

in church music, which he had learned, after the Roman method, from the disciples of St. Gregory. He was ordained priest by Wilfrid whilst he was in Kent, before Theodore's arrival (Edd. v. Wilfr. c. 14). He was made bishop of Rochester by Theodore in the place of bishop Damian, after a long vacancy in the see, about 669, and was present at the council of Hertford in the year 673 as "episcopus castelli Cantuariorum quod dicitur Hrofescaestir." In the year 676 Ethelred of Mercia invaded Kent and sacked Rochester, whereupon Putta retired under the protection of the Mercian bishop Saxulf, taking no trouble about recovering his see or restoring the church of Rochester, but contenting himself with a church and a small estate, on which he resided continually, only occasionally leaving it to give instruction in the songs of the church. This new home of Putta is identified, although not by Bede himself, with Hereford, and Putta ranks as the first bishop of that see (*M.H.B.* 621; *W. Malmesb. G.P.* iv. § 163). Although there is little direct authority for this, there does not seem much reason to question it, as probably the creation of the diocese of Hereford was, like that of the other new dioceses of Mercia, an immediate result of the measures taken by Theodore in 679 (*Councils, &c.*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 130). Putta's death is dated, on the very questionable evidence of a MS. of Florence of Worcester, in 688 (*M.H.B.* 538). His successor Tyrhtel attests a charter of 693 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 36). [S.]

**PUTUBASTES** (PUTUBATES, Πουτουβάστης, Πουτουβάστης), an Egyptian solitary in the time of Antony (Soz. iii. 14, vi. 30). [C. H.]

**PYNUPHIUS** (PINUFIUS), presbyter and governor of a large coenobium near Panephris, in the east of Lower Egypt, in the 4th century. Finding the position he held unfavourable to the cultivation of humility, he withdrew by stealth, and proceeded alone to the coenobium of Tabenna in Thebais, where his person but not his fame was unknown, and where having obtained admission as a novice he was set to the performance of the meanest offices. After three years, through a travelling monk of his former monastery, it was discovered who he was; he was at once treated with the utmost deference and induced to return. He fled again, and embarking for Palestine, where he believed his very name was unknown, was received in the coenobium of Bethlehem, where Cassian then was. Here, too, some Egyptian monks discovered and brought him back. Cassian, on visiting Egypt, c. 390, called at his monastery, and it was there with him that his twentieth conference, *De Poenitentiae Fine*, was held. (Cassian, *Inst.* iv. 30-32, *Collat.* xx. 1; Tillem. xiv. 160, 165, 166.) [C. H.]

**PYRAMUS**, said to have been one of the British bishops of York. Geoffrey tells us that he was king Arthur's chaplain, that he was appointed by Arthur to the see after the expulsion of Sanxo, and that he restored the churches, etc., which had been destroyed (*Hist. Brit.* ix. 8). The chroniclers of the Arthurian school repeat this, and there is no other evidence for the assertion. [J. R.]

**PYRRHUS**, patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded his friend SERGIUS at the end of A.D. 638, or beginning of A.D. 639. He had previously been abbat at Chrysopolis. He was, like his predecessor, a Monothelite. Soon after his consecration he convened a synod in which he confirmed the ECTHESIS. (Mansi, x. 674, 1002, 1014; Maximus, *Disput.* 194, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xci. 352.) He also wrote to pope Joannes in support of Monothelism, referring to the forgery purporting to be by MENNAS. (*Max. Disp.* 181; Agatho, *Epp.* i. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1205). He was a friend of Heraclius, who before his death deposited large sums with him for the use of the empress Martina, in case her stepson CONSTANTINUS III. should expel her from the palace. This money Constantine obliged him to give up. Theophanes accuses him and Martina of poisoning Constantine, on whose death Pyrrhus, to appease the people, swore on the true Cross that neither through him nor through any one else, should Constantine's sons suffer any injury, but he was compelled by them to crown CONSTANTINUS IV., the eldest. The people were still incensed against him, invaded the church, tore the altar cloth, and carried off the keys. Pyrrhus fearing further violence, entered the church the following night, and laid his omophorion on the altar with the words, "I do not resign my bishopric, but I yield to the disbelieving people." This happened in September or October, A.D. 641. Sheltered for a time in a pious woman's house, he took a favourable opportunity of escaping to Carthage, PAULUS being appointed patriarch in his place. Pope Theodore while condemning the heresy of Pyrrhus, asserted that he should have been canonically deposed. [PAULUS (19).] Pyrrhus in Africa encountered MAXIMUS (23) his successor as abbat, with whom, in July A.D. 645, he held his celebrated Disputation. He was convinced by his arguments, and going to Rome presented a libellus, in which he condemned the heretical opinions of himself and his predecessors, and was received into communion by the pope, and treated as the legitimate patriarch, while on the other hand he was excommunicated by PAULUS. For the details of his reception see MARTINUS (3), Vol. III. 856. The exarch Plato sent to Rome and induced Pyrrhus to go to Ravenna, where he was persuaded to recant his recantation. Pope Theodore then pronounced a sentence of excommunication against him with unusual solemnity. [PAULUS.] Pyrrhus returned to the East, and on the death of Paulus on December 26th, A.D. 654, managed to get himself reappointed Patriarch, but died between four and five months afterwards. (*Lib. Pont., Vitae Martini et Theodori*; Theophanes, 275, 276, 282, 283, 286; Nicephorus; *Passio S. Martini*, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 117; Mansi, x. 878; *AA. SS.* Aug. i. 78\*.) [F. D.]

## Q

**QUADRAGESIMUS**, subdeacon of Buxentum, Gregory the Great's authority for his account of the miraculous restoration of a dead man to life by a monk (*Dial.* iii. 17). [F. D.]



QUADRATUS (1), proconsul. [POLYCARPUS, (1).]

QUADRATUS (2), bishop of Athens, apparently contemporary with Dionysius of Corinth, who, writing not long after A.D. 170 (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23), tells how by the exertions of Quadratus, the church of Athens was revived from a low state into which it had fallen on the martyrdom of its bishop, PUBLIUS. St. Jerome identifies, but probably erroneously, this Quadratus of Athens with QUADRATUS (3) the Apologist, *q. v.* [G. S.]

QUADRATUS (3), the author of an apology for the Christians, presented to the emperor Hadrian, who reigned A.D. 117-138. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 3) reports that the work was still in circulation in his time, and that he was himself acquainted with it. He quotes one sentence, which proves, as Eusebius observes, the great antiquity of the work. Quadratus remarks that the Saviour's miracles were no transient wonders, but had abiding effects. Those who had been cured, or who had been raised from the dead, did not disappear, but remained, and that for a considerable time after the Saviour's departure, so that some had even survived to the times of Quadratus himself. Accordingly Quadratus is called a disciple of the apostles by Eusebius in his Chronicle, under the eighth year of Hadrian according to the Armenian, the tenth according to the Latin.

St. Jerome twice (*De Vir. Illust.* 19; *Ep.* 70, ad Magnum) identifies the apologist with Quadratus bishop of Athens, and states that the apology was presented on the occasion when Hadrian visited Athens and was initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries. But on chronological grounds we must reject this identification. For it is improbable that any one contemporary with subjects of our Lord's miracles should survive to A.D. 170. We may doubt also whether the apologist resided at Athens. A writer against the Montanists (*ap. Euseb. H. E.* v. 17) contrasts the behaviour of the Montanist prophetesses with that of those who had been recognized in the church as prophets, such as the daughters of Philip, Ammia, and Quadratus. Eusebius evidently understood the reference to be to a Quadratus whom he speaks of (*H. E.* iii. 37) under the reign of Trajan, and who to all appearance is the same as the apologist. But since the author whom Eusebius quotes wrote in Asia Minor, it is likely that it was there Quadratus enjoyed the reputation of a prophet, as did the other prophets referred to, who lived, the daughters of Philip in Hierapolis, and Ammia in Philadelphia.

The *Apology* of Quadratus seems to have survived so late as the 6th century, for several passages were quoted in the controversy between the monk Andrew and EUSEBIUS (86) (Photius, *Cod.* 162). [G. S.]

QUARTILLOSIA, Feb. 24, a companion of St. Montanus and St. Lucius, African martyrs and disciples of St. Cyprian. The acts, as given in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* are marked by numerous visions, like those narrated in the acts of Perpetua. [G. T. S.]

QUARTO-DECIMANI. In the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, t. i. pp. 588-591, under

the head of EASTER, will be found an account of the Quarto-decimans till the time of Epiphanius. In the 4th century the supporters of this view seem to have separated themselves into a distinct party, as their baptism is allowed as valid by the seventh canon of the council of Laodicea, held some time between 343 and 381. (Cf. Mansi, t. ii. 563 sqq.) It continued to flourish in Proconsular Asia and the neighbouring provinces in the 5th century, as we find Nestorius among the first acts of his episcopate, at Constantinople, in A.D. 428, fiercely assailing the Quarto-decimans of those parts. They had clergy of their own too, cf. Mansi, t. iv. 1358, where a Quarto-deciman priest is mentioned in the proceedings of the sixth session of the Council of Ephesus, by name Patricius, who was so illiterate that he could not write. Socrates *H. E.* vii. 29, cf. v. 22, tells us that their church discipline was very strict, excluding from communion those who had sinned after baptism. At the close of the latter chapter Socrates informs us that the Novatians also had divided into parties which refused communion to each other because of their diverse views about the time of Easter. Cf. the three volumes of Hefele's *Councils*, trans. in Clark's series, for a minute account of the Quarto-decimans especially t. 1, pp. 298-334, secs. 37 and 38. The ancient Irish church is sometimes called Quarto-deciman, but without any foundation. She retained the old Roman method of computing Easter practised prior to A.D. 460. She long refused to adopt the new Roman method invented by Victorius of Aquitaine and revised and improved by Dionysius Exiguus, but she was no more Quarto-deciman than Rome was prior to that date, cf. Salmon, *Introd. to N.T.* pp. 303-315. [G. T. S.]

QUARTUS, a Roman martyr, mentioned by Bede alone in his *Martyrology*, Aug. 6, as having suffered with pope Sixtus. The *Roman Martyrology* only mentions Felicissimus and Agapetius, together with four subdeacons, as the pope's fellow martyrs. The name Quartus may be an explanation of an abbreviation, "et cum eo d. iiii." for the "cum eo diaconi quatuor" of St. Cyprian's. *Epist.* lxxx. (Cf. the note in Usuardi *Mart.* Aug. 6, Migne's *P. L.* cxxiv.) [G. T. S.]

QUATUOR CORONATI. See *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* t. i. p. 461, for notice of the legend and liturgical use; and SIRMIUM, STONE MASONS OF, in this Dictionary. [G. T. S.]

QUENBURGA (1), sister of Ine [CUENBURH]; (2) a nun [COENBURGA].

QUENDRIDA, wife of Offa, king of Mercia (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 469, note). [CYNETHRITHA.] [C. H.]

QUENTIN, ST. [QUINTINUS.]

QUERTINUS, ex-praefectus in A.D. 602, requested Gregory the Great to use his influence to procure the appointment of Bonitus as praefect. Gregory declined, for the reasons he gave (*Epp.* xii. 27). [F. D.]

QUICHELM. [QUICHELM.]

QUICUNQUE VULT. The title of the Psalmus *Quicunque vult* (or, sometimes, simply



the *Psalmus Quicunque*) has been commonly given for nearly 700 years to the document which, in its Latin form, begins with these words. It is almost needless to observe that it was usual in the medieval Church thus to designate the Psalms of Holy Scripture, and other Canticles, both scriptural and ecclesiastical; as e.g. the *Magnificat* or the *Te Deum*. The *Quicunque vult* has, for an equally long period, been also known as the *Symbolum S. Athanasii*. Other titles were occasionally applied to it in Gaul, the country where it seems to have been best known. Such were *Fides S. Athanasii Episcopi*, *Fidei Catholicae S. Athanasii Expositio*, *S. Athanasii de Fide Sermo*, *S. Athanasii de Fide Libellus*, *Fidei Catholicae Sermo*. The schoolmen, who were generally far keener as metaphysicians and theologians than as literary critics, for the most part assumed the authorship of Athanasius. But even between 1050 and 1450 some varieties occur. At the earlier of the dates just named, Gualdo of Corby is content to speak of it as ascribed to S. Athanasius (*quem composuisse fertur B. Athanasius*). Manuscripts of the 12th century assign it to pope Anastasius, as does also a Bodleian MS. of A.D. 1400.

The association, however, of the *Quicunque* with the name of pope Anastasius I. or II. does not seem to have been seriously urged by many critics of note. The earlier Anastasius died in A.D. 402 [ANASTASIUS I.], and was not specially involved in any of the controversies connected with the *Quicunque*; the latter, who was pope in A.D. 496-8 [ANASTASIUS II.], is noticeable for his effort to promote peace between the Churches of the East and West. Now, although it is very possible to exaggerate the anti-Orientalism of this famous document, still it is hardly probable that it was the composition of an ecclesiastic, who was eminently bent on the restoration of friendly intercourse between Rome and Constantinople. The substitution of the name of Anastasius for that of Athanasius may have originated in the error of some copyist.

The authorship of Athanasius, for the most part unchallenged from the sixth century to the period of the Reformation, was not at first assailed amidst the controversies connected with that event. Not only Roman Catholic theologians, as Cardinal Bona, Bellarmine, Petavius and others, but many of the Reformed—it must here suffice to name Luther and Rivet—accepted without hesitation what had become the traditional theory. Nor can that theory be said to have been, even in our own day, thoroughly resigned. One of the most vigorous defenders of the Creed, the late Rev. J. S. Brewer, seemed rather inclined to uphold its Athanasian authorship; and a similar tone is apparent in the Roman Catholic *Encyclopædia* of Drs. Wetzer and Welte. Athanasius is alleged to have composed it during his sojourn at Treves, and on the occasion of his visit to Rome to have presented it to his friend and ally pope Julius.

But the difficulties connected with this view are too grave and serious to warrant its being considered even a probable hypothesis. Athanasius is said by one of the most ardent students of his writings (J. H. Newman) "to have spent his long life in fighting for a theological term." Is it probable that he would have composed a Psalm or Creed, call it which we will, in which

this term (*ὁμοούσιος consubstantialis*) finds no place? Again, how is it that good editions of that great doctor's works do not comprise the *Quicunque*, that it is absent from nearly all MSS. of his writings, and that those which do contain it bear the heading "commonly attributed to St. Athanasius"? It must be added that neither the panegyrist of Athanasius, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, nor any early biographer, make any distinct reference to such a composition. Above all, why was it never appealed to in any of the controversies of the century subsequent to the death of the great bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 373? Our Latin copies of the creed exhibit, on the whole, a very substantial uniformity. But the same cannot be said of the Greek copies, and this is one of the arguments in favour of a Latin and not a Greek original (\*). Indeed, the Greek copies do not look like the compositions of men accustomed to write in that language.

On the whole, then, the case for the Athanasian authorship of the *Quicunque* must be regarded as non-proven; we may almost venture to say disproven. Of course, if it could be proved, it would fix the date of the authorship as being necessarily prior to A.D. 373, and would impart to the creed whatsoever amount of authority is conferred by so great a name as that of Athanasius. If, however, with the great majority of critics, we regard this as an extreme and untenable view, it must be added that almost similar language may be employed respecting another and entirely opposite hypothesis.

We refer to the supposition that the *Quicunque* is a deliberate forgery, put forth through the influence of the emperor Charlemagne, and composed by divines who were numbered among his friends. The object of the forgery is suggested to have been a wish to deepen the breach between Eastern and Western Christendom. This theory is, we believe, entirely due to one divine of our own times, the Rev. E. S. Ffolkes.

But not all the learning and ingenuity of this distinguished author, nor the deserved influence of his name, have sufficed to convince students of the problems connected with the *Quicunque* of the probability of such an origin. The one well-nigh unailing mark of every forgery, which is made for the support of a political or ecclesiastical cause, is wanting to this document. That mark is the almost invariably undue prominence and definiteness, which is given to the point at issue. Now in the case before us the one topic, which would aggravate the dissension between East and West, would be an assertion of what is commonly known as the double procession of the Holy Ghost. Such an assertion is indeed contained in the *Quicunque*. But it only occupies one single verse; and though Constantinople might be inclined to repudiate that verse, still the doctrine is so stated that many Orientals have hesitated about the entire condemnation of a proposition so nearly approximating to

\* The evidence on this head is well and briefly given by Canon Lumby. "The History of the Creeds" (Cambridge, 1873), Chap. IV. with its Appendix. But to the present writer the one passage of St. Gregory's panegyric which is claimed as a reference to the *Quicunque* cannot be made to bear such an interpretation. How can that creed be called specially "a thoroughly royal and magnificent gift concerning the Holy Ghost"?



the language of St. John of Damascus. A forger would, in all human probability, have both expressed the doctrine more emphatically, and would have enlarged upon it, as the *Quicunque* does enlarge upon the doctrine of the Incarnation. Moreover, the charge of forgery implicates the great names of Paulinus and of Alcuin. To suspect these men of complicity in such a proceeding is to go against all that we know of their characters; and the letter of thanks from Alcuin to Paulinus on the subject of some such symbolic composition thanks its author for the condemnation of errors, to which the *Quicunque* does not contain the slightest allusion. We believe that we are right in stating that the author of this hypothesis has not succeeded in procuring a single ally.<sup>b</sup>

Between these two extreme views, namely that of the Athanasian authorship in the 4th century, and of deliberate forgery at the commencement of the 9th century, there remains room for a considerable variety of opinion. The question of date, and even the question of authorship (when that of Athanasius has been resigned) might seem to be problems, which could be discussed without passion or prejudice. In some quarters this may be the case. Many sincere upholders of the main doctrines set forth in the *Quicunque* regard both the name and epoch of its author as problems of so subordinate a character as hardly to repay the trouble of investigation, and a brilliant bystander describes the whole matter as infinitesimal, if the doctrine of the Incarnation be accepted.<sup>c</sup> But this is hardly perhaps the general view. The *Quicunque* cuts directly across two leading principles. All religion, it has been said, must be either dogmatic or undogmatic. And, again, there either is, or there is not, such a thing as a responsibility of the intellect in matters of faith. The *Quicunque*, more trenchantly than either the Apostles' creed or (in its present form) the Nicene creed, takes one side on both these problems. Those who, on the whole, sympathise with its tone, are naturally inclined to support the view, which assigns an early origin to this document. Those who are unsympathetic are attracted in an opposite direction.

The present writer has no right, any more than some of those from whom he is inclined to differ, to claim immunity from prejudice. He can only state the considerations which lead him, though without wishing to dogmatise, to lean to the side of those who assign the composition of the *Quicunque vult* to some time about the middle of the 5th or (at the latest)

<sup>b</sup> For details of reply the reader is referred to Dr. Heurtley's "Reasons for rejecting Mr. Ffoolkes's Theory," and to Mr. Ommaney's earlier volume. See also Canon Maccoll's volume (to which reference will be made further on), and chap. xxvii. in Dr. Swainson's volume on the Creeds.

<sup>c</sup> "The essence of the belief is the belief in the divinity of Christ. But accept that belief: think for a moment of all that it implies, and you must admit that your Christianity becomes dogmatic in the highest degree. Every view of history, every theory of our duty, must be radically transformed by contact with that stupendous mystery. Whether you accept or reject the special tenets of the Athanasian creed is an infinitesimal trifle." Freethinking and Plainspeaking, by Leslie Stephen (London, 1873).

about the middle of the 6th century. The argument, as in all such cases, must depend upon (1) external and (2) internal evidence.

1. The external evidence is, it must be owned, far from copious and precise. For a time it seemed as if the question might be set at rest. This creed was copied into many Psalters; and in 1873 a Psalter known as that of Utrecht, containing a copy of it (possibly a copy which was known to Abp. Usher and to Waterland) was discovered in Holland. The Master of the Rolls (Lord Romilly) commissioned the Deputy Keeper of the Records (the late Sir T. Duffus Hardy) to prepare a report upon the subject; and that eminent and impartial critic gave it as his opinion that the MS. was of the 6th century.<sup>d</sup> This opinion for a time to many seemed conclusive, and in some quarters it is still accepted as such.<sup>e</sup> But palaeographers of equal eminence have assigned the origin of the manuscript to a much later date; and consequently this evidence cannot be pressed.

Nevertheless, though demonstrative proof may be lacking, there does remain a mass of testimony which to many looks like a strong probable evidence on behalf of an earlier date for the creed, i.e. as has been said between A.D. 450 and 550: or rather perhaps between A.D. 450 and 500. By A.D. 700 and onward we have abundant manuscripts of it. Commentaries, numerous and varied, can be shown. Canons of local councils refer to it. Sermons use its phraseology. What similar case can be alleged? Twice only, we believe—and that in the later middle ages, when intercourse between countries had grown freer and literature more widely spread—did any writings, other than imperial laws or productions of oecumenical councils, attract commentators within the space of a single generation. We refer to the *Libri IV. Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard, bishop of Paris, who died in 1164; and the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, who died in 1320. Peter Lombard's famous book found a commentator (the first of a long series) in his disciple, Peter of Poitiers: and Dante's wonderful poem brought out at least three commentators and public lecturers while many of its author's friends and enemies were yet alive. But this is recorded by historians of literature as a great marvel, and neither of these compositions can be said to have given rise to a creed.<sup>f</sup>

Let us glance at some illustrations of the probable date of the *Quicunque*. There is the commentary upon it given by Waterland in his famous disquisition, and reproduced by Dr. Heurtley in his small volume *De Fide et Symbolo*. Let it be granted that there is some lack of

<sup>d</sup> On this head may be consulted the Report by Sir T. D. Hardy: the Counter Report by other experts with a Preface by the late Dean Stanley and Sir T. D. Hardy's Reply. Also the *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1876, and Mr. Ommaney's *Early History of the Athanasian Creed*.

<sup>e</sup> E.g. In the Roman Catholic Dictionary of Messrs. W. Addis and Thos. Arnold. Art. "Creed." London, 1884.

<sup>f</sup> Drs. Wetzer and Welte give a list in their *Encyclopaedia (sub voce Lombard)* of the commentators on the Book of Sentences. For the case of Dante, Maffei may be consulted, *Storia della Lett. Italiana* (lib. i., cap. 4). Boccaccio took the lead.



definite evidence respecting the claim of authorship for this commentary made on behalf of *Venantius Fortunatus*. Still there seems fair ground for supposing that it was written somewhere about the date to which Waterland assigns it; namely A.D. 570. If we subtract from this date even so little as the thirty years usually allowed as the term of a generation, this would give us a time anterior to the middle of the 6th century. Then, again, there is the decree of the council of Autun. That council may have been held as late as 677. Its records, as they have come down to us, contain the following canon: "Si quis presbyter, diaconus, subdiaconus, vel clericus, symbolum, quod inspirante Sancto Spiritu apostoli tradiderunt, et fidem sancti Athanasii praesulis irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit, ab episcopo condemnatur." Unless the genuineness of this canon can be disproved, the *Quicumque* is so thoroughly accepted in the Gaul of the latter part of the 7th century, that for the clergy not to know it by heart has become penal. Clearly then, it cannot in that case be a production of the 8th or of the 9th century.<sup>g</sup> It could not have been completed by Hincmar about A.D. 870.

Further, we are bound to take into account the large number of manuscripts, respecting some of which we have the judgment of eminent palaeographers, such as Montfaucon and Muratori, that they are not later than the 8th century. The theory which would assign the production of the *Quicumque* to the 8th or 9th century involves the belief, that it at once sprang into notice in Western Christendom, and was everywhere deemed of such importance as to be copied into Psalters and Litanies. The theory which assigns it to some time within the hundred years between A.D. 450 and 500 (or at least 550) leaves time for a gradual recognition of its value, for its insertion into collections of authorised documents, for its sanction by local councils, for the appearance of its phraseology in sermons.<sup>h</sup> To the present writer this view commends itself as possessing by far the larger share of probability.

2. But this probability is greatly strengthened, when from the external we turn to the internal evidence. Of this or that document, for which a certain date is claimed, we are able to say: "Not such is the theology of the period, not such is the language of the period." But

<sup>g</sup> Labbe, *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 1013 (Paris, 1714). The case against the canon of the Autun council may be seen in the works of Mr. Ffoulkes and of Canon Swainson. [See list of books at the end of this article.] The counter-case has been set forth by Mr. Ommaney. The theory of Gieseler, that by *fidem sancti Athanasii* is meant the Nicene creed, is little worthy of so eminent a man, and hardly needs refutation. No product of a General council was ever called or regarded as the creed of an individual. Gieseler also stands alone in considering Spain rather than Gaul as the birth-place of the *Quicumque*.

<sup>h</sup> On behalf of the earlier date may be named Vossius, Waterland, Antelmi, Ussher, Mr. Harvey, Bishop Harold Browne, Caspari, and Mr. Ommaney. The two volumes of the last-named writer form a perfect storehouse of evidence. Lists of testimonies, of commentaries ancient and modern and of manuscripts, will be found in Waterland's *Critical History*. Additions to all three sources of information (especially in the matter of MSS.) have been made by Mr. Ommaney.

neither objection holds good against the supposition, that the *Quicumque* belongs to the latter half of the 5th century. The supporters of this earlier date maintain that, in its general outlines, it is sufficiently Athanasian to render it intelligible that it should have been ascribed to Athanasius, although they admit that it betrays a closer resemblance still to the theology of Augustine, and (perhaps closest of all) to that of Vincent of Lerins. [VINCENTIUS LIRIENSIS.]

Objections have been urged to the effect, that it is anti-Athanasian (a) in respect of its employment of the term *Persona*, (b) in the expressions *homo ex substantiâ matris*, and (c) in its assertion of the double Procession of the Holy Spirit. Even if these objections can be substantiated, it would not militate against a Western authorship of A.D. 450 or A.D. 500: and it would still remain Athanasian in its general doctrine concerning God the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Eternal Son.

But can they be substantiated? The present writer thinks that they cannot.

(a) That the Latin doctors found a difficulty in adequately representing the Greek terms *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία* is known to every student of the Arian controversy. It is recognised by the Fathers, both Western and Oriental, as e.g. by St. Hilary of Poitiers (*de Synodis*), and by St. Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* xxxi. 46), and referred to in modern compositions, as e.g. the Augsburg Confession, the works of Bull, Pearson, Waterland, Newman's *Arians*, and Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*.<sup>1</sup> But the fact remains that, despite the danger of introducing an earthly sense of individuality, the Easterns had by the date even of the Second General Council fully acknowledged that *Persona* was the best term which the Latin-speaking races could employ in the enunciation of the Catholic faith concerning the Holy Trinity. [Cf. ATHANASIUS, Vol. I. p. 198.] Its use has been untouched by the Reformation, as may be seen in the confessions of foreign Protestants, in the Anglican 39 Articles, and in the admission of Roman Catholic controversialists. Nor is there any evidence to show that Athanasius disapproved of it.

(b) Materialism is a grave and abiding danger in connexion with religion, and one which ever calls for watchfulness. But it must not be forgotten that there is such a thing as a false and dangerous anti-materialism, of which the Gnostic heresies were the earliest and most extravagant example. That matter was not in itself evil; that God made all things good; that every creature could be hallowed by the word of God and prayer; such were the Scriptural tenets adduced by the church against Gnosticism. Further, the orthodox doctors maintained that matter had been specially honoured by the Saviour of the world, in that He chose material substances to be the outward form of His sacraments; and, even more highly, in that He took to Himself a material body to be for ever united to His divine personality. That He took this body *in utero*

<sup>1</sup> We subjoin the language of the Augsburg confession: "Et nomine Personae utuntur eâ significatione, quâ usi sunt in hac causâ Scriptores Ecclesiastici, ut significant non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit." (Art. I. De Deo.)



beatæ Virginis, ex illius substantiâ (to employ the language of our second article), has ever been thought a fair and legitimate inference from the words of Holy Scripture, such as St. Matthew i. 20-23; St. Luke i. 30-38, 41-43; Galat. iv. 4, &c. Here, again, the Reformation has altered nothing. But how it can be supposed that St. Athanasius would have regarded such phraseology as materialising, is to the present writer simply perplexing. It would, he believes, be possible to adduce from his works a *catena* of passages which virtually contain, not only the statement on this head contained in the *Quicunque*, but also that embodied in our own articles. For brevity's sake, a single passage only shall be set down. "For no one else is found in the Scriptures, except the common Saviour of all, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ. For this is He who proceeded from a Virgin and appeared on earth as man, and who has a generation according to the flesh that is indescribable. For there is no one, who can name His father according to the flesh, inasmuch as His body is not from a man, but from a Virgin alone."<sup>\*</sup>

(c) Concerning the assertion of the double procession of the Holy Spirit it must be said, that however wrong it may have been to try and force it upon the Orientals as part of a creed, there is not only a sense in which it embodies true doctrine, but that such sense is frequently found in patristic writings of the West and in at least, one utterance of a local council anterior to A.D. 550. We refer to the creed appended to the canons of the first council of Toledo, held in A.D. 400, in which the Holy Spirit is described as the Paraclete, "*qui nec Pater sit, ipse nec Filius, sed à Patre Filioque procedens.*" It is indeed possible that this document has been placed too early, but even in that case it is held to have been promulgated by a council held between those commonly reckoned as the first and the second of Toledo; i.e. between A.D. 400 and 531. The language of individual Western Fathers, and the admission of even St. John of Damascus that there must be a sense in which the Holy Spirit is the "Spirit of the Son" (Galat. iv. 6) need not be dwelt upon here, inasmuch as they will hardly be disputed. But against the assertion that the language of the *Quicunque* on the Procession of the Holy Spirit can rightly be termed anti-Athanasian, we must refer to page 124 in the article on the HOLY GHOST in Vol. III. of this Dictionary, where the statements of St. Athanasius are analysed, and the just remark appended, "It is impossible not to see in these statements another approach to the Western doctrine of the Procession."

Evidence for the date of documents is to be sought not only in what they contain, but also in what they do not contain. Here, again, there appears to those, who believe in the early date

of the *Quicunque*, a large amount of probable evidence in favour of their view. No one, for instance, doubts that this creed, or psalm, contains protests against the heresies of Arius and of Apollinaris. It gives us something which the Apostles' creed and the Nicene creed do not give us: namely, a more distinct assertion of the unity of the threefold Personality of the Godhead; and, so to speak, a separate treatment of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Doubtless they in turn have each some precious truth. The Apostles' creed, in its present form, alone expresses a distinct belief in the communion of saints; the Nicene creed is possibly the most clear of all respecting the *Principatus Patris*. But the scholastic form into which the propositions are cast in this creed has also special merits of its own.<sup>1</sup>

Theologians, from Waterland down to bishop Harold Browne and Dr. Pusey, have been greatly struck with what it does not contain. The prominent heresy in the days of Charlemagne was that known as Adoptionism; but against Adoptionism we have here no protest. At an earlier date, apparently about A.D. 616, the heresy of the Monothelites (which archbishop Trench calls "a struggle for life and death") may be said to have assumed its shape. The *Quicunque vult* is silent concerning it. Nay, it is far from pronounced on the earlier errors of Nestorius and of Eutyches. Why? Is the answer of Dr. Pusey too emphatic? "Its language fixes it as belonging to the fourth or fifth century. It is inconceivable that so accurate a writer would not have used more definite language on the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, had he lived after their rise."<sup>m</sup>

It is right to specify the originality of the Latin as distinct from the Greek form, and the first rise of the creed being in Gaul, as points on which an almost unbroken unanimity may now be said to prevail.

Bp. H. Browne gives the following as the probable dates of the reception of this creed in various parts of Europe: in "Gaul as early as A.D. 550; Spain 630; Germany 787; England 800; Italy 880; Rome 930." It is remarkable that the Sarum Breviary contemplates the daily recitation of the *Quicunque* at Prime. The Roman (at the same hour) requires its recitation on Sundays only, and then only when the dominical office is used. There are exceptions even to this rule. It is to be omitted on Sundays falling within the Octaves of Christmas,

<sup>1</sup> "It is a very remarkable fact, that every missionary Bishop in Convocation insisted on the value of the Athanasian creed even in the case of neophytes. Bishop Claughton found it useful among the natives of Ceylon, Bishop Macdougall among his Chinese converts in Borneo, and the Bishop of Lichfield among the Maories of New Zealand. The late Bishop Cotton, too, having gone to India with some prejudices against the use of the Athanasian creed, found it so valuable as an antidote against the various forms of Oriental theosophy that he became one of the most earnest advocates for its use in congregational worship." "The Damnable Clauses of the Athanasian Creed," by the Rev. Malcolm Maccoll (London, 1872). P. 25.

<sup>m</sup> Letter to Dr. Liddon on the Clause "And the Son" (Oxford, 1876). Pp. 51.

Dr. Pusey refers to Waterland's Critical History, chap. vii., which states the same thing in a more detailed manner.

<sup>\*</sup> Ἄλλὰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εὐρίσκειται, πλὴν τοῦ κοινῶ πάντων ζωτήρος, τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκ παρθένου προελθὼν καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ γῆς φανεῖς, καὶ ἀδιήγητον ἔχων τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γενεάν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὅς δύναται τὴν κατὰ σάρκα πατέρα τοῦτου λέγειν, οὐκ ὄντος τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐκ παρθένου μόνης. De Incarnatione Verbi, cap. xxxvii. Compare also the proper preface for Christmastide in our present Office for Holy Communion.



the Epiphany, the Ascension, and *Corpus Christi*, also upon Easter Sunday and Whit Sunday. The rule concerning the use of the dominical office also excludes it on a Sunday when a saint's day is observed. As it is followed by the Apostles' creed in this office, it seems to be treated more as a psalm than as a creed. If, however, the Breviary Offices are employed by our Roman Catholic fellow Christians in domestic worship (as one of their highest dignitaries in England is said to desire) the *Quicunque* will be heard by some Roman Catholics more often than by Anglicans, who at most hear it only once a month.

The *Quicunque* (though usually, we believe, with some modification of the clause respecting the Procession of the Holy Ghost)<sup>n</sup> has obtained a certain amount of reception in the Eastern Church. A deceased theologian,<sup>o</sup> who had enjoyed special opportunities of examining the question, states: 1. That it is printed in a kind of Appendix to the *Horologium* and therein stated to be "consonant with the doctrine of the orthodox church." 2. That in the *Σύνοψις ἑρα*, an abbreviation of the Hours, it is described as "useful to each Christian." 3. That Macarius, a Russian divine of repute, places the Athanasian creed among "the expositions of the faith, which though not examined and expressly approved by the Councils, are yet received by the whole Catholic church."

Here, for the present, must rest our epitome of the case on behalf of the earlier date assigned to *Quicunque vult* being the more correct one. It is by no means impossible but that still more definite evidence may one day be forthcoming. Undoubtedly, it does deserve consideration whether those who believe in the value and usefulness of this psalm, or creed, may be unconsciously biased in their interpretation of the evidence. But this is a consideration which does not tell in one direction only. Enthusiastic admirers, such as Martin Luther or John Keble,<sup>p</sup> may be regarded as prejudiced. Can it be supposed that bishop Jeremy Taylor and archbishop Tillotson would be utterly unprejudiced? Those, who value it most, regard the (so-called) damnatory clauses as simply a charitable warning against wilful resignation of known truth, against the notion that man is not responsible for use of the intellect. (Gal. i. 8, 10; 1 St. John 9-11; St. Jude 3, 20; cf. also St. Mark xvi. 17, a passage not to be rejected hastily, as may be seen by Dr. Salmon's support of Dean

<sup>n</sup> Oriental divines are believed, for the most part, to be satisfied if the preposition *à* (in the clause *à Patre et Filio*) is in Greek versions rendered by *ἀπὸ* as it fairly may be. They object to *ἐκ*, as it seems to them (however mistakenly) to deny the *μὴν ἀρχὴν* of the Godhead enshrined in the Eternal Father, Who is, in the language of Western Theologians, confessed to be the *Fons et Origo Deitatis*.

<sup>o</sup> Rev. George Williams, cited by Dr. Pusey in Sermon on "The Responsibility of Intellect." (Appendix p. 82.)

<sup>p</sup> Luther doubted "whether anything more important and glorious (*etwas Wichtigeres und Herrlicheres*) had been written since the time of the Apostles." (*Werke*, ed. Walch, vi. 2315) cited in Schaff's *History of the Creeds of Christendom*, p. 41 (London, 1877). Keble's Sonnet in the *Lyra Apostolica* is well known. The writer does not intend any allusion to living critics of the question at issue.

Burgon's defence of its genuineness.)<sup>q</sup> They do not suppose it to refer to any who have not received the faith, or whose non-admission of it from hereditary teaching, or any like cause) is involuntary and free from deliberate purpose.

*Literature.* The following are leading writers: Vossius *de tribus Symbolis* 1642 [he assigns the *Quicunque* to A.D. 600]; Archbishop Usher 1647 [fixes on A.D. 447]; Quesnel, A.D. 1675 [assigns it to Vigilus Tapsensis, A.D. 484]; Dr. Cave 1683 [follows Quesnel, as do Dupin and Pagi a little later; also Natalis Alexander in 1714, and Bingham in 1716]; Antelmi, 1693 [Vincent of Lerins before 450]; Muratori 1698 [Venantius Fortunatus in A.D. 570]; Bingham. For fuller information the reader is referred to what still remains the classical treatise on the subject, the Critical History of the Athanasian Creed, by Daniel Waterland, D.D., Cambridge 1724. Among more recent publications may be named Essays in the *Contemporary Review* of August and November 1870, by Dean Stanley (reprinted separately), the Literary History of the Nicene and Apostles' Creed, and that commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, by Canon Swainson, D.D., London 1875, the History of the Creeds by Canon Lumby, D.D. Cambridge. [These two present the ablest case for the later date of the *Quicunque*. Dr. Swainson assigns it to Hincmar, A.D. 700.] The essay by Mr. Ffoulkes has been already noticed.

On the other side are Mr. Harvey's "The History and Theology of the Three Creeds," London, 1854, the reply to Dean Stanley by Mr. Brewer ("The Athanasian Creed vindicated," London, 1871), and the replies to Mr. Ffoulkes by Dr. Heurtley and Mr. Ommaney. The last-named writer's "The Athanasian Creed" and "The Early History of the Athanasian Creed" (London 1875 and 1880), deserve the very fullest recognition. It is worthy of notice that Dr. Caspari,<sup>r</sup> acknowledged on all hands as a competent specialist, is inclined to trace this creed to the fifth century, or at least to some time between 450 and 600. (Letter to Dr. Schaff, cited in Schaff's History of the Creeds.) This "indefatigable investigator," as Dr. Schaff calls him, will publish in due time some of the evidence on which his inferences are based. [J. G. C.]

QUIETUS. [African] bishop at Syn. 4, Carth. sub Cyp. *de Basilide* (A.D. 254), Cyp. Ep. 67. He may be the same as the Mauretanian bishop, Quietus of Buruc (? Burca, Ptol. not mentioned apparently in inscriptions), whose speech is twenty-seventh in *Senti. Epp.* at Syn.

<sup>q</sup> On this point the reader may be referred to the work of Canon Maccoll already cited in a note, and to Dr. Pusey's discourse on *Responsibility of the Intellect in Matters of Faith* (Oxford, 1873). One, who is probably the most learned of living Scotch Presbyterian Divines says in this sermon, in reference to such responsibility: "Perhaps it has never been better expounded and enforced." Professor Flint, D.D., *Theism*, p. 337; Edinburgh, 1877. Dean Burgon's work on the passage in St. Mark is well known. Dr. Salmon's judgment may be seen in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1885). Lect. ix. sub fin.

<sup>r</sup> Dr. Caspari is Professor of Theology in the University of Norway. He published at Christiania (vol. i. in 1866, vol. ii. in 1869, vol. iii. in 1875): "Ungedurchte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Tauf-Symbols und der Glaubens-Regel."



Carth. vii. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* 3, A.D. 256. (Through misreading the name as Quintus, Morcelli confounds him (there is no *var. lec.*) with the bishop Quintus to whom *Ep.* 71 is addressed.) [E. W. B.]

QUILLIANUS, bishop. [CILIAN.]

QUINIDIUS, ST., bishop of Vaison, c. 573-578. There is a life of him, with miracles, and a commentary by Bolland. (*Acta SS.* 15 Feb. ii. 829; *Gall. Chr.* i. 923.) [C. H.]

QUINTA, martyr at Alexandria by stoning. Mentioned by Dionysius Alexand. in his epistle to Fabius of Antioch (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 41). [G. T. S.]

QUINTIANUS (1), Christian (? Carthaginian refugee) at Rome, A.D. 250. [MACARIUS (20)] (*Cyp. Ep.* 22). [E. W. B.]

QUINTIANUS (2), bishop of Gaza, an Arian intruder into the see of the orthodox Asclepas, deposed by the Eusebians at Antioch (*Soz. H. E.* iii. 8, 12; *Theod. H. E.* ii. 8). He attended the council of Sardica in 347, and was one of the seceders to Philippopolis (Labbe, ii. 711). The orthodox bishops thereupon denounced Quintianus, together with Basil of Ancyra and Gregory of Alexandria, as "wolves," who were unworthy of the name of Christians, with whom it was unlawful to hold communion, or even to receive letters from them (*Theod. u.s.*; *Hilar. Fragm.* ii. tom. ii. p. 628; *Fragm.* iv. p. 665; *Athanas. Apolog.* ii. p. 766; *Le Quien, Or. Christ.* iii. 606). [E. V.]

QUINTIANUS (3), priest of Badesila, a place which Morcelli, with much probability, regards as identical with Vegesela in Numidia, who had allowed to be read in his church some non-canonical writings put forth by heretics and Manicheans, contrary to an express decree of the council of Carthage, A.D. 397 (*Can.* 47, *Bruns.* i. p. 133). The see of Vegesela was then vacant by the deposition of the late occupant, and Aurelius, bishop probably of Macomadia (Morcelli, iii. 12), who was administering the diocese, refused to communicate with him until the matter had been thoroughly investigated, which he proposed to do on Christmas-day at the place itself. A short time before that day Quintianus wrote to Augustine a letter which was received by him the day or next day but one previous to it. The letter appears to have embraced three subjects: 1. A request to Augustine to interfere in the matter, and to write to the people of the place on his behalf; and expressing his fear lest they should be disturbed in their minds by the visit of Aurelius. In his reply, though expressing the utmost kindness towards Quintianus and assuring him that he had taken care that the matter should be laid duly before Aurelius, Augustine declined altogether to take any part in the matter at present, as being entirely beyond his province so to do. He exhorted him to be patient, as there could be no doubt that it had been postponed only from pressure of necessary business. But he did not scruple privately to blame him for troubling the church by what he had allowed to be done. ii. Quintianus also requested Augustine not to receive into his monastery at Hippo Privatianus, probably the reader in question, who had left his post and sought admission

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

there, and founded his objection on a decree of the same council (*Can.* 21). Augustine points out (1) that the decree is directed not against laymen but against clerical persons, and that it made no mention of monasteries, though he does not suppose them to be excluded. (2) That the respect which Quintianus paid to the council in this matter is hardly consistent with his neglect of it in the other. (3) As a matter of fact Privatianus had not been admitted, but the matter was left to the decision of Aurelius. (4) That he cannot understand how any one can properly be regarded as a reader, who has read only once, and then only non-canonical writings. How can he be called a reader of the church who reads what the church does not appoint? iii. As to the people of Vegesela, they cannot be compelled to receive a bishop degraded by the council. No one can be more culpable than he who seeks to recover by secular force an office of which the church has deprived him (*Aug. Ep.* 64). The view of Morcelli seems to bring the various topics of the letter into consistency with each other, but Tillemont does not regard Badesila as identical with Vegesela, and thinks that, of the two places of the same name, this was in Byzacene, not in Numidia, of which Aurelius was certainly not at this time primate. (*Till. vol.* xiii. 137, p. 362.) [H. W. P.]

QUINTIANUS (4), father of pope Leo I. *q. v.*

QUINTIANUS (5), ST., second bishop of Rodez, between St. Amantius and St. Dalmatius (A.D. 506-515), and afterwards fifteenth of Clermont, between Apollinaris and St. Gallus I. (circ. A.D. 520-527), was born in Africa, and was the nephew of a bishop Faustus, probably either of Castra Seberianensium [FAUSTUS 9], or of Buronia [FAUSTUS 8]. Like the Gallic clergy generally he favoured the orthodox Franks in their struggle for the mastery of Gaul, and was forced to fly from the violence of the Goths, who were then dominant at Rodez. He took refuge at Clermont, where the bishop Eufrasius provided him with the means of subsistence. On Eufrasius's death the people elected him as his successor, but he was half cajoled, half forced into relinquishing the office to Apollinaris, a son of Sidonius Apollinaris. However, upon the usurper's death three or four months later, king Theoderic, who recognised a debt of gratitude for his sufferings in the Frankish cause, raised him to the see of Clermont. Here, as at Rodez, his episcopate was a troubled one. Private foes harassed him on the one hand, while a devastating army of king Theoderic overran his diocese. He died in 527, at a great age, and was buried in the church of St. Stephen. His day of commemoration is Nov. 10. Gregory of Tours held him in special reverence, and the details of his account of him give curious glimpses of the French church at that time. (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.* ii. 36; iii. 2, 12, 13; iv. 5, 35; *Vitae Patr.* iv. 1-5; vi. 3; *Gall. Christ.* i. 198; ii. 236.) [S. A. B.]

QUINTIANUS (6), bishop in the Byzacene. The priest Adeodatus complained to Gregory the Great that Quintianus had taken advantage of his two months' absence from his church caused by illness, to ordain another priest in his stead. Gregory in A.D. 593 directed the primate of the province to inquire into the matter (*Ep.* iv. 13). [F. D.]



QUINTILIANUS (1), proconsul of Asia, under whom Pionius suffered. His full name was Julius Proculus Quintilianus. Several proconsuls called Proculus ruled Asia in the second century (cf. Waddington, *Fastes des Prov. Asiat.*) as in A.D. 103, 112, and under Antoninus Pius, (*AA. SS. Boll. Feb. i. 45*). [PIONIUS.]

[G. T. S.]

QUINTILIANUS (2), brother of EXUPERANTIUS (q.v.), invited by Jerome to come with his brother to stay at Bethlehem (Jerome, *Ep. 145*, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

QUINTILIANUS (3) a bishop, but of what see does not appear, to whom St. Augustine wrote, A.D. 425, commending to his good offices Galla, a widow, and her daughter Simpliciola. (*Aug. Ep. 212*). [H. W. P.]

QUINTILLA AND THE QUINTILLIANI. Following on his article on the Montanists (*Haer. 48*), Epiphanius has an article (*Haer. 49*) on a sect to which he gives the alternative names of Quintilliani, Pepuziani, or Priscilliani; but he gives no sign that he had any real knowledge of the sect which he describes, or of any features distinguishing it from other forms of the Phrygian heresy. It is on the Quintilliani that Epiphanius, after some hesitation, decides (p. 417) to fix the story referred to in the article MONTANUS (Vol. III. p. 960, etc.), that the sacrifice of an infant and the partaking of its flesh formed part of the mysteries of the sect. Epiphanius derives the name Quintilliani from a supposed Montanist prophetess named Quintilla; but in asserting the existence of this woman (concerning whom, indeed, he speaks very doubtfully) he stands alone; all other authorities mentioning only two Montanist prophetesses, Maximilla and Prisca, or Priscilla.

Tertullian in the first chapter of his treatise on Baptism speaks of a female teacher, a viper "de Caiana haeresi," who opposed that rite; and according to several editions, in the end of the chapter, he gives her the name Quintilla. But the editio princeps, which Oehler follows, instead of "ita Quintilla," reads merely "itaque illa." [G. S.]

QUINTINUS (QUENTIN), ST., and martyr, said to have suffered in the Vermandois, in the time of Diocletian, circ. A.D. 287. His *Acta*, published by Surius (Oct. 31), are not included in Ruinart's *Acta Sincera*, and the critics assign them to the early years of the 7th century (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 500; Ceillier, iii. 100). Though his cult was firmly established, and a church dedicated to him was in existence in the time of Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Mart. lxxiii.*), yet the position of his tomb was forgotten until about the year 641 St. Eligius rediscovered the remains, or supposed remains, and moved them again (Audoenus, *Vita S. Eligii*, ii. 6, *Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 515*). In 881 they had to be carried to Laon to escape the devastations of the Northmen, but were brought back again after a few years, and from this time the town came to be called after him—St. Quentin. For his cult in later times, see Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Oct. 31, and for the history of the city and church, La Fons, *Hist. de Saint-Quentin*.

[S. A. B.]

QUINTUS (1), a Phrygian, who in the beginning of the persecution at Smyrna in which Polycarp afterwards suffered, of his own accord presented himself to the tribunal, but afterwards on sight of the wild beasts lost courage and recanted. From this example the Christians learned to condemn the rashness of self-confident rushing into danger without due cause. (Euseb. *H. E. iv. 15*). [G. S.]

QUINTUS (2) I. Mauretanian bishop (Cyp. *Ep. 72, 73*), to whom Cyprian wrote *Ep. 71*, on the baptism of heretics. [E. W. B.]

QUINTUS (3) II. An African bishop, who appears in Council on Baptism, i., as answering the questions which Quintus I. asks later, and whose seniority seems to identify him perfectly through the following lists as present in A.D. 252 at the second Synod. Carth. *de pace maturius danda*, Cyp. *Ep. 57*; in A.D. 254, at Syn. Carth. iv. *de Basilide*; Cyp. *Ep. 67*; in A.D. 255, at Syn. Carth. *de Bap. Haer. i.*; and as giving the sixty-fifth suffrage as bishop of Aggya or Aga, in Prov. Procons.; in Conc. vii. *de Bap. Haer. iii. (Sentt. Epp.)*, which like 'Episcopus Agensis,' in Conc. Lat. A.D. 649, seems to be corrupt for *Agbia*, Momms. *Inscr. L. vol. viii. p. 189*, etc.; in Prov. Procons. *M. and T. read Abbia*, though Hartel keeps *Aggya*. [E. W. B.]

QUINTUS (4) III. Either of the above, I. and II., may possibly be the same with Quintus, Cyp. *Ep. 55*, African (bishop?) "compresbyter," who brought to Cyprian the second letter of bishop Antonian, in which he takes a doubtful tone as to Cornelius, whom at first he supported. [E. W. B.]

QUIONIA, otherwise CHIONIA, q.v. An account of her may also be seen in Baron. *Ann. 304, xli.*, Tillem. v. 240, and *D. C. A.* [C. H.]

QUIRICUS (1), bishop in Iberia, wrote to Gregory the Great to inquire whether rebaptism was necessary in the case of priests and laymen who had renounced Nestorianism. The bearer lost the letters on his journey at Jerusalem, but informed Gregory verbally of their purport, who replied in A.D. 601 by a letter addressed to Quiricus and the other bishops of Iberia (*Epp. xi. 67*). It deals not only with the case of the Nestorians, but also with that of other heretics, such as the Arians and Montanists, and lays down the rule that, if while heretics they had been baptized in the name of the Trinity, they were not to be baptized again. [F. D.]

QUIRICUS (2), bishop of Barcelona otherwise CYRICIUS, q.v. To that article it may be added that he was present at the 8th council of Toledo in A.D. 656 (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Canones de la Iglesia Española*, ii. 417), when probably he had been bishop several years. He was the author of the hymn in honour of St. EULALIA of Barcelona, in the Mozarabic liturgy (*Patr. Lat. lxxxvi. 1099*), though Arevalo, in his note on Prudentius's hymn in honour of St. Eulalia of Merida, doubts this (*Patr. Lat. lx. 340*). It appears from the hymn that he had introduced monks instead of secular clergy into the church of the saint. He probably died



c. 666 [IDALIUS]. (*Esp. Sag.* xxix. 134, 439; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. [2], 152.) [F. D.]

QUIRINUS (1), a Christian of Carthage, who, together with Cyprian, sent relief to the bishops and martyrs in the mine (*metallum*) of Sigus in Numidia and elsewhere, A.D. 257, Cyp. *Ep.* 77, 78; not impossibly the same layman for whom in the first instance Cyprian compiled the *Testimoniis*, when apparently he was a Neophyte (*ad prima fidei lineamenta formanda*). [E. W. B.]

QUIRINUS (2), June 4, bishop of Siscia, in Illyricum, and martyr in the Diocletian persecution, under Amantius, president of Pannonia Prima. His acts are genuine. They are embodied in the *Acta Sincera* of Ruinart, and are often quoted by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs*, as in pp. 42, 52, etc., for illustrations of Roman criminal procedure. [G. T. S.]

QUODVULTDEUS (1), bishop of Centuria in Numidia (Procopius, *Vandal.* ii. 13), present at the council of Mileum, A.D. 402, at which a question was raised against him by an opponent. At first he professed willingness to submit to the decision of the council, but on another day withdrew his consent. The council then forbade communion with him until the matter should be decided, but refused to depose him. The charge was probably withdrawn, as no further mention of it appears, and he was present at the conference A.D. 411. (Bruns, *Conc.* i. 178; *Carth. Coll.* i. 126; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 126, ii. 15.) [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (2), Donatist bishop of Asi, a sea-port of Mauretania Caesariensis (Anton. *It.* 16, 3), who, having signed at Carthage the document preliminary to the conference held there in 411, died on his way home before the proceedings began. When the list of signatures was examined, and his death became known, much altercation took place as to the genuineness of the signature, and the Catholics accused the Donatists of forgery. The simple explanation however offered by Adeodatus of Mileum, as to the fact of the case founded on the wording of his signature *aeger subscripsi*, at length satisfied the imperial commissioner, and the business was allowed to proceed. (*Carth. Coll.* i. 207, 208.) [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (3), an African bishop, probably of Girba, a place of unknown site in Proconsular Africa. A bishop of this name, but without mention of see, was among the twenty who were deputed by the council of Carthage, A.D. 401, to inquire into the case of Equitius. [EQUITIUS (3).] A bishop of Girba of this name was present at the conference, A.D. 411, and the same name occurs among the members of the council of Carthage against Pelagianism, A.D. 416 (*Aug. Ep.* 175). [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (4), a clergyman said by Petilianus to have been ejected from the Donatist community on a charge of two acts of adultery, and received by the Catholics, but not, said Augustine, until he had proved his innocence. (*Aug. c. Litt. Petil.* iii. 32, 37.) [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (5), a deacon, who wrote to Augustine from Carthage, A.D. 427, requesting him, for the benefit of many ill-informed clergy there who read but little, to give him a brief account of the number and nature of the heresies which had arisen since the introduction of the Gospel, as to its cardinal doctrines, faith, the Trinity, Baptism, the human and also the divine nature of Christ, the Resurrection, the Old and New Testaments; which of them requires baptism, and which reject it, after what heresies the church permits baptism, *i. e.* not re-baptism, and on what conditions it receives returning penitents (*Aug. Ep.* 221). In reply, Augustine excuses himself from fulfilling his request, on the ground that the work has already been done by Philastrius and Epiphanius. In reply to this letter, Quodvultdeus still pressed his request, and in the course of the following year, 428, Augustine was able to fulfil his friend's desire by the composition of his work "concerning heresies," of which he gives a list in alphabetical order to the number of eighty-eight. This work, entitled *de Haeresibus*, will be found at the beginning of vol. viii. of the works of St. Augustine, ed. Migne. [H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (6), bishop of Carthage at the time of the capture of that city by the Vandals, A.D. 438. He was probably the same person as the one mentioned by St. Augustine in his letter to Honoratus, who had consulted him, A.D. 428, on the subject of seeking safety during invasion. (HONORATUS (11) Vol. III. p. 138.) The letter of Augustine to Quodvultdeus, which he sent to Honoratus by way of reply is lost, excepting one passage quoted in that to Honoratus. After the capture of the city Genseric ordered him and many others of the clergy, having been plundered of their goods, to be put on board some leaky vessels, which, however, reached Campania in safety. He appears to have died at Naples about 444, and his name was mentioned in a Neapolitan Kalendar as to be observed on Feb. 20, but nothing is known of his life after his arrival there. (Victor Vitensis, *Persec. Afr. Prov.* 1, 5; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 54; iii. 142-152.) In *Cal. Carth.* his feast was 8 Jan. and in *Mart. Rom.* 26 Nov. [J. G. & H. W. P.]

QUODVULTDEUS (7), African bishop at the council of Junca in 524. [FULGENTIUS (3)] (*Vit. S. Fulg. Rusp.* c. 29, s. 60; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 9, 828). [J. G.]

QUODVULTDEUS (8), abbat of St. Peter's at Rome, bearer of the first letter of Pelagius II. to Elias, the schismatic patriarch of Aquileia, and the other bishops of Istria c. 585 (Pelagii II. *Epp.* 3, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 710). [F. D.]

QUODVULTDEUS (9), African bishop, one of the bearers to Gregory the Great of the letters of DOMINICUS (2), bishop of Carthage in A.D. 592 (*Epp.* ii. 47). [F. D.]

QUOENTHRYTH (Kemble, *C. D.* 198. [QUENDRITHA.]