

him worthy of mention, his only excuse for classing him with the heretics would have been the official verdict of the Church. But no such verdict had been uttered. He decides, therefore, to accept Siger's profession of loyalty to the faith, and to assure him by the solid fact of his personal salvation that his former interpretation of the *De Anima* was wrong. If it be asked, finally, what were the *invidiosi veri* taught by Siger, the answer is not difficult. Along with his errors, he had taught much sound Aristotelianism, and, in particular, he had defended, in company with St Thomas, the unity of substantial forms, which Tempier, Kilwardby, and Peckham had the effrontery to deny. Peckham even went so far as to insinuate that Siger and other secular persons were the authors of that doctrine, while in fact it was essential to the Thomist position. Although Dante, very probably, had never heard of Peckham's allegation, from Dominicans in Italy he would have heard a version of the year 1277 which would strongly incline him to sympathize with one driven into exile by Tempier and his friends. What further details of Siger's life in Italy he may have known it is impossible to say; but in no case can I find it inexplicable, or even very surprising, that one deeply imbued with the spirit of St Thomas should have chosen to adorn the memory of an exiled and murdered philosopher with the radiance of eternal light.

W. H. V. READE.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *QUICUMQUE VULT*.

PROFESSOR R. SEEBERG of Berlin in the new edition of his great work on the History of Dogmas¹ has done us good service by recalling attention to a remarkable dissertation by a Jesuit scholar, Heinrich Brewer, 'The so-called Athanasian Creed a work of Saint Ambrose'.² I confess that after my first reading, ten years ago, I put it away unconvinced, but under the stimulus of Seeberg's lucid summary of the argument I turned to it again and found that one after another of my former difficulties melted away.

In 1905 Dr K. Künstle published a book with the title *Antipriscilliana*,³ in which he warmly espoused my theory that the *Quicumque vult* was written to meet the heresy of Priscillian, and endeavoured to prove that it was written in Spain. The first section of Brewer's book deals

¹ *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* ii 165.

² *Das sogenannte Athanasianische Glaubensbekenntnis ein Werk des heiligen Ambrosius in Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte*, herausgegeben von Dr A. Ehrhard und Dr J. P. Kirsch, ix. Band, 2. Heft, Paderborn, 1909.

³ Freiburg, 1905.

trenchantly with this theory of origin, and I think finally disposes of it. He then turns to the theory of Gallican origin, maintained by the late Prebendary Ommanney and myself, and disputes the keystone of the argument that the first part of the *Quicumque vult* is dependent on the teaching of St Augustine.

He introduces his own argument by a quotation from Augustine's *De Trinitate* viii made by Professor Kattenbusch¹: 'sed in ea (catholica fide) nonnulli perturbantur, cum audiunt deum patrem, et deum filium, et deum spiritum sanctum, et tamen hanc trinitatem non tres deos, sed unum deum'. Augustine, writing c. A. D. 400, appears to imply the existence of the creed from which he quotes cl. 15, 16.

To this I replied, *Introduction to the Creeds* p. 146, that 'the reference in this case seems too weak to bear the weight of so important an argument. It comes to this. If the main portion of part i clauses 7-19, which one has been accustomed to think of as pre-eminently Augustinian . . . is not the fruit of Augustine's influence upon the author, but exercised, on the contrary, a constraining influence upon Augustine, the Church owes an unacknowledged debt of gratitude to a mind superior to that of the great African teacher. Surely this is an incredible hypothesis, since we find no trace of such influence in Victricius or Vincentius.' Brewer then quotes the reply of Kattenbusch²: 'I hold that this is an overstatement of the theological importance of the *Athanasianum*. What Augustine says about the Trinity lies quite in the line of the *Athanasianum*, but is far deeper, finer, and greater. I agree with Morin in declining to estimate too highly the theological art of the *Athanasianum*. What is characteristic and remarkable in the formula is not the thought-material as such but the form into which it is brought.' Before he read this discussion Brewer had been for some time seeking parallels to the thought of the *Quicumque* in the writings of St Ambrose and other writings of his time, and I am bound to admit with amazing success.

The leading thought of the author is based on Mk. xvi 16: 'Qui crediderit . . . salvus erit, qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur,' referred to the catholic faith. This motive expressed both positively and negatively in cl. 1. 2, recurs in cl. 26 and cl. 40. Brewer's first parallels are:

Rescript of the Emp. Theodosius to the *Liber precum Marcellini et Faustini* in the year 384: *Catholicam fidem* omni favore veneramur, sine qua salvi esse non possumus.

¹ *Theolog. Literaturztg.*, 1897, n. 5, s. 144 in a review of my book *The Athanasian Creed and its Commentaries*.

² *Theolog. Lit.-ztg.* 1902, 172.

Ambrosius *in Luc.* vii 9 : Nemo potest resurrectionis gloriam videre, nisi qui integrum mysterium trinitatis incorrupta fidei sinceritate servaverit.

Ambrosius *Epist.* xxii 21 of year 386 : Audivimus hodie dicentes eos (obsessos), quibus manus imponebatur, *neminem posse esse salvum . . . qui trinitatis omnipotentem virtutem non crederet.*

Ordo Ambrosianus (ed. Mercati) p. 23¹ : Omnesque (deus) . . . propitius dignare respicere, ut semper *tua religione laetantes. constanter in sanctae trinitatis unitate et fide catholica perseverent.*

Brewer then sets out at length all the parallels to the *Quicumque* which he can find in writings of St Ambrose, printing below the parallels which Ommanney and I had collected from Augustine, Faustus, and Vincentius. They make an imposing show, particularly in the case of clauses 7, 8, 9, where we had none to produce.

Cl. 7. *Hexaem.* i, 19 : Filius est imago dei invisibilis : *qualis ergo deus est, talis imago.*

De Incarn. 112 : *Talis ergo, qualis est deus, sua videtur in imagine. Unde oportet, ut imaginem eius talem credas, qualis est deus.*

Cl. 8. *De Incarn.* 112 : Unde quia *incretus pater, incretus et filius.*

Cl. 9. *De Fide* 5, 228 : *Immensum te, filiumque tuum et spiritum sanctum* legi frequenter, credo libenter.

Cl. 10. *De Incarn.* 17 : Non possum de patris aeternitate dubitare, cuius *aeternus est filius.*

And the list is not complete, for I have found to add to the last quotation :

De Spiritu sancto i. viii : Ergo si mutationem non habet, aeternitatem habet, et ideo Spiritus sanctus sempiternus est.

I may add to illustrate the use of *singulatim* in cl. 19 the following :

De Fide 1 : Singularitas ad personam pertinet, unitas ad naturam.

A few more specimens illustrating part ii may suffice.

Cl. 28. *In Luc.* 10, 3 : Ergo et *deum Christum et hominem credamus*, unum in utroque.

Cl. 29. *De Sp. s.* 3, 168 : *Ante saecula ex patre ut dei filius natus, et in saeculo ut homo carnis assumptione generatus.*

Cl. 30. *In Luc.* 4, 45 : *Iesum deum hominemque, in utroque perfectum.*

Cl. 31. Ambros. *in Gestis Aquileiens.* n. 37 : *Secundum carnem filius minor est patre, secundum divinitatem aequalis est patri.*

¹ *Antiche Reliquie Liturgiche* (Studi e Testi 7), Roma, 1902.

I put a query to this, as to the use by Ambrose of the word *humanitas*, but I am now satisfied with Brewer's statement (p. 88) that Ambrose generally used the word in the classical sense. In one passage he gives it the extended meaning of *humanum genus*: *De offic.* iii 19 'in uno homine communicatio totius humanitatis solvitur'. It seems that the Arians used it in the sense of human nature, and that Ambrose accordingly took up what was apparently the meaning in everyday speech.

Frag. Arianum xiii: *Ipsium igitur Verbum Deum, ut non aestimes hunc innatum Filium unigenitum Dei, certissime et manifestissime ostendit Spiritus sanctus per beatissimum Ioannem; simul et modum humanitatis manifestissime adnuntians, obstruit os eorum qui dicunt eum animam cum corpore assumpsisse.*

Brewer goes on to speak of the content of the creed as a witness for Ambrose as the author, and calls attention to the parallels in the Synodal Letter which the Catholic bishops assembled in Constantinople in 382 sent to their brothers in Rome, Damasus, Ambrose, and others:

ἡμᾶς πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, δηλαδὴ θεότητός τε καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ οὐσίας μιᾶς τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος πιστευομένης, ὁμοτίμου τε τῆς ἀξίας καὶ συναϊδίου τῆς βασιλείας ἐν τρισὶ τέλειος ὑποστάσεσιν, ἤγουν τρισὶ τέλειος προσώποις ὡς μήτε τὴν Σαβελλίου νόσον χάραν λαβεῖν συγχεομένων τῶν ὑποστάσεων, ἤγουν τῶν ιδιοτήτων ἀναιρουμένων· μήτε μὴν τῶν Εὐνομιανῶν καὶ Ἀρειανῶν καὶ Πνευματομάχων τὴν βλασφημίαν ἰσχύειν, τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς φύσεως ἢ τῆς θεότητος τεμνομένης . . . καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον ἀδιάστροφον σώζομεν . . . ὅλον δὲ εἶδοτες τέλειον μὲν ὄντα πρὸ αἰώνων Θεὸν Λόγον, τέλειον δὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν γενόμενον.¹

There are other remarkable parallels to clauses 3 and 24 in Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus published in the year 380, and used by Ambrose in his work *de Spiritu sancto* in the following year.

Orat. xxv 17 Νῦν δὲ δίδασθε τοσοῦτον εἶδέναι μόνον, μονάδα ἐν τριάδι, καὶ τριάδα ἐν μονάδι προσκυνουμένην.

Orat. xxxi 14 Ἡμῖν εἰς θεός, ὅτι μία θεότης καὶ πρὸς ἐν τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, κἂν τρία πιστεύηται· οὐ γὰρ τὸ μὲν μᾶλλον, τὸ δὲ ἥττον θεός, οὐδὲ τὸ μὲν πρότερον τὸ δὲ ὕστερον . . . ἀχρόνως ἐκεῖθεν ὄντα καὶ ὁμοδόξως, τρία τὰ προσκυνούμενα.

Seeberg notes that the Synodal Letter was a reply to the Roman Synod of 380 at which Ambrose was present, and which sent to Paulinus of Antioch a Creed with twenty-four anathemas which have points of contact with the *Quicumque*: e.g. anath. 20 with *Q.* 6, anath. 24 with *Q.* 16.²

¹ Theodt. *H. E.* v 9.

² Hahn³ *Bibliothek der Symbole* § 199.

Anath. 24 ends: haec ergo est salus Christianorum, ut credentes trinitati, id est patri et filio et spiritui sancto (et baptizati) (so according to the Greek translation given by Theodoret *H. E.* v 11) in eam veram, solam, unam divinitatem et potentiam eiusdem, haec sine dubio credamus.

The heresies of Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, and Photinus are condemned by name, and also those who deny that the Lord had a reasoning soul.

Anath. 7: Anathematizamus eos qui pro hominis anima rationabili et intelligibili dicunt Dei Verbum in humana carne versatum, quum ipse Filius est Verbum Dei et non pro anima rationabili et intelligibili in suo corpore fuerit, sed nostram, id est, rationabilem et intelligibilem sine peccato animam susceperit atque salvaverit.

A yet more important section follows on 'the stylistic and linguistic character of the creed and its witness to the Ambrosian origin'.

Brewer produces many passages from the *de Spiritu sancto* to prove Ambrose's method of teaching by repetition. The following may suffice:

De Sp. s. i 112: donat solus pater, solus filius, solus spiritus sanctus.

140: sunt pater lumen ita etiam filius lumen, et spiritus sanctus lumen est.

With the figure of *Repetitio* is connected that of *Antithesis* in cl. 11-18.

De Sp. s. iii 109: ergo sanctus pater, sanctus et filius, sanctus et spiritus: sed non tres sancti, quia unus est deus sanctus.

Cf. iii 28 and *in Luc.* viii 67.

Brewer then produces parallels to quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia fidem tenere, Catholica fides, (fides) integra, (fidem) servare, absque = sine, in aeternum perire, fides autem catholica haec est, ut . . ., Deum venerari = adorare, et tamen, similiter, (confiteri) compellimur, (dicere) prohibemur, etc.

The most remarkable are those to the use of *totus = omnis*, which Dom Morin, writing on Caesarius of Arles, called a Gallican peculiarity. But Brewer produces eight illustrations from Ambrose, and refers to Forcellini *De Vit. s.v.* 'totus' ii; Roensch *Itala und Vulgata* § 338; Goelzer *Latinité de S. Jérôme* p. 402.

In defence of the reading 'Deus *pariter* et homo est' Brewer has nine quotations to prove that Ambrose used the expression in similar connexions.

We may compare with *resurgere habent*

De Elia 6: quod per cibos mundus haberet imminui.

For the use of *suis* and *propriis* in the clause *cum corporibus suis et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem*, we may note:

In Luc. vii 205: *igne aduretur proprio et suis vermibus consumetur.*

In Ps. xxxvii n. 51: *David non erubescerat sua recensere peccata . . . non esset hodie in requie . . . si erubisset delicta propria confiteri.*

Brewer adds eight others.

He finds traces of the use of the creed in the tract of the Presbyter Faustinus *De Trinitate sive de Fide contra Arianos*:

Cl. 6. vii 3: *Una est ergo divinitas patris et filii et spiritus sancti.*

Cl. 7. iv 3: *Qualis enim pater deus est talis et filius deus est.*

Cl. 13, 14. iii 2: *Sed ne duos omnipotentes intellegas praecavendum est; licet enim et pater omnipotens sit et filius, tamen unus est omnipotens, sicut et unus deus.*

And the *Liber de Haeresibus* of Philastrius of Brescia:

Cap. 93: *Ergo est vera persona patris, quae misit filium, et est vera persona filii, quae advenit de patre, et est vera persona spiritus, quae a patre et filio missa est. Trium itaque harum personarum una est veritas, maiestas et substantiae aequalitas et divinitas sempiterna. Qualis est enim immensa et inenarranda patris persona, talis est et filii, talis est et sancti spiritus.*

Both of these writings belong to the year 384: so Brewer suggests that the creed was written between the autumn of 382 and the winter of 383. Seeberg is more cautious and prefers 'after 382'. When the empire was divided between Gratian and Theodosius in 379 Moesia and Dacia fell to the latter.¹ Brewer is able to prove that in 381 and the year following Ambrose was in close communication with Theodosius about the deposition of Arian bishops, and suggests that the Emperor may have asked for an instruction of this kind on the Catholic faith, as Ambrose had supplied Gratian with the first books of his *de Fide* against Illyrian Arianism.

This would certainly explain the curious statements of Honorius of Autun (1090-1125) and Sicardus of Cremona (1185-1215).

Honorius *Gemma animae* ii 59: *Quarto fidem 'Quicumque vult' (ecclesia catholica) quotidie ad Primam iterat, quam Athanasius, Alexandrinus episcopus, rogatu Theodosii imperatoris edidit.*

Sicardus *Mitræ* iv 6: *Subditur symbolum fidei, scilicet 'Quicumque vult', quod Athanasius Alexandrinus episcopus, rogatu Theodosii imperatoris ad eradicandam invalescentem haeticorum perfidiam et divulgandam fidem catholicam edidit.*

¹ Ambrose *Ep.* xii n. 3 'Equidem per Occidentales partes duobus in angulis tantum, hoc est in latere Daciae Ripensis ac Moesiae fidei obstrepi videbatur.'

It is obvious that they quote from a common source, and their mistake about Athanasius is easily explained by the number of MSS which in the twelfth century attributed the creed to him. The conjecture is certainly attractive that Theodosius asked Ambrose to write it. Brewer notes that the biographer of Ambrose Paulinus (n. 36) speaks of a lost treatise on the faith *ad modum catechismi* which he sent to Frigetil, Queen of the Marcomanni. But he wavers between the theory that the *Quicumque* was such a popular catechism and the theory that it was written to be sung as a hymn.

In 385 when the Empress Justina threatened to banish Ambrose and set Auxentius in his place, and her guards kept watch round the basilica, he kept the people quiet as Augustine tells us by teaching them to sing hymns after the Eastern fashion.¹ And in a sermon against Auxentius quoted in *Ep.* xxi, Ambrose himself refers to a Confession of the Trinity which the people sing daily.

(n. 34): Hymnorum quoque meorum carminibus deceptum populum ferunt. Plane ne hoc abnuo. Grande carmen istud est, quo nihil potentius. Quid enim potentius, quam confessio trinitatis, quae quotidie totius populi ore celebratur? Certatim omnes student fidem fateri; patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum norunt versibus praedicare: facti sunt igitur omnes magistri, qui vix poterant esse discipuli.

Dreves² suggests that we have a reference here to the famous hymn *Splendor paternae gloriae*, the first three strophes of which are addressed to the three Persons of the Trinity. But Brewer proves that Ambrose used the word *Hymnus* for the *Tersanctus* as for Old Testament Psalms, and he thinks that the expression *grande carmen* points to something longer than his metrical hymns. Is it the *Quicumque vult*?

The *Quicumque vult*, like the *Te Deum*, is written after the style known as *Cursus Leoninus* with rhythmical cadences governed by accent at the ends of the sentences. Brewer seems to identify the style with the metrical prose of e. g. Cyprian *de Mortalitate*, although Meyer told him it was not: On p. 127 n. 2 he attempts to make a metrical analysis of the first sentences, and scans 'neque substantiam separantes' thus: $\cup \cup | - - \cup | - - \cup | - \cup$.

This is really a good specimen of the ending called *velox*: 'substantiam separantes'. The other endings are *planus*: 'unus aeternus', and *tardus*: 'carne subsistens'. And there is the fifth of the metrical endings classified by Meyer which was allowed as a sixth form of the *cursus* $- \cup || \cup \cup - \cup$: 'in unitate veneremur'. Possibly the *Te Deum* was

¹ *Conf.* ix 15.

² *Aurelius Ambrosius der Vater des Kirchengesanges* p. 29f.

one of the hymns (from the East?) introduced at this time, and if so the *Quicumque* might have been sung to a similar chant.

But I think that the use of the *Quicumque* as a canticle began with the revival of Church music in the schools founded by Charles the Great, when we find his scholars looking about for canticles and inserting the *Quicumque* and the *Te Deum* at the end of their Psalters.

I find it difficult to believe that the author ever intended the *Quicumque* to be sung. One of the old commentaries, the so-called Oratorian, speaks of it as 'frequently made the subject of meditation by our priests'. This was written in Gaul in the eighth century, and such use preparing for catechetical instruction seems to me the best use which we can make of the creed to-day.

Ambrose writing to his sister Marcellina (*Ep.* xxii) in 386 about the discovery of the bodies of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius says that demoniacs delivered at the shrine cried out at the moment of their exorcization, n. 21: 'neminem posse esse salvum, nisi qui in patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum credidisset . . . qui trinitatis omnipotentem uirtutem non crederet'. Brewer regards this as a proof that the creed had taken hold of the popular mind.

He is not very successful in tracing the early use of the creed in the Church of Milan. The following parallels are not decisive:

Liturgy for *Feria V in Authentica* (Thursday in Holy Week) the Milanese Canon compared with the Roman has an interpolation:

'Tu nos Domine participes filii tui, tu consortes regni tui, tu incolas paradisi, tu angelorum comites esse iussisti, si tamen inlaesa et intermerata fide caelestis militiae sacramenta servemus'.

Oratio ad consecrandam ecclesiam: 'Omnesque homines venientes adorare in hoc loco propitius dignare respicere, ut semper felices, semperque tua religione laetantes, constanter in sanctae Trinitatis unitate et fide catholica perseverent.'¹

He has to fall back on a long quotation from Ommanney on the use of the Creed in North Italy ending with the words: 'But the most important evidence of the early reception and use of the *Quicumque* in North Italy is furnished by the fact of its being said—as we have every reason to believe from a remote antiquity—in the Milanese or Ambrosian rite or office of Divine worship, being sung daily at Prime.'²

The evidence may be quoted as follows:

Epistola canonica, published by the Ballerini and assigned by them to the sixth century, is an episcopal charge directing that all clergy should learn the Catholic Faith by heart. It belongs to North Italy and was adopted by Atto, bishop of Vercellae, in the tenth century.

¹ *Mercati Antiche Reliquie Liturgiche Ambrosiane e Romane*, Roma, 1902, p. 23.

² *Dissertation* p. 445.

Ratherius of Verona held a visitation of his clergy in Lent 966 and directed that they should learn the three Creeds, ascribing the *Quicumque* to Athanasius.

A Synod held at Siponto at the end of the ninth century directed all clergy to sing the Creed every Lord's Day.

Ommanney quotes a commentary connected with Milan which he found in the Ambrosian library (*Cod. T. 103*) of the tenth century.

It is obviously important that all MSS containing the text of the Creed which are in any way connected with Italy should now be scrutinized afresh. I may mention (1) *Cod. Vat. 82*, a Psalter of the tenth century which belongs to the Province of Milan; (2) *Cod. B.M. Add. 16413*, written in a Lombard or Beneventan hand of the tenth century; (3) I have a note of a MS at Monte Casino, *Cod. 439(c)*, but I do not know the date.

The earliest MS of all, *Cod. Ambros. O. 212 sup. c. A. D. 700*, comes from Bobbio, which is in the province of Milan. In it the *Quicumque* follows the *Liber de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* of Gennadius and the *Faith of Bachiarius*, a priest who came from Spain apparently to Gaul, and was challenged about A. D. 410 to clear himself from the suspicion of Priscillianist heresy.

I have been accustomed to think of the *provenance* of this collection, as such, as being Gallican rather than Italian, and the *Quicumque* might have been brought to Bobbio with those other Gallican documents. But we must allow that it might have come from Milan.

So far as I know not a single MS has handed down the name of Ambrose as the author of *Quicumque*.

In the parallel case of the *Te Deum* an important series of MSS preserves the name of Niceta (Nicetius), and we know now that this was the tradition of authorship at Lincoln Cathedral as well as Salisbury in the sixteenth century. But further research in Italy may yet discover the last link in the chain of evidence connecting the *Quicumque* with Ambrose.

Looking back over the whole argument I feel bound to confess that I am converted to an earlier date for the creed than I formerly thought possible. I have always contended for the theory of Waterland that the creed dated from Apollinarian times, that is before the rise of Nestorianism. This remains true, for the Roman Synod of 380 and the synod at Constantinople in 382 were concerned with Apollinarianism as well as Arianism.

The Gallican quotations, which Ommanney and I collected with such pains, remain valid as quotations. But the theory that the creed came from the Monastery of Lérins must go by the board. We have only proved that the monks of Lérins were among the first to quote and use it.

Also my theory that it was written to meet the heresy of Priscillian is undermined. This I regret the more because it had recently received the considered approval of Dr Kidd.¹ We may still say that it was found useful to meet that heresy in Spain and Gaul. Since Priscillian himself came to see Ambrose about 381 after his unsuccessful effort to see Damasus, the implied criticism of Manichean error which Brewer acknowledges in clause 28 may be referred to Priscillianism. He quotes Künstle² as finding in the words 'shall give account for their own deeds' a protest against Priscillianist teaching about 'stellae fatales' as governing human lives.

But I had suggested that since Priscillian was both Sabellian and Apollinarian the combination of the two parts of the *Quicumque* was explained by my theory. In view of the evidence that Ambrose and the Synod of Rome in 380 were occupied in explaining the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation together, this is not as necessary as it seemed to be when we were chiefly occupied in combating the Two-Portion theory of Swainson and Lumby.

In my *Introduction to the Creeds*³ I wrote these words, and I gladly repeat them :

'A kindly French critic of my former book took me to task for "somewhat rash hypotheses". I must plead guilty to the charge of repeating some of those hypotheses, and even of adding to them. Surely it is not possible to make any progress without new hypotheses. The one thing needful is to state the evidence fully enough to serve the critic, who has a better hypothesis to suggest.'

When the ground has been cleared by shewing that the *Quicumque* is not dependent on Augustine, all is ready for the new theory. The wealth of quotations by which Brewer proves that in every detail the creed corresponds to the literary style of the great Bishop of Milan produces a profound impression. His book is the fruit of years of patient labour and acute observation. His courtesy to his predecessors in the field is charming. Others may succeed in detecting flaws in his argument which I cannot discover. If not—we may congratulate him indeed on unravelling one of the most obscure problems of early Christian literature, and I hope that his theory that Ambrose was the author of the creed will receive universal recognition.

A. E. BURN.

¹ *A History of the Church* ii 309 sq.

² *Antipriscilliana* p. 229.

³ p. ix.