

Chapter xix: *Text of the Creed*

CREDO IN UNUM DEUM, cries the celebrant, standing proudly alone in the midst of the One God's altar. *I believe in One God*, he sings, on behalf of the whole congregation, the whole Church, the whole Creation. The deacon and subdeacon stand in a line behind him, bringing up the Godward procession. Then, once he has finished that first triumphant praise, the two sacred ministers climb up to join him, using the same elegant right-angles we saw at the beginning of that offering of praise, the *Gloria in Excelsis* – many chapters back. Now all three of the sacred ministers stand, nobly and splendidly dressed (in pink damask!), making the offering of faith to God, crying out to God that we believe in Him.

But it is not merely in God's existence that we believe. An awful lot more words follow that declaration, words taxing on our intellects and imaginations and even patience. Well, the tag at the top of these chapters is *Orabo spiritu orabo et mente: psallam spiritu psallam et mente*, which means *With the spirit I shall pray, and with the mind; sing psaltries with the spirit, and with the mind also*. We cannot just sing to God; the mind is enveloped too by the Faith, and by the Mass; and now, at that point in High Mass called the Creed, the rite insists on the intellect's dancing.

What follows – although it's also an exacting recipe for healthy thought about God; and a medicine, reminding us of shameful sicknesses in the past – is glorious: in its way just as glorious an offering to God as the *Gloria*.

The text of the ‘Nicene Creed’.

CREDO IN UNUM DEUM begins the long formula, which is therefore known as the *Credo* – or, if we have to Anglicise the word, as the Creed. The celebrant sings out the first line, and then the choir, or the choir and congregation, pitch in and sing through the whole thing with him.

Here it is. Ignore the underlinings and so forth for the moment, and attend only to the words.

¶ I

*Credo in unum Deum
Patrem omnipotentem,
factorem cæli et terræ,
visibilium omnium
et invisibilium.*

*I believe in One God
the Father almighty,
maker of heaven and earth,
and of all things visible
and invisible.*

¶ II

*Et in unum Dominum
Jesum Christum,
Filium Dei unigenitum.
Et ex Patre natum
ante omnia sæcula:
Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine,
Deum verum de Deo vero.
Genitum, non factum,
consubstantialem Patri:
per quem omnia facta sunt.
Qui propter nos homines,
et propter nostram salutem
descendit de cælis.
Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto
ex Maria Virgine:
ET HOMO FACTUS EST*

*And in one Lord,
[bow] Jesus Christ,
the only-begotten Son of God,
begotten of His Father
before all worlds:
God of God, light of light,
Very God of Very God;
begotten, not made;
being of one substance with the Father,
by Whom all things were made:
Who for us men,
and for our salvation,
[kneel] came down from heaven,
and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost
of the Virgin Mary,
AND WAS MADE MAN.*

[rise]

*Crucifixus etiam pro nobis:
sub Pontio Pilato passus,
et sepultus est.
Et resurrexit tertia die,
secundum Scripturas.
Et ascendit in cælum:
sedet ad dexteram
Patris.
Et iterum venturus est cum gloria,
judicare vivos et mortuos:
cujus regni non erit finis.*

*and was crucified also for us,
under Pontius Pilate: He suffered
and was buried.
And the third day He arose again,
according to the Scriptures,
and ascended into heaven:
and sitteth on the right hand
of the Father:
and He shall come again with glory,
to judge both the quick and the dead:
Whose kingdom shall have no end.*

¶ III

*Et in Spiritum Sanctum,
Dominum et vivificantem:
qui ex Patre
[Filioque] procedit.
Qui cum Patre et Filio
simul adoratur et conglorificatur:
qui locutus est per prophetas.*

*And [I believe] in the Holy Ghost,
the Lord and Giver of life,
Who proceedeth from the Father
[and the Son],
Who, with the Father and the Son,
is worshipped and glorified:
Who spake by the prophets.*

¶ IV

*Et unam, sanctam, Catholicam
et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.
Confiteor unum baptisma
in remissionem peccatorum.
Et exspecto
resurrectionem mortuorum.
Et vitam venturae saeculi.
Amen.*

*And [I believe] one [holy], catholic,
and apostolic Church.
I acknowledge one baptism
for the remission of sins.
[✱] And I look for
the resurrection of the dead,
and the life of the world to come.
Amen.*

But reader, friend: I vehemently suspect that your eyes have jumped down to here, to this familiar solid square-edged text, skipping over all those wandering italics above. Do please go back now and read them through, as if for the first time, wondering over these precise and careful, almost anxious, articles.

(You might like to relish also the sonorous Latin words on the left. These Latin words say much the same thing as the English words, but they speak more roaringly, like torrents leaping down mountainsides with a mighty music, raising spray that turns the strong sunlight to rainbows: *consubstantialem Patri ! remissionem peccatorum ! Dominum et vivificantem !* – Enough poetry. Go back and read all the words.)

How such a fourteen-century-old formula could matter to us.

LAST WEEK WE CONSIDERED how Christianity is prone to quarrels about doctrine, and how these quarrels are not necessarily trivial, even if they turn on small, abstract points. If we make a small mistake in theological understanding – especially at the centre of Christian theology, which concerns the union of God and man in Christ – then the results can be massive and fatal. If churchmen hit on a mistaken theological idea, and the Church lets it become too powerful, Christians start to misunderstand Who Christ is; and their slightly distorted doctrine produces massively distorted devotion, massively distorted worship and ethics, and thus great human misery.

A small, persistent error in accountancy will eventually bankrupt a company. A tiny, persistent mistake in medical theory will eventually kill thousands of patients. Much of what goes practically wrong with Christianity throughout the centuries flows from errors in belief which seem to trivial people, once they are pointed out to them, too small to worry about. The trivial man titters *Oh how can it matter whether Christ had two natures or one?* But his brutal misogyny, which makes his wife and children so wretched, follows, if he only he knew it, from his contempt for the human body; and that horrible attitude remains in his mind because the minister at his conventicle (where the Creed is never recited) has not grasped that the Incarnation has lifted the human body into eternity. How could the minister grasp such a thing, imagining as he does that Christ was merely God going about in human disguise, as if at a costume party? Because the Creed does not defend the trivial man's 'pastor' from error, the truth can find no way into the trivial man's mind – even the truth that he should not jeer at his daughters' dresses.

The best way to cure doctrinal error is to impose a Creed, which is to say a very carefully worded statement of faith designed to preclude certain errors. A Creed is not meant to include all truth, or even to summarise the whole content of Christian Faith: it is designed to keep *out* certain dangerous mistakes, and to discipline with censure those who hold them.

It is this always a painful business constructing and elaborating Creeds, and the Church undertakes such work very reluctantly. She never does it for fun. Creeds are always elaborated in the face of heresy – that is, in contradiction of powerful new distortions of the Faith; and powerful new distortions do not, thank God, come along very often.

The age of Creeds.

AS IT HAPPENS, the worst doctrinal diseases broke out and were cured at a certain point in the Church's development.

That shouldn't surprise us. We grow the same way. Your most basic qualities were fixed at your conception; your temperament was pretty much established in infancy. Most of your intellectual qualities result from what happened to you between the ages of three and seven, when you came to terms with learning and books and study; your sexual characteristics date from those messy years between twelve to twenty; and so forth. You are the result of your own history, and your various facets are the results of critical epochs at specific points in your life. If we want to understand why, say, you are so anxious about criticism, or so fond of responsibility, we need to

investigate your home life when you were two. You are the product of these turning points.

The Bride of Christ is not just an immense organisation but also a unity, a personality; and she has the same history you have. Her most basic qualities were fixed at the Resurrection. Her shape was formed in the first century, when her government and sacraments and scriptures were composed. Her liturgy was perfected in the sixteenth century. Her devotional tone dates (I think) from the nineteenth. But her [dogma](#) (*dogma* means explicit, requisite religious theory) was formalised in the fourth and fifth centuries.

If we want to understand dogma, or what Christian truth actually is, we have to see what it is *not*. The only way to understand what the Church teaches is to grasp what she explicitly *denies* in her Creed. And her Creed is the result of a certain moment in her development – the fourth and fifth centuries.

So, remote though such knowledge may seem, we have to tackle fourth and fifth century history to get at Christian beliefs, just as we have to tackle first century history to grasp what the New Testament actually says, and sixteenth century history if we want to understand the Anglican communion (or, indeed, modern Roman-Catholicism). There is no short-cut, and wrestling with that turbulent age will take up this installment of *The Freeze-Frame* and the next.

Here we go.

Creedlessness: when we were very young.

IN THE VERY EARLY CHURCH there were no formal Creeds – that is, no brief, systematic, authoritative statements of Christian belief – because there was no systematic Christian belief. When early writers like St Paul tried *ad hoc* to summarise the Christian message, the results were sketchy.¹ Converts were baptised after declaring, very simply, that *Jesus is the Messiah* – if they were Jews. Gentile converts, who were almost always leaving behind polytheism, had to utter a slightly more elaborate statement, insisting on monotheism. But these Creeds were really only announcements that the believer had passed from mere Judaism or mere paganism into the infinite realities of the Gospel, which cannot be exhausted, which no formula can summarise.

In late second century, to exclude [Gnosticism](#) (the silly tendency to regard matter as inherently evil and unreal, and therefore incarnation and even crucifixion as illusions), baptismal creeds began to insist that God truly made the world; that Christ was truly born of a human mother, suffered at a particular moment in history (*under Pontius Pilate*), *died and was buried* as with all men; and that the Holy Ghost is *in the Holy Church*, rather than in Gnostic cliques. We find such a formula in Hippolytus, our oldest liturgical manual.² Such formulæ were being used, with different wording, all over the Christian world. And thus Gnosticism was driven out, and perished in the Void (until the coming of sensationalist Protestantism with Wesley – a voice howling out black space if ever there were one. But I digress).

After Gnosticism came a more serious crisis.

¹ I Corinthians viii⁶, for instance, and II Timothy iv¹.

² *Apostolic Traditions*, xxi^{12sqq.}.

Round I: the defeat of Arianism and the divinity of Christ.

Christians had always believed in the One God, yet also believed that Jesus was *the brightness of His glory, and the express image of his person*.³ Jesus was [the Word](#): *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*.⁴ How did these two ideas – the Unity of God, the divine light of Jesus – fit together? How could the Word be *with* God if the Word *was* God? This had never been clarified.

An Egyptian parish priest named [Arius](#) proposed a solution. He hit on the ghastly idea that that the Son was in fact not really the Son, but was a [creature](#) – that is, a being created by God, made the way planets and men are made – and therefore not properly divine at all. God was eternally alone, absolutely transcendent (as heathen philosophers had always liked to think). But He has made a sort of demigod called the Word, named ‘Son of God’ only as a courtesy title, and He sent this Word into the world to enlighten us. The Word took on flesh – a human body, although not a human mind – and went about being called ‘Jesus’.

This revolutionary new view ([‘Arianism’](#)) unhappily caught on, because the idea of God taking flesh is always hard and shocking. And as Chesterton declared last week, it is always easier to float with the spirit of the age – in late antiquity, to relapse into high-brow polytheism (for the Arian Word, and indeed the Arian Spirit, are really secondary gods). The Church was thus plunged into civil war at the very moment – the 320s – when she was conquering the State and converting the Emperor Constantine.

What was to be done about reestablishing doctrinal order? Constantine was prompted to summon a council of every bishop from throughout Christendom: an universal or ‘œcumenical’ council. For if the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, lives within the Church, how can we hear Him better than by listening to Him through the voices of all the apostles’ heirs? So hundreds of bishops (by no means all Christian bishops) assembled in May 325 at Nicæa, not far from the imperial capital at Constantinople, to form the [Council of Nicæa](#), the [First Œcumenical Council](#).

There’s a old legend, unhistorical but bracing, that at Nicæa St Nicholas, Bishop of Myra and kindly patron saint of children, was so appalled at Arius’ fatal distortion of the Faith that he sprang from his throne and thwacked him about the ears. Certainly Nicholas and the other Fathers of the Council, as delegates at Œcumenical Councils are politely called, [condemned](#) Arius and his teaching. That is to say, they solemnly declared that Arianism was not compatible with the Christian Faith, that it was fatally wrong, and that if Arius did not repent and recant (which he didn’t), he was cut off from the Body of Christ.

That was the easy bit. But how to re-establish sense in Christian teaching? Since even bishops had gone in for the Arian heresy, a new Creed was needed, not as a declaration for those about to be baptised, but as a test for those already within the Church: a declaration that on the central point of the divinity of Christ they held to the orthodox Christian faith, and not some new invention of their own or of Arius’. And so the Nicene Council (*Nicene* being the adjective from *Nicæa*) came up with an elaborate formula, which was called the Nicene Creed.

³ Hebrews i³.

⁴ John i¹.

It is the basis of the Creed we are singing at this freeze-framed moment of the Mass, and you can go back and look at it now. In fact, please do. The words of the Nicene Creed *I have printed like this*. (The Nicene Creed was of course composed in Greek, but in this church the Creed is sung in Latin or English, and the translation into both languages is faithful.)

I've divided the four sections of this Creed by discreet ¶s. The first section is about God the Father, the second about God the Son, the third about God the Spirit, and the fourth about the Church; but as you'll see, there's no balance. The Nicene Creed was not meant as a summary of the Christian Faith. It was a wall to keep out Arian heresy about the Son, and therefore the bulk of the Creed is the long second section on God the Son, which insists that the Son is indeed God: *God of God, Light of Light, True God of True God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father . . .*

All these phrases were designed to preclude Arian views, and the reiterations were an attempt to make sure no cunning cleric could twist the words of the Creed and subscribe to it while still harbouring heretical notions. These five phrases insist that the Being we saw as Jesus was divine before time began, that He was God *from God*, that He was not a creature (that is, made or created the way planets and men are made), but somehow proceeded out of God the Father eternally: He was *begotten, not made*.

That is difficult enough; but the hardest and most controversial phrase was *'omoousion to patri (homoousion tō patri)*, which means *of one ousia with the Father*. And *ousia* is a Greek word signifying *substance*, or *essence*, or *reality*. It was the technical term the Fathers fixed on to express the essential unity of Father and Son. Arius and his supporters had said Father and Son are essentially different, and the Church exerted herself at Nicæa to grasp that this was the *opposite* of the truth. Father and Son were indeed *homoousios*, essentially the same. In reaction to the heresy of the Word as a finite creature, she provocatively asserted that the essence of Jesus Christ the Man was literal *divinity*.

What follows from the divinity of Christ: the doctrine of the Trinity.

NICÆA, EXACTLY BECAUSE it was so forthright, was not the end of the fight. The Council's boldness provoked a reaction.

For on second thoughts, the Imperial establishment realised that it rather *liked* the Arian interpretation of Christianity – or at least some halfway 'semi-Arian' position between the blatant heresy of Arius and the radical Nicene position. Who, after all, really wanted to imagine a union of divinity and humanity as absolute as the one the Nicene Creed proclaimed? The idea that the eternal God had been in the world overthrew every human category and assumption; and the forces of worldliness rallied against it. The emperors in Constantinople and Rome aligned themselves against the Nicene party. Theologians began to go in for such terms as *'omoiousios (homoiousios), of similar substance*; which is only an *i* or, in the Greek alphabet, an *iota* away from *'omoousios (homoousios), of the same substance*: only 'an *iota* of a difference', but still a fatal distance from orthodoxy.

All this dogmatic controversy was of course almost as hard for Christians to follow then as it is for us now. They had clearer minds than we do when it came to abstraction, but their heads still hurt at this talk of *procession* and *substance*, *person* and

nature. Perfectly pious Christians failed to see that Nicæa was the only way forward. Perfectly reasonable believers found themselves on different teams, and because of our family characteristic of quarrelsomeness, these teams fell upon each other with terrible cries of Anathema! (which means *O accursèd thing devoted to utter destruction!*, and is the theological equivalent of a Bronx cheer, only more menacing).

“The situation was exactly like a battle by night,” recalled an historian a few generations later, “for both parties seemed to be in the dark about the grounds on which they were hurling abuse at each other.”⁵ Worse still, it was the *wrong* team, the Arians, who seemed to be winning: “The whole world groaned and marvelled to find itself Arian.”⁶

That the world didn’t stay that way is largely to the credit of Athanasius, the furious and implacable Patriarch of Alexandria in Egypt. He stands above our high altar, scowling defiantly into his beard, and at his feet is one of his books, open to the Greek phrase: *For the Son of God became Man that we might become divine*. We are saved by being lifted up to divinity; unless Christ is authentically God and Man, humanity is not lifted up: we are lost. That hope of salvation by being lifted into divinity was what the Nicene Creed offered mankind, and what Arianism in all its varieties denied. Athanasius would not give up that hope, however much mobs might howl at him or Arian synods anthematise him or emperors depose him. (His own Nicene mob howled back, of course, and in due course Nicene synods deposed and Nicene emperors banished just as thoroughly. This was the great age of theological riots, when every storekeeper was an angry proponent of one view or other of the nature of Christ, when every street urchin was articulate for *homoousion* or *homoiousion*, when everyone thought vigorously and acted badly.)

At last, in 381 a Second Ecumenical Council met at Constantinople. This Council of Constantinople confirmed the Council of Nicæa. But it went further, for it formally expounded the doctrine of the Trinity. Not only is the Word eternally divine (and not merely a creation of God the Father), but the Holy Ghost which – as Christians have always known – fills the world and the Church, is eternally divine too, and not a creation of God the Father.

From all eternity, then, there was the Son and there was the Spirit sharing divinity with the Father. God is One, but also Three: there are in the Godhead (that is, in very nature of God) Three distinct Persons, a perpetual Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity.

This Trinitarian doctrine is not in the New Testament. But that is no obstacle to believing it. The Church predates the New Testament; she created the New Testament; and through the terrible and dangerous process of fighting heresy, she came to understand more deeply the nature of God – which is the deepest, most serious and most mysterious knowledge of all. It is hardly surprising that it took even the Church three and half centuries to perceive so far as the everlasting structure of the Most Holy Trinity, self-existent and beyond time as the Trinity is.

If the fact of the Trinity is so hard and so deep, why do we human beings need to be troubled with it? Because of the Incarnation. God has given Himself to us so drastically that He has opened up His very nature to us. By meditating on the coming of His Son, literally human but also literally divine, the Church eventually realised that the

⁵ Socrates, *Hist eccl.* I xxiii.

⁶ St Jerome, *Dial. c. Lucif.* xix.

Son must be – not a creature, nor a temporary emanation of a monadic, unitarian God – but eternal: God the Son. If we did not know that God had become a Man we would not know that there must be God the Son, eternally ‘begotten’ of His Father. If we did not know that God remains within us (a force that flows through our finite minds because we are baptised into Christ, and lives in Christ’s fallible Church, but is nonetheless literally divine) then we would not know that there was God the Spirit.

God exists as Three Persons, and therefore as a community of unimaginable, infinite love: and that is a beautiful thought, if we can master it. But we would not know of this community (and could not know, and would not need to know) if it were not for the Incarnation. But because God has been united with Man, we indeed *need* to know about the Trinity. For such understanding of the [Triune](#) (or three-Personed) God is necessary to understand how God could have appeared as a Man, and how He is still present within us. The Incarnation is implausible without the doctrine of the Trinity. And that is why it was necessary for the Church, through the agony of controversy, to come to hold this ultimate knowledge of God.⁷

The Church’s new and deeper Trinitarian understanding of God involved an expansion of the Nicene Creed, which was undertaken either at the Council of Constantinople or (more probably) a little later. The terse Nicene statement *And [we believe] in the Holy Spirit* was expanded to describe the divine activity of the Holy Ghost:

*And [we believe] in the Holy Spirit,
the Lord and life-giver,
Who proceeds from the Father,
Who is worshipped and glorified together with the Father and Son,
Who spoke through the prophets.*

If you jump back to page 161 you’ll see how these new phrases about the divine Ghost, *which I’ve printed thus*, fit into the third section of the Creed. (Ignore the awkward phrase [[printed thus](#)]; we’ll get to *him* next week.)

This new, expanded formula is technically known as ‘the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed’ – which is an accurate term, but of course absolutely unuseable because no one can hope to say ‘Niceno-Constantinopolitan’ without breaking down (the

⁷ The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is not to be found in the Bible, because it was not discerned until the Council of Constantinople. Protestants, who claim that all necessary truth is in the Bible, are logically compelled to become [Unitarian](#): that is, to reject the Council of Constantinople and its Trinitarian formula. Some of them have the integrity to do so: they rapidly cease to be Christians at all, for without the doctrine of the Trinity the doctrine of the Incarnation dissolves into the vague feeling that Jesus was specially inspired. More inspired than Buddha or Gandhi or the Rev’d Martin Luther King, Jr.? The consistent or Unitarian Protestant has no way of saying: his theology therefore dissolves into mush, his worship into vague aspirations for Fellowship and the Higher Life.

But Catholic Christianity is forever blaring out in her worship: *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost!* She knows the doctrine of the Trinity, however abstract it sounds, is what stops Faith dissolving into a fastidious pose. Trinitarianism is the single most practical idea in the world.

trick is to take a big breath after *ENO* but hold back the accent until *POL*). Our tender mother the Church therefore went on calling her Creed ‘the Nicene Creed’, and that’s how it’s titled in Missals, and in our own excellent weekly bulletin. And as this installment of *The Freeze-Frame Mass* ends, that is what we are reciting, and celebrating, and offering up to the One Triune Godhead, Three Persons and One God, world without end.⁸

⁸ Alas! what a bad word *person* is in English.

Person is how we turn into English the Latin term *persona*, which meant *mask*, and is itself therefore a clumsy translation of the Greek technical term ‘*upwstasiς*, *hypostasis*, which means something like *ultimate (hyper, above all) reality (stasis, state)*. *Person* in this sense does *not* mean *personage, character, individual*. To say that there are three people or three personalities in God would be insanity or paganism or blasphemy. What the Second Œcumenical Council proclaimed is that Trinity is the final truth. Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the eternal reality of God. He is always to be understood as three *hypostases*, one in will and glory, but eternally distinct. There was never a time, nor will never be a time, when God is not three in Person: Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

But if the term *Person* tempts you to think of three separate people on a committee (say two brothers and their dad on the board of directors of a family firm), don’t use it. Try saying one *hypostasis*, two *hypostases*, three *hypostases* to yourself. It’s not such a bad word after you get used to it.

While we’re decrying unfortunate English terms, let’s pause to sigh over the fine Anglo-Saxon word [ghost](#). *Ghost* is a good word. It means the inner, more real, non-material realm. A man’s ghost is his soul: we still say *She gave up the ghost*, when a woman dies, and on Good Friday we’ll hear that Christ on the cross *sighed and gave up His ghost*, meaning that His soul left His Body (John ix³⁰). The Friar in *Romeo and Juliet* is called a *ghostly father* (III, iii, 49), which means that he is Romeo’s spiritual parent, far more a father than Romeo’s awful *mafioso* of a biological father. *Ghostly* means *solidier than material reality*. *Ghost* is a better word than the Latin word *spirit*, because *spirit* is a vague word, always close to meaning tendency or trend (as in *Spirit of the Age*).

Unfortunately, English can be a sloppy language, and people began to call *wraiths* – that is, wandering shadows of dead individuals – *ghosts*. *Wraiths* do not exist, which is no reason for not making up fine scary stories about them, but *is* a reason for not wasting the useful word *ghost* on them. However, English did so waste the word, and now it sounds rather strange to call the indwelling God *the Holy Ghost*. Most churches have abandoned giving Him that name, and instead always say *Holy Spirit*: which actually sounds more vague and vapourish, not less. Alas!

I suspect the main reason educated Christian believers shy away from studying the fundamentals of the Faith is simply the English terminology. They hear that there are three *persons* in the *godhead*, one of them a holy *ghost*. *Person* and *ghost* each mean something bafflingly different in modern English, and *god-head* is just quaint. So believers recoil from hearing any more, which is a shame; for knowledge of the Trinity (like knowledge of any part of Christian truth) is elating, and useful, and important – as moving as great poetry and as practically useful as a computer manual. Or more useful, since no one reads computer manuals, and there is nothing at all to stop anyone reading

On to Round II.

IS THAT IT? Did the age of dogmatic crisis end with the Council of Constantinople? Gentle reader, it did not. Victory and resolution on the question of God the Son opened up, almost at once, an even more desperate question – I shan't tell you what, since it would only give you an anxious week. Sufficient unto the day is the dogma thereof.

himself deeper and deeper into the theology of the Blessed Trinity (for instance, beginning with David Brown's magnificent book *The Holy Trinity* (1985), one of the few worthwhile works of dogmatic theology to come out of the weary twentieth century).