

This he does under the guidance of the principle that, religion being primarily the satisfaction of our longing for unity, religious development must be a process of unification. Hence the appearance, in time, of monotheism in place of polytheism and animism. Such is the first law of development which he finds in the history of religious thought. Another such general law at which he arrives is, that the richness of the conception of God in the religion of any particular people at a given time stands in direct proportion to that people's width and complexity of experience, and to the degree of energy with which it separates the contrasting elements, such as good and evil, finite and infinite, which religion endeavours to unify or transcend. Further, Dr Dorner discusses, in an interesting and suggestive manner, the evolution of religion and the progressiveness of revelation in the light of the principles which he sought to establish in a previous lecture: that religion, in its subjective aspect, is the activity of the *Einheitstrieb*, and, on its objective side, the revelation of an immanent God.

Lecture V deals with subjective faith and the various modes in which it has found expression.

We could wish that Dr Dorner had here attempted a more thorough and clear definition of faith in contrast with knowledge. He fails to distinguish between objective certainty and subjective certitude, a distinction which is essential to a clear definition of faith. The same lecture contains some discussion of the development of faith during the course of religious evolution, and as to the point at which the necessary illusoriness of such faith as was possible in earlier stages was exchanged for possible certainty.

With the later lectures we need not deal. They are concerned with the specific forms in which religion has expressed itself: revelation, prayer, symbols, sacraments, dogmas, and so forth. The author considers that most of such outward adjuncts, even such as belong to Christianity, are destined to pass completely away as religion approaches more and more nearly to its ideal. But on these matters less light is thrown by the lecturer than upon the topics dealt with in the earlier portion of his interesting volume.

F. R. TENNANT.

### THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN.

*The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin.* By F. R. TENNANT, M.A., B.Sc., formerly Student of Gonville and Caius Coll., Cambridge. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1903.)

In this volume Mr Tennant presents us with the historical investigation which preceded his recently published Hulsean Lectures on *The*

*Origin and Propagation of Sin.* The book forms a fairly complete introduction to the study of the most remarkable, though by no means the most important, of the doctrines associated with the name of St Augustine. Mr Tennant begins with the story of the Fall as given in Genesis; its exegesis, ethnological origin and relations; its psychological origin, and character, and the use made of it in the Old Testament. Subsequent chapters deal with the teaching of Ecclesiasticus and of the Alexandrian Judaism, of the later Rabbis, and of the Jewish pseud-epigrapha. This elaborate review of Jewish opinion occupies about two-thirds of the volume, perhaps too large a proportion in view of the fact that the Rabbinical speculations are post-Pauline in date and of dubious relevancy. Perhaps we may sum up the result by saying that on the subject of the Fall the Jews had no doctrine, but many opinions. Some held that Eve's transgression brought universal punishment on the human race, that of physical death; but this view, which Mr Tennant finds for the first time in Ecclesiasticus (p. 119), was not held by Philo. Others held that the result of the Fall was a permanent and general weakening of the moral nature of man; but to this rule exceptions were admitted, for instance in Wisdom viii 20 'Solomon is represented as having entered into a "body undefiled" in consequence of the "goodness" of his soul in its previous state of existence' (p. 129). But no one, except possibly Rabbi Nathan in the second century, spoke of hereditary guilt (p. 171). Mr Tennant says (p. 258): 'It is certainly the case that, in some of the apocalyptic books approximately contemporaneous with the writings of St Paul, we meet with the assertion that death was decreed against the race because of Adam's sin, and side by side with this the (apparently) conflicting statement that each individual is responsible for his own ruin, or, as pseudo-Baruch expresses it, that every man is the Adam of his own soul.'

The second, and much shorter, division of the book deals with the development of the doctrine of Original Sin from St Paul down to St Augustine.

Mr Tennant holds (against Sanday and Headlam) that in Rom. v 12 St Paul must be regarded as meaning that all men sinned in Adam, but follows Mr Stevens in explaining this statement away as due to 'mystic realism', in other words as a poetical trope (p. 262). This phrase of Mr Stevens is surely ill-chosen. Realism is certainly mystical, but it is as certainly real; the realist regarded his ideas as things. Nor is it easy to follow Mr Tennant when he says that 'St Paul identifies the race, as sinners, with Adam in the same sense that he identifies the believer with Christ'. Certainly as regards the latter of these unions it would be unjust to the Apostle to suppose that he is employing a mere figure of speech. But we all know how difficult it is to explain a mystic, if we do

not happen to be mystics ourselves. However, the result seems to be that St Paul is left with no doctrine at all, except just this that physical death is the consequence of the Fall. From this it follows naturally that 'his doctrine of the Fall must be regarded as widely different from that which was destined to become general in the Christian church' (p. 267). In other words, Augustinianism rests upon a serious misunderstanding of St Paul. This is the most disputable point in Mr Tennant's book.

From this point onwards little or no difference of opinion will be evoked by Mr Tennant's clear and scholarly account of the progress of speculation. The chief pioneers of Augustinianism he discovers in the East in Origen and the two Gregories, in the West in Tertullian. The last-named doctor is by far the most important. He is marked by three extraordinary peculiarities; he was a Stoic, a Traducianist, and a Montanist. Mr Tennant does not dwell upon this last feature which is probably the most important of all, and has never been properly worked out. From Montanism Tertullian received, not indeed his doctrine of the Trinity, but the figures by which he illustrated the doctrine. It has often been noticed that these figures are much too concrete, and the reason is that they come from visions. We may guess that much of his teaching is derived from the sister who used to fall into trances during service, and see visions which she afterwards described. Montanism would lend itself very readily to a pessimistic view of human nature. The Stoics again were at many points Calvinists before Calvin. From the Stoics Tertullian borrowed his view of the animal propagation of the soul. Finally, by combining traducianism with the Christian belief in the Fall, he reached his doctrine of an inherited degradation of the soul, which however, though grievous and ruinous, was not absolute (we shall remember the *testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae*). It may seem strange that Augustine should have retained and darkened Tertullian's view of human nature while rejecting, though not quite positively, the traducianism on which that view reposed. Perhaps, however, Mr Tennant (see p. 335) rather exaggerates this apparent inconsistency. A Platonist Father, though he believed in the divine origin of each individual soul, would still hold that at the Fall the *donum superadditum* was lost, and this view, though widely different in its logical foundation from that of the *tradux*, comes really to much the same conclusion.

Finally, it may be said that the essential feature of St Augustine's teaching is not his doctrine of Original Sin, which is really quite secondary, but his doctrine of Grace, which he identifies with Love. It is this that makes his teaching at once so beautiful and so terrible. Nothing can be simpler or juster than the precept 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God'. Yet nothing is more appalling, for no man can say

I will love anything or anybody. This is the true root of Augustinianism, both in its sweetness and in its bitterness. Mr Tennant has done his work very well, so far as one to whom the Rabbinical writers are known only at second hand can judge of it. But the scheme which he planned for himself, and to which he has adhered with scholarly concentration of purpose, obliged him to deal exclusively with the less important, less agreeable, less scriptural, and less philosophical of the sources of Augustinianism.

C. BIGG.

### THE LIFE OF SEVERUS.

*Vie de Sévère par Zacharie le Scholastique, texte syriaque publié, traduit et annoté par M. A. KUGENER (Patrologia Orientalis tom. 2 fasc. 1). (Paris, 1903.)*

THE life of Severus was published by Dr Spanuth in 1893, and has been translated into French from his text by M. Nau in the *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 1899, 1900; but, as Spanuth's text is so printed that one can hardly read it without injury to the eyesight or find any desired passage in it, the editors of the *Patrologia* have done well in publishing M. Kugener's work, which he intends to follow up by an edition of the unpublished life of Severus by John the archimandrite (parts of which have been translated by M. Nau<sup>1</sup>), and by an introduction and commentary. Moreover, M. Kugener has been able in several places to correct Spanuth's text from the MS, and has done much more towards removing corruptions than was attempted by Spanuth. At 37. 4 and 86. 12 however, and perhaps also at 106. 11, his corrections are unnecessary, and at 91. 6 the emendation spoils the sentence, where we should supply *محله* from the previous clause, and render 'or how can any one who is a Christian give any attention to such words?'. On the other hand at 66. 5 an emendation seems to be required, for the extraordinary statement that Leontius the law-student 'was at that time *μάγιστρος*' cannot be right, unless M. Kugener has some explanation which he is reserving for the commentary. Many passages however defy emendation, and M. Kugener has here wisely given the text as it stands with an approximate translation instead of making wild conjectures. The printing is clear and misprints few (I have noted such at 18. 12 translation, 66. 3, 70. note 6, and 104. 16 translation); but an unfortunate system has been adopted of using vowel-points in place of diacritic marks, which, being unusual, is sometimes puzzling.

The Syriac is a literal translation from the Greek; and M. Kugener,

<sup>1</sup> *Rev. de l'O. C.* v 293.