought against the Albigenses that they preferred the law of the Jews to the law of Christians.

(9) 'And also by all the prophets He spake.

(10) 'And He further sent His Christ into the world.

'In these things, my brother, I believe that so they are.'¹

If I am right in my conjecture, we have here a far more primitive creed than that of Aphraates, and one out of which it could quite naturally be developed. The 'symbolic' use of events mentioned in the Old Testament can easily be paralleled, and is of very great antiquity, and I venture to think that the Creed before us could easily be translated into theological language by the aid of Aphraates himself and other early writers. To take a single example; the translation of Enoch is, for Aphraates, the means by which God made known to Death that his dominion should not endure for ever over all men.²

But most remarkable of all is the fact, that by the change of a single word, possibly by the addition of a single letter, in the Syriac text, we could convert this document from a Christian into a Jewish Creed.³ If instead of reading 'He *hath* sent His Christ into the world', we read 'He *will* send His Christ into the world', we have a creed which, I think, admirably expresses the tenets of Pharisaic Judaism, such a one in fact as St Paul himself might have subscribed to in his youth. It will, however, be urged that no such confession of faith appears to have existed among the Jews earlier than the middle ages, or at least we may confidently say that, apart from one passage in the writings of Philo,⁴ none has survived to us. This fact certainly demands some explanation, and as far as I know those generally given are eminently unsatisfactory, and out of accord with facts as known to us, at any rate through Christian sources.⁵ What we know of the proselytizing activity of the Jews is sufficient to make it eminently probable, on *a priori* grounds at least, that some confession of faith would have been offered to candidates for admission to the Synagogue. Why then have we no knowledge of any such formula? If my conjecture be correct, and we have here before us a Jewish profession of faith, which, by the alteration of a single word, becomes a Christian Creed, it is surely not too much to surmise that such formulae would, in the course of time, come to be regarded with so great disfavour by Jews that their disappearance from the fragments of Jewish literature of the first three centuries, which are preserved for us, is amply accounted for. It was not, I think, till the middle ages, when the Christian controversies of early centuries of this era had been forgotten,

¹ Par. col. 4.

² Compare Homily xxii 3, Par. col. 906.

³ It is suggested that ܕܡܫܝܚܐ was changed into ܕܡܫܝܚܐ.

⁴ *De mundi opificio*.

⁵ Compare *Jewish Encycl.* vol. i p. 148, 'Articles of Faith.'

and new and different controversies had taken their place, that the lack of a formal profession of faith was felt, and an effort made to supply it. From Saadyah onwards we meet with attempts to formulate a creed, that of Maimonides ultimately obtaining more or less general acceptance. The record of the long and bitter dispute with regard to the Creed forms a chapter in the history of mediaeval Jewish theology which sufficiently proves that the idea of a formal profession of faith was by no means acceptable to those to whom it was proposed, not because they disagreed with the articles suggested, but simply because they had become unaccustomed to any such discipline.

Let us now return to Aphraates and his correspondent. My suggestion, then, is, that the confession of faith contained in the letter addressed to Aphraates was originally Jewish, and that it had been converted to Christian uses by one very simple alteration. I have indicated that the existence of such a Jewish Creed is not, in itself, improbable on *a priori* grounds. It remains to be seen whether there is any evidence for such a transformation of a Jewish into a Christian symbol, as I have suggested. I know of one passage at least which appears to me to contain such evidence. In his edition of *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, edited from Syriac manuscripts, Dr Wright includes a section from the Περὶ ὁδοῦ of St Philip, which is 'not extant or at least unpublished in the original Greek, narrating the conversion of the Jew Hananiah or Ananias, and, by his means, the city of Carthage'.¹ The narrative is briefly as follows. St Philip goes down from Jerusalem to Caesarea, to seek a ship to convey him to Carthage. He finds one, but the wind is unfavourable; he is invited by the captain, who perceives that he is a servant of God, to embark, and pray for a favourable wind. St Philip does so, and invites those on the ship to join with him in prayer, which he addresses to our Lord. Immediately his prayer is answered, and a wind is granted of such violence that the ship begins to fly over the water like an eagle in the air. But one of the crew, by name Ananias, refuses to join in St Philip's prayer, and blasphemes, saying, 'May Adonai recompense thee, and the Messiah on whom thou callest, who lo! has become dust, and lies in Jerusalem, whilst thou livest, and leadest astray ignorant men by His name.' When the wind comes for which the Apostle has prayed, an angel is in it, and the angel finding the Jew helping the sailors to hoist the sail of the ship, suspends him by his great toes head downwards from the top of the sail. The Jew appeals to St Philip for help, but St Philip swears that he shall not come down until he has confessed his blasphemy. Having done so, he again begs to be loosed from his unfortunate position, and states that the angel

¹ *Apoc. Acts* p. 10.

is standing by his side, and is lashing him with scourges of fire. St Philip then says, 'How dost thou view this matter, Dost thou believe in the Messiah that He is the Son of God?' The Jew's reply, which is of some length, is, for our present purpose, sufficiently important to be given in full. I give it in Wright's translation.' 'The Jew cried out weeping and saying with a loud voice "Yes, Sir, I believe in the Messiah, thy God, that He is 'I am that I am', El Shaddai, Adonai, the Lord (of) Sabaoth, the strong, the glorious in His holiness, Who made Heaven and earth by His word. And He made Adam in His image, and in His likeness, and He accepted the offering of Abel, and He rejected the offering of Cain the Murderer. And He removed Enoch, without his tasting Death. And He delivered Noah from the flood. And He spake with Abraham His friend. And He saved Lot from the midst of the overturned city. And He preserved Isaac from the knife. And He revealed Himself to Jacob at Bethel. And He expounded His secrets to Joseph. And He led Israel out of Egypt. And He spake with Moses in the thorn bush. And He divided the sea before the people. And He sent down the manna from Heaven. And He brought up the quails from the sea. And He dashed to pieces Pharaoh and his host in the sea of Suph. And He delivered Joshua the son of Nun in the wars. And He revealed His mystery to Gideon. And He strengthened Barak and Deborah in Israel. And He spake with Samuel in the interior of the Temple. And He destroyed Goliath before David. And He gave wisdom to Solomon. And He took up Elijah to Heaven. And He delivered Elisha from the armies. And He took Jonah out of the fish. And He brought Daniel out of the pit. And He extinguished the blazing fire of Ananias and his companions. And He rescued the wronged Susannah. And this is Emmanuel, the mighty God, in whose name the sea, and land, and the winds, and Angels are subject unto thee."'

Now this lengthy *résumé* of Old Testament history, suggesting as it does Psalm cvi and, in a lesser degree, Psalm lxxviii, surely demands some explanation. St Philip could hardly doubt that the Jew would believe the Old Testament. The explanation is, I think, that the Jew is here making a 'Symbolic' use of events described in the Old Testament. At any rate the Apostle seems to have understood him in this sense. His reply is for our purposes certainly suggestive. 'And Philip rejoiced and glorified God and said: "Praise be to Thee our Lord Jesus the Messiah, who changest rebellious minds and blasphemous tongues, and suddenly makest them harps praising Thy glory. Yea, Lord, pardon Thy servant Hanana who has believed in Thee."'³ And the Jew is, of course, straightway released.

¹ Vol. ii pp. 73-74.

³ Wright p. 74.

May we not have here a reminiscence of some such happenings as I have suggested? Is it not possible that the author of this passage, whoever he may have been, had actually encountered some such experience, or at least had heard that such things had actually happened? I am inclined to think that the 'blasphemous tongues suddenly changed into harps of praise' is no mere figurative expression, but a reminiscence of actual facts which were at one period of frequent occurrence. The length of the Jew's reply needs some consideration. On the one hand, if the narrative is to preserve any appearance of verisimilitude (and it must be confessed that on the whole it is of a very extravagant order), it demands some explanation; on the other hand, its prolixity differentiates it from the very concise formula used by Aphraates' friend, with which, however, it will be seen that, in its opening sentences, it verbally agrees. It is of course possible that the passage, as we have it, is not in its original form. The temptation to amplify a simpler formula may have proved too great for an editor or scribe well versed in Old Testament history. But it may also be suggested that we have here a link between the final developement, as it occurs in Aphraates, of what may conveniently be called an Old Testament *Kerygma*, and its earliest forms, as we find it, for example, in the famous passage of Ecclesiasticus, or the eleventh chapter of Hebrews.

It remains for us (1) to attempt to translate the Creed of Aphraates' correspondent into theological language, and (2) to compare that Creed with the Symbol given by Aphraates himself. Five Old Testament personages are mentioned in this passage—Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Moses. The juxtaposition of these names is of course extremely familiar. We have already seen that the mention of the translation of Enoch may be explained as a symbolic equivalent for belief in the 'life of the world to come'. The addition of the words 'because of his pleasing Him' would suggest that the attainment of the after-life was dependent on the individual effort to please God. In the passage in the Acts of St Philip we have: 'And He translated Enoch so that he tasted not death.'¹ This would also sufficiently convey the possibility of an after-life, but is less satisfactory than the form under consideration. That God accepted the sacrifice of Abel is equivalent to saying that sacrificial service is pleasing to Him, a point apparently insisted upon as a test of the faith of converts to Judaism.² In St Philip the words 'and He rejected the sacrifice of Cain' are appended to this form, signifying the necessity of a right disposition on the part of him who sacrifices. Possibly this was intentionally omitted from the more developed formula, as coming rather under the head of the works demanded by faith, than in the category

¹ Compare Parisot 906 lines 10-11.

² See *Jewish Encycl.* vol. i p. 148 col. 2.

of the faith itself. That God protected Noah on account of his righteousness, recalling as it does the whole incident of the Flood, implies nothing else than the necessity of belief in a system of divine rewards and punishments, a dogma which occupies an important position in all mediaeval Jewish formulas of belief.¹ The choice of Abraham because of his faith is of some importance. If the election according to faith was a formal article of the Jewish Creed, a fresh light, it may be urged, is thrown on St Paul's arguments in his Epistle to the Romans, and elsewhere, and it is unnecessary to search the scanty record of Pharisaic Judaism in order to find passages which will explain the emphasis which the Apostle of the Gentiles laid on this dogma.

We now come to Moses and the Prophets, a significant collocation. 'And He spake with Moses because of his meekness, and also by all the Prophets He spake.' This is equivalent to an expression of belief in the inspiration of the Scripture, but it is more than this. God speaks *with* Moses, but *by* the Prophets; thus a higher level of inspiration is claimed for the Law than is allowed to the later portions of the Hebrew Canon.² It may be suggested that the words, 'He spake with Moses because of his meekness,' implying as it does a reminiscence of Deut. xxxiv 10, represent the germ of a belief which found its ultimate expression in the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount. The tenth article of this Creed requires no comment. It remains to say something about the first three. Of these the significance of the first is self-evident. It is worth noticing, however, that in the passage of St Philip, after the words 'And He made Heaven and earth', we have the addition 'by His word'. The second article is not so easy to explain. It appears, however, to mean that God placed in the world all things necessary for man's use before his creation, an idea which is expressed by Aphraates himself at some length in Homily xvii, where he actually uses the expression 'adorned the world',³ which occurs in the passage which we are now considering. The third article, 'And He made man (not 'Adam' as in Aphraates' Creed) in His image', might possibly imply, on the one hand, man's potentialities, on the other, his responsibilities.

To summarize, then, it appears possible to express this Creed in the following manner:—

I believe,

(1) In one God, the Maker of Heaven and earth,

¹ Compare the thirteen articles of Maimonides, art. ii. So also Saadyah, &c.

² 'Prophets', no doubt, is here a term of wide significance. Aphraates quotes the Psalms as 'the Prophet'. For different degrees of inspiration within the Old Testament itself, in the view of later Jewish Theology, see Qimchi's preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms*, ed. Schiller-Szinessy, pp. 4, 5.

³ *Hom.* xvii 7, Par. col. 797.

- (2) And that He hath placed therein all things necessary for man.
- (3) That man is made in the image of God.
- (4) That sacrifices are acceptable to Him.
- (5) That there is a life of the world to come, the attainment of which is dependent on pleasing God.
- (6) That man is rewarded or punished according to his works.
- (7) That there is an election according to faith.
- (8) That the sacred Scriptures are the Word of God, and that there are degrees of inspiration, of which the highest is to be found in the Law.
- (9) That all Scripture is the Word of God.
- (10) That the Messiah, promised by God, has come.

Now it is clear that, if the change in the last article which I have suggested was actually made, it would necessitate some modification in the mode of expression of the other articles. This has, I think, taken place in Aphraates' Creed, to which we must now turn our attention. But before doing so, we should note the number of the articles of the Creed which we have just been discussing. The number 10 of course suggests the Decalogue, which we know was used by the Jews as a confession of faith. It was regarded as such by Philo, and it is important to notice that, if it was so, we have the most primitive of all models for a Creed to which works were attached. The Jewish division of the Decalogue¹ is a sufficient proof of its symbolic use.² That it was employed in the Liturgy is seen from the Mishna (*Tamid* v 1), where its recital is ordered before that of the Shema (*Deut.* vi 4-9). This latter was also clearly used for symbolic purposes, and in it also we have the familiar juxtaposition of faith and works. The Mishna directs that after these have been recited there shall follow a prayer beginning with the words, 'This is true and certain'. In fairly early times the Decalogue seems to have dropped out of the Liturgy. The Shema, however, remained, and it is possible that the prominent place assigned to it may be due to the fact that it is practically the only symbolic utterance which the Jewish Liturgy retained. Now, as it happens, we know the reason why the Ten Commandments were removed from the Liturgy. It is stated, both in the Talmud of Jerusalem and in the Talmud of Babylon, that they were removed on account of the Christians; and it is interesting to note, in the second of these quotations, that one of the localities in which their

¹ See Taylor *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* App. V, where all the evidence is collected.

² In the Jewish division, *Exod.* xx, verse 2 constitutes the first commandment; verse 3 is regarded as the beginning of the second commandment. This division is as old as the Targum, but for our purposes it is sufficient to note that Aphraates himself is a witness to the Jewish division. He quotes the first commandment as 'I am the Lord your God which brought you out of the land of Egypt' (*Hom.* i 11).

use was abrogated was in the Persian Empire, and therefore, perhaps, not very far from the place where the letter we are discussing was written. If, as appears to be the case, there are good reasons for supposing that the Persian Church was in its beginning to a large extent composed of converts from Judaism, we have a fairly consistent explanation of most of the facts that are at our disposal.

We now come to the 'faith' of Aphraates, a translation of which is given above. Let us compare it with that of his correspondent.

Articles 1 and 2 of Aphraates' Creed are practically identical with articles 1 and 3 of that of his friend's. Article 2 of the latter has disappeared, so also articles 4, 6, and 7. Article 5 appears in a new and developed form in Aphraates' Creed as article 6, while articles 8 and 9 of his friend's Creed correspond to 3 and 4 of that of Aphraates.

What is the significance of these changes?

Articles 4, 6, and 7 of the 'faith' of Aphraates' friend have disappeared. These, if my conjecture be correct, express belief in (4) the acceptability of sacrifices, (6) that man is rewarded and punished according to his works, and (7) that there is an election according to faith.

Now the first of these articles, though to be expected in a creed of Jewish origin, would naturally disappear from one adapted to Christian purposes; while with regard to the second it would be superfluous in a statement of faith such as that of Aphraates, to which was appended so considerable a list of 'the works of the faith'. It is more difficult to find an explanation of the omission of article 7. It must, however, be remembered that Aphraates has added to his confession the words, 'And further that he believe also in the Mystery of Baptism'. The addition of the word 'also' lends colour to the view, that so far Aphraates considered that he had merely been offering to his friend a revised edition of his own confession, but it may also account for the omission of article 7 of that confession; for was not a belief in the Mystery of Baptism a very practical demonstration of belief in an election according to faith?

Some other modifications have taken place.

Belief in 'the bringing to life of the dead' is now explicitly stated, and not merely, by implication, under the figure of the translation of Enoch, and also the place of this article has been changed. In the older formula it occupies what may be termed its natural historical position, between the dogmas symbolized by the sacrifice of Abel, and the preservation of Noah; in the revised edition of this formula it occurs just where we should expect, viz. after the mention of the Incarnation. There is, Aphraates appears to imply, a better and more convincing reason for belief in this article of the faith than had been suggested in his correspondent's confession; 'He hath sent His Christ into the

world'—belief in the resurrection necessarily follows. Aphraates takes over articles 8 and 9 of his friend's creed and expresses them in a modified and more strictly theological form. It is here especially that his reference, as Dom Connolly has shewn, to the pseudo-Pauline correspondence is evident. But it must be remembered that for Aphraates these documents were an integral part of the New Testament. He thus is merely expressing the Jewish doctrine of inspiration in what was, for him, New Testament language. He begins at Moses, and, quoting, as he believes from St Paul, declares that God 'sent of His Spirit in the Prophets'.

Thus we have here simply a revised edition of the faith of Aphraates' correspondent, modified to meet more completely the needs of a Christian community. I do not for a moment suggest that Aphraates desired his friend to accept this statement as a formal or baptismal 'creed'. He merely seems to say: your old Jewish 'creed' with its slight modifications is inadequate for your needs; it requires further revision; it may rather be expressed thus; and then he gives his friend his revised edition of it. This of course does not exclude the hypothesis that Aphraates had in his mind the passages from the pseudo-Pauline correspondence; but if he had desired to formulate a refutation of the Daisanite heresy, he would surely have included some reference to the Virgin Birth of our Lord, in which, as we know, he believed himself.

Two very serious objections may be raised to the theory set forth in this article. It may be asked:—

1. If there did exist a Jewish creed, why have no traces of it survived in Jewish literature?
2. Why should it appear in such a document as the letter prefixed to the *Homilies*?

Some answer to the first of these questions has already been attempted. We have seen that, on the hypothesis set forth above, there was every reason, from a Jewish point of view, for its suppression, and, further, we must bear in mind the very scanty nature of the Jewish literature of the first three centuries which has survived to us. But if such a creed existed, is it not likely that it would continue longest in use amongst Jews who had not as yet to deal with the problems of Christianity? Such a body was that of the Jews in Persia during the first two and a half centuries of this era. Christianity probably did not penetrate to this region till about the middle of the third century. It is surely possible that on this account the formula continued to exist unaltered among the Jews of this region, long after its use had been discontinued by their brethren who came in daily contact with Christians. Now it is perfectly clear from the *Homilies* that the difficulties by which Aphraates and his friend were beset frequently arose from the

hostility of the Jews, and from the *Acta Martyrum* it is quite clear that they took a very active part in the persecution of the Christians under Sapor II. In point of fact, it is quite possible that the conditions of the Church in Persia at the beginning of the fourth century, were in many respects similar to those of the churches of the Roman Empire some two centuries earlier.

History was repeating itself; it is likely enough that the earliest converts to Christianity in Persia were Jews and Jewish Proselytes, and it is just among people of this kind that such a formula is likely to have continued to exist. Some such confession as this I surmise had been learned by Aphraates' friend. It did not, for obvious reasons, satisfy him. He required something further and more specifically Christian. He asks for it, and receives it from Aphraates, in the shape of the revised edition of his confession, which is found, if I am right, in the passage under discussion, towards the end of the Homily concerning faith.

It may, however, be further urged that no evidence is forthcoming from Western sources, and that if it had at one time existed, it is very improbable that no reference to such a confession should be made by any early Christian writers. I believe, however, that there is at least one passage which confirms the view I have taken; at least, my theory offers an explanation of the passage, which is not at all easy to understand in its present context. It occurs in Irenaeus, *contra Haer.* iii 3 § 3. In this passage St Irenaeus is speaking of St Clement of Rome: ὁ καὶ ἑωρακὸς τοὺς μακαρίους ἀποστόλους, καὶ συμβεβηκὸς αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔτι ἕναλον τὸ κήρυγμα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχων. He then speaks of the letter sent by the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth: εἰς εἰρήνην συμβιβάζουσα αὐτούς, καὶ ἀνανεοῦσα τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦν νεωστὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παράδοσιν εἰλήφει. Here the Greek fails, and for the continuation of the passage we must rely on the Latin. It proceeds as follows:—annuntiantem (1) unum Deum omnipotentem, (2) factorem coeli et terrae, (3) plasmatorem hominis, (4) qui induxerit cataclysmum, (5) et advocaverit Abraham, (6) qui eduxerit populum de terra Aegypti, (7) qui colloquutus sit Moysi, (8) qui legem disposuerit, (9) et Prophetas miserit, (10) qui ignem praeparaverit diabolo et angelis eius. Hunc Patrem Domini nostri Iesu Christi ab Ecclesiis annuntiari, ex ipsa Scriptura, qui velint, discere possunt, et Apostolicam Ecclesiae Traditionem intelligere; cum sit vetustior epistola his qui nunc falso docent, et alterum Deum super Demiurgum et factorem horum omnium, quae sunt, commentiantur.

Now if we examine the passage 'unum Deum . . . angelis eius' we shall find it corresponds very closely to the 'confession' of the letter prefixed to the *Homilies*, and is almost entirely Jewish in character. I venture

to think that we have here another example of the Jewish creed. To facilitate comparison I subjoin a table (p. 15).

Dom Connolly is certainly right when he says that 'If the Homily on faith were all that we had of his (Aphraates') writings, we should know next to nothing of his real doctrinal position'. But fortunately we have more than this, and Dom Connolly has carefully collected the doctrinal statements for the purposes of his reconstruction. If my theory be correct it is not surprising that Aphraates, in the 'creed passage' that has here been discussed, confined himself to the statement, 'He sent His Christ into the world'; with this article of his friend's confession he is of course entirely in agreement, and he does not emend it in his revised edition.

His doctrine of the person of Christ is set forth as follows by Dom Connolly in his reconstruction of Aphraates' Creed:—

' I believe
 ' in our Lord Jesus Christ,
 ' the Son of God,
 ' God, Son of God,
 ' King, Son of the King,
 ' Light from Light,
 ' Son, and Counsellor, and Guide, and Way, and Saviour, and Shepherd, and Gatherer, and Door, and Pearl, and Lamp, and First-born of all creatures,
 ' Who came and put on a body from Mary the Virgin of the seed of the house of David, from the Holy Spirit,
 ' and put on our manhood,
 ' and suffered', or, 'and was crucified,
 ' went down to the place of the dead', or, 'to Sheol, and lived again, and rose the third day,
 ' and ascended to the height', or, 'to heaven,
 ' and sat on the right hand of His Father;
 ' and He is the Judge of the dead and of the living, who sitteth on the throne.'

The justification for this reconstruction will be found in the article from which it is quoted. I desire here to add a few words about the seventeenth Homily, that entitled 'Concerning Christ that He is the Son of God', to which we naturally look for information on Aphraates' doctrine concerning the person of Christ. This Homily is an anti-Jewish polemic, and has been generally considered an *argumentum ad hominem*. This of course it is, but it is also a good deal more. Prof. Burkitt has given a most admirable summary of the Homily, of which he rightly says, 'Nothing less than this full abstract does full justice to Aphraates' style and method'.¹ I give it here at length:—

¹ *Early Eastern Christianity* p. 93.

Aphraates' Homily i 9.

When a man shall believe in :

1. God the Lord of all, who made the heavens, and the earth, and the seas, and all that in them is.
2. And He made Adam in His image.
3. And He gave the law to Moses.
4. And He sent of His Spirit in the Prophets.
5. And He sent His Christ into the world.
6. And that a man should believe in the bringing to life of the dead.
7. And further that he believe also the Mystery (Sacrament) of Baptism.

The letter prefaced to the Homilies.

For I only firmly believe that :

1. God is One, who made the heavens, and the earth from the beginning.
2. And He adorned the world with His works.
3. And He made man in His image.
4. And it was He who accepted the sacrifice of Abel.
5. And He translated Enoch because of his pleasing (Him).
6. And He protected Noah because of his righteousness.
7. And He chose Abraham because of his faith.
8. And He spake with Moses on account of his meekness.
9. And also by all the Prophets He spake.
10. And He further sent His Christ into the world.

Iren. iii 3 iii.

Annuntiantem :

1. unum Deum omnipotentem.
2. factorem coeli et terrae.
3. plasmatorem hominis.
4. qui induxerit cataclysmum.
5. et advocaverit Abraham.
6. qui eduxerit populum de terra Aegypti.
7. qui colloquutus sit Moysi.
8. qui legem disposuerit.
9. et prophetas miserit.
10. qui ignem praeparaverit diabolo et angelis eius.

Acts of Philip.

I believe in the Messiah thy God that He is :

I am that I am, El Shaddai, Adonai, the Lord (of) Sabaoth, . . .

Who made heaven, and earth by His word.

And He made Adam in His image, and in His likeness.

And He accepted the offering of Abel, and rejected the offering of Cain the murderer.

And He removed Enoch without his tasting death.

And He delivered Noah from the flood.

And He spake with Abraham His friend.

And He led Israel out of Egypt.

And He spake with Moses in the thorn bush.

And this is Emmanuel, the mighty God.

'This Homily, like so many that Aphraates wrote, is directed against the Jews, who complained that Christians worshipped a man whom they called Son of God, in defiance of God's own word, "I am God, and there is none beside Me".

'Aphraates sets himself the task of defending the Christian practice, even if he should concede to the Jews that Jesus, whom the Christians call God, was only a man. "Though," he continues, "we do affirm that Jesus our Lord is God the Son of God, and the King the Son of the King, Light from Light, Son¹ and Counsellor and Guide and Way and Saviour and Shepherd and Gatherer and Door and Pearl and Lamp; and by many Names is He called. But now we will shew that He is the Son of God, and that He is God, who from God hath come" (§ 2). For the name of divinity has been given to just men, as for instance to Moses, who was made a God, not to Pharaoh only, but also to Aaron² (§ 3); and though the Jews say God has no son, yet He called Israel His First-born,³ and Solomon His son.⁴ David also says of them: "I have said Ye are Gods and sons of the Highest all of you"⁵ (§ 4). God gives the most exalted titles to whom He will: He called impious Nebuchadnezzar "King of Kings". For man was formed by Him in His own image, to be a Temple for Him to dwell in, and therefore He gives to man honours which He denies to the Sun, and the Moon, and the host of Heaven⁶ (§§ 5, 6). Man of all creatures was first conceived in God's mind,⁷ though he was not placed in the world till it was ready for him (§ 7). Why should we not worship Jesus, through whom we know God, Jesus who turned away our mind from vain superstitions, and taught us to adore the One God, our Father and Maker, and to serve Him? Is it not better to do this than to worship the kings and emperors of this world, who not only are apostates themselves, but drive others also to apostasy? (§ 8). Our Messiah was spoken of in the prophets even to the details of the Crucifixion (§§ 9, 10). We therefore will continue to worship before the Majesty of His Father, who has turned our worship unto Him. We call Him God, like Moses; First-born and Son, like Israel; Jesus like Joshua, the son of Nun; Priest, like Aaron; King, like David; the great Prophet, like all the prophets; Shepherd, like the shepherds who tended and ruled Israel. And us, adds Aphraates, has He called Sons, making us His Brothers, and we have become His Friends (§§ 11, 12).'⁸

Now at first sight this does not appear to prove very much, and even though Aphraates may safeguard his arguments by prefixing to them

¹ *Sic*: cf. Isa. ix 6, and also § 9.

² Exod. iv 22, 23.

³ Ps. lxxxii (lxxxii) 6.

⁷ Ps. xc (lxxxix) 1, 2.

² Exod. vi 1; vii 1.

⁴ 2 Sam. vii 14; cf. Heb. i 5.

⁶ Deut. iv 17.

⁸ Burkitt *Early Eastern Christianity* pp. 91 ff.

a confession of faith, that 'Jesus our Lord is God the Son of God', yet if we only call Him God like Moses, and First-born and Son like Israel, His Jewish adversaries would scarcely be convinced of the truths which our author is urging them to accept. As a matter of fact, taken by itself, this Homily does not seem to have very much point, and there is some reason for Dr Gwynn's description of it as 'painfully inadequate in the treatment of its great theme'.¹ It is only when it is read in conjunction with other passages in Aphraates' writings that it becomes more intelligible. But even so, the ideas which underlie the somewhat obscure phraseology are by no means apparent on the surface, and it may be suggested that we have here only the first stage of the argument which Aphraates advises his friend to use in his controversies with the Jews. Its main object then would appear to be to prepare the way for subsequent developments of the argument, and that chiefly by pointing out that the ordinary terminology of Christian doctrine was not, as the Jews supposed, contrary to the teaching of the Old Testament. Others had been called God as well as Jesus, others also Son of God; this in fact was perfectly scriptural language; how then were Christians guilty of blasphemy in so designating Him, who the Jews very well knew had converted the pagans among whom they lived to the worship of the God they themselves adored?

That Jesus was God in a very different sense to that in which the term was applied to Moses, and Son of God in a manner quite other than that in which Israel or Solomon had been so designated, might surely be left to be shewn on another occasion. It is as if Aphraates were advising his friend to set to work cautiously, to work from the known to the unknown, and above all to smooth the way by explaining the terminology in a conciliatory manner. The rest might surely follow later. Aphraates knew perfectly well the real significance of the facts, and he appears to assume that his friend did also, and would therefore know how to develop the argument for himself.

It seems, therefore, that for the more developed form of his Christological conceptions we must look to other parts of his writings. He has already made it clear from the confession of faith which he prefixes to the Homily which we have been considering, that he believed completely in the Divinity of our Lord, that He was God, Son of God. In what way, then, would he have differentiated between these appellations as applied to our Lord, and as applied to the heroes of the Old Testament? The answer to this question is, I think, to be found in a passage in the twenty-third Homily. Speaking there of our Lord's birth, he remarks, 'Though He was not of the seed of Joseph, yet He received from the latter "the name of fatherhood" which had been transmitted from

¹ Gwynn *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* xiii p. 162.

Adam to Joseph, and in like manner "the name of priesthood" from John', &c.¹ Now this appears to be an important factor in Aphraates' theology, and it is in the light of this statement that we should approach the arguments of Homily xvii, if we wish to understand them in their entirety. It is in this sense that 'we call Jesus God like Moses, and First-born, and Son like Israel, and Priest like Aaron', &c. Not that Moses was in any real sense God, nor that the adoption of Israel was in a complete sense the *υιοθεσία*, nor that Aaron was the great High Priest, who should make atonement for the sins of the whole world. But in each of these, and in a great many others, some one, or more than one, of those aspects or potentialities had been partially manifested, which ultimately found their complete expression in Jesus the God-Man.

In conclusion it may be remarked that though the 'creed passage' is undoubtedly a very inadequate expression of Aphraates' theological position, yet it would be wrong to minimize its doctrinal significance. It is in any case an immense advance on the point of view set forth in his friend's confession of faith. In it we have mention of the three persons of the Trinity, 'God the Lord of all, His Spirit, and His Christ,' while the visible Church and the Sacraments are at least implied in the last article.

The text of the *Homilies* itself is of course the best commentary on this confession, while the 'Creed of Aphraates' as 'reconstructed' by Dom Connolly may safely be regarded as the fullest expression which we possess of the theological position of their author.

H. LEONARD PASS.

THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING OF IRENAEUS.

IN the *Apostolic Preaching* Irenaeus occasionally moralizes in a lofty strain on our duty to God and man. His theological statements are equally casual and invaluable. For in some places they throw more light on the problem of the relations of the Divine Persons to One Another than is to be found in the treatise *Adversus Haereses*. The dominant ideas of the Tract are, as in the Treatise, (1) immortality (*ἀφθαρσία*) conferred on man by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; (2) the image and likeness of God restored to man by both the Son and the Holy Spirit, and (3) communion with God established through Christ. This last is pressed home by a quotation from Baruch (iii 29—iv 1). That work had been already cited in *Adv. Haer.* IV 20, 4, with the

¹ *Hom.* xxiii Wright p. 473.