

buting their hold upon the masses to the novelty of their doctrine, and to 'une pratique religieuse en somme plus commode à l'endroit des Sacrements'. But on the very next page (80) he says: 'La morale janséniste . . . préconisait une pratique religieuse trop dure, inaccessible à la plupart des chrétiens.' The truth would seem to be that the Jansenists, whatever we may think of them, practised what they preached, and this will always attract even those who have no intention of following the example set. All to whom the Christian ideal is familiar like to see it carried out by others if not by themselves.

M. de Meyer's views on 'Probabilism' are, I believe, correct, and on this account I wish, for the sake of English and Protestant readers, he had developed them more fully. The undoubtedly evil results of the unscrupulous application of Probabilism have given a bad name to what is in itself an innocent thing, and indeed an inevitable accompaniment of the system of universal and compulsory confession. And one may hazard the opinion that, in a last resort, it is rather the doctors of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 when Confession was rendered obligatory, than Bartolomé de Medina, the inventor of Probabilism, who must be held responsible for any laxity which has crept in through the Confessional. M. de Meyer deserves thanks for the fullness of his references which render his book indispensable to students of the subject. But a word of protest must be permitted against his Index. He has followed that bad easy habit of recording every occurrence of a name without stating the context. What possible help is it to know that Arnauld figures on 100 and Hermant on 130 pages?

Slight misprints, over and above those noted in the *Errata*, occur on pp. 107, 187, 260, 263, 269, 352, 402, 443, 503.

H. F. STEWART.

The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity: A popular exposition, by RENDEL HARRIS. (Longmans, Green & Co., Manchester University Press, 1919.)

THIS short, very interesting, and in some respects highly illuminating, book is a sequel to Dr Harris's recent studies on the *Testimonies* and the Prologue to St John's Gospel. It is intended as a popular account of the results he has reached in them, and it will certainly serve to bring them before the notice of a wider public. That is all to the good.

As to the *Testimonies* first. Dr J. B. Gregory's original and *bahn-brechend* work *The Oracles of Papias* (1894) was disregarded; but the idea that a collection of Messianic proof-texts from the Old Testament existed early and might be the Matthaean Logia to which Papias refers got into the air and was current before Dr Harris turned his attention

to the subject and *more suo* threw fresh light on it. The Matthaean Logia of Papias were, he contends, a collection of *Testimonies* against the Jews, drawn from the Old Testament, yet not primarily Messianic, but covering a much wider field and largely dependent on the Sapiential books: a collection that may well have been made by Matthew and was in the hands of St Paul and other writers of the New Testament. It is in every way probable that such a collection would be made at the earliest moment for use in controversy with the Jews; and inasmuch as the later collections of *Testimonies* known to us identify Christ with the Wisdom of God, and the eighth chapter of Proverbs (including the LXX mistranslation in verse 22) played a dominant part in all the great controversies as to the Person of Christ, Dr Harris is on strong ground in arguing that the primitive collection included such passages, and that the identification of Christ with the Wisdom of God is the background of the high Christology of St Paul and of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of St John. The persistence of proof from the Old Testament, rather than from the New, was due to the fact that the proof was made in the first instance for Jews, and drawn, accordingly, from the only Scriptures which existed and were regarded as authoritative by Jews and Christians alike. All the New Testament writers are themselves dependent on the Old Testament; it was from the Old Testament that they derived their doctrine and drew a whole series of proof-texts which are the backbone of their theology.

If this has not been said so plainly before, it ought to have been. It is no doubt true as regards the Wisdom passages which in particular Dr Harris has in mind. Yet we know little of Matthew and much of St Paul. St Paul was surely as likely as Matthew to have been first in the field in applying these passages to Christ. And historians of the origins of the doctrine of the Trinity have always recognized the 'preparation' for it in the Old Testament; all the Sapiential passages, I think, are cited and discussed, for example, in M. Lebreton's *Les Origines du dogme de la Trinité*. Yet Dr Harris puts the case so vigorously and freshly that the familiar and rather dull study of the use of the Old Testament in the New springs to life again at his beck and we owe him our gratitude for this tonic.

Again, it is common ground that the Logos Christology was preceded by the Pauline; and St Paul wrote of Christ as the Wisdom and the Power of God. That identification may well have been made in the first edition of the Testimony Book. If so, it is no doubt true that in later editions 'where Logos and Sophia come together, it is Logos that is the afterthought and the intruder' (p. 30). But why the 'intruder'? The Wisdom literature of the Old Testament is not purely Hebraic, and the Logos theology as applied to the interpretation

of the Person of Jesus is not purely Greek. Two philosophies coalesced in something greater than either alone. The Logos theology as we have it in the New Testament and later is not quite the same as the Wisdom theology, and to say that 'all statements in which Christ is affirmed to be the Word of God' may be replaced 'by an earlier series of statements in which He is equated with the Divine Wisdom' (p. 31) is surely to say far more than the evidence warrants, and to miss the true instructiveness of the process by which the finest fruits of Gentile thought were brought into the treasury of Christian doctrine.

But there are other statements in this popular exposition of the origin of the doctrine of the Trinity which seem to me to be even more misleading and fundamentally dangerous, because they take us away from the solid historical ground on which Christian doctrine rests in the consciousness and the experience of Jesus Himself and the impression he made on His contemporaries. They take us away from the *terra firma* of history, on which we can tread safely, to the unsubstantial region of speculative thought.

Dr Harris has the point in mind. He writes at the end of his book: 'we have to stop and ask ourselves whether it is at all likely that such a title [as the Wisdom of God] was assumed by our Lord, or given Him by His disciples' (p. 36); but he does not deal with the question. I wish he had put it to himself sooner. The answer must surely be unreservedly, No. Not one of the titles under consideration was 'assumed by our Lord' (the very phrase implies a false start for the enquiry), and none of the evidence in the Synoptic Gospels (not even that of the so-called 'Johannine' passage Lk. x 21, 22 || Mt. xi 25-27) suggests that He could have thought of Himself as the Wisdom of God. The concept is altogether too impersonal: it belongs to the philosophy of history; whereas with the titles 'Son' and 'Messiah' we are on the plane of actual human life. In writing the following words 'historically, the first impression He made upon His disciples and His compatriots was that of an abnormal, supernatural Wisdom', Dr Harris plays truant from the evidence just when he ought to sit at its feet most closely, and reverses the actual order of the process of the development of Christian doctrine. He emphasizes the fact that the Deity of Jesus is the central point of the Trinity, and he allows, of course, that the primitive confession included the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah and as the Son of God; but he would relegate this twofold recognition to a secondary place. Yet the evidence of Epistles and Gospels goes to shew that this recognition was primary, that it carried in its train belief in His Deity, and that only in dependence on this primary recognition did any relating of Him to the Wisdom of God occur. It is never 'Jesus' but always 'the Christ' who is so related (Dr Harris notes this fact but

turns his back on it, p. 27). There is no evidence adduced by Dr Harris that bids us abandon the view that our Lord's own consciousness of His Sonship and Christhood was the original basis of the doctrine of His Deity (which is the presupposition of the doctrine of the Trinity). Then the Wisdom passages suggested other categories under which He could be thought of, and other functions; and the Logos philosophy enriched the early established belief. These later conceptions can hardly be said to have confirmed the belief: rather, they enlarged it. And it must be observed that they did not lead at all directly to the doctrine of the Trinity. In the New Testament that doctrine is not at all clear, and indeed its formulation is impeded rather than helped by the close identification of the Christ or the Son of God with the Divine Wisdom or the Logos. As long as that identification exists we have a duad rather than a triad. The real triad—the real doctrine of the Trinity—only came when some of the characteristics of the Wisdom and the Logos were transferred from the Incarnate Son, and hypostatized as the Spirit of God. It was by differentiation of Christ from the Wisdom of God that the doctrine of the Trinity was reached. Dr Harris's quick eye has discerned in the Mosque of St Sophia evidence for his case. I do not wish to dispute it; but in order to keep pace with the development of doctrine the dedication of the Church of the Holy Wisdom by Justinian ought to have been to the Holy Ghost.

This then, I submit, is the way in which the identification of Christ with the Wisdom of the Sapiential literature is connected with the doctrine of the Trinity. Its real basis is to be sought elsewhere. So, while admiring the freshness of Dr Harris's outlook and heartily accepting many of the results of his work, I cannot but dissent from the particular application he has made of it and regret the summary manner in which he presents it as a popular exposition of the origin of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Charis: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Christentums. Von GILLIS P:SON WETTER. (Oscar Brandstetter, Leipzig, 1913.)

Phōs (ΦΩΣ): eine Untersuchung über hellenistische Frömmigkeit, zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Manichäismus. Von GILLIS P:SON WETTER. (Uppsala, Akademiska Bokhandeln, and O. Harrassowitz, Leipzig, 1915.)

THESE books, published respectively six and four years ago, have only just come into my hands. Their author is a young Swedish scholar, whose theological studies have been pursued mostly in Germany,

though he has also paid visits to England and expresses his obligations to Dr J. H. Moulton. He has been Docent at Upsala and has now been appointed Professor of the History of Religions at Stockholm. Of two other works of his, an earlier (*Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus*, 1912) and a later (*Der Sohn Gottes*, 1918), reviews will, I hope, appear in a subsequent number of the JOURNAL.

In the first of these two works he gives us a very full and careful study of the word χάρις which, philological in part as it must be, is prompted by the purpose of getting light on Pauline and later Christian conceptions. His aim is to discover the main lines on which the thought of the earliest Christians about 'grace' travelled, and he carries down his researches to Irenaeus, halting there because at that point in the history all the notions which were associated with Grace in the Church of later times have already come into view. Indeed, he finds in the various books of the New Testament itself the roots, at least, of them all. There is no one idea of Grace in the New Testament: the word does duty for a whole series of dissimilar notions which belong to different conceptions of the whole structure of mankind and the world. (This is, perhaps, one of the over-statements to which I refer below.) To students of Doctrine I suppose the most obvious change in the use of the word is that by which it comes to be dissociated from its personal religious connexion with Christ or God, and either, as it were, hypo-statized, or treated as a force or power in its own right. Dr Wetter has a good deal to say on this 'concrete' or 'realistic' use, and here, as elsewhere, he draws largely on the Hermetic writings and the magical papyri for his illustrations. There is so much that is interesting in his study, and also so much repetition, that I can only aim at giving a general impression of the argument.

Dr Wetter begins by maintaining that the conception of χάρις as found in St Paul was not Jewish and that it has no equivalent in Hebrew. Though the word occurs frequently in the LXX, the meaning is always different: men may find 'favour' in the eyes of God, but they look to Him for 'mercy' towards them. The Jewish conception, he argues, is always 'ethical', concerned with man's conduct towards God and the judgement He passes on it. St Paul's, on the other hand, is 'religious'; it is no question of man and his works: it is all God's doing. So he finds the origin of the Pauline sense of the word in Greek usage (Philo, Epictetus, inscriptions and the like referring to benefactions of Emperors), where it denotes either an act or deed of gift or favour, or the beneficent disposition from which such beneficent action flows, on the side of a free sovereign power occupying a relation external to the recipient, who is not conceived as being affected otherwise than externally.

In contrast with this 'Greek' conception Dr Wetter sets the 'Hellen-

istic' or 'oriental' conception, according to which, he argues, χάρις is a mystical power bestowed on men, working inwardly in them or with them and effecting a change of being, as a God-given new equipment or endowment. This is the origin of the Pauline sense of the word as a power which has mastery over the inner life of the Christian.

Dr Wetter accepts as St Paul's only the 'undisputed' epistles, and all through this part of his study he discusses many passages with the fresh clues to their meaning that he conceives he has found, and gives his reasons for discarding the interpretations of most previous commentators as failing to appreciate St Paul's fundamental thoughts. He thinks that, on the one hand, Jewish influences tended to 'psychologize' the original Pauline thought and so to treat χάρις as an attribute of God, making it synonymous with θεός; and, on the other hand, that it was due to Hellenistic notions that it came to be regarded from an educational point of view as an aid to Christian life, guiding the development of the Christian in the right direction. So, as I understand him, we can trace a transition from the Pauline conception of a single act of God of a revolutionary character to the idea of Divine stimulus of an evolutionary process, with the further idea that the Church is the proprietor of all Grace which it is able to convey and to transmit through its various 'means of grace'. So 'grace' is partly given and partly won, and the idea of quantitative differences comes in.

Each of the points I have touched on is dealt with at length by Dr Wetter. In such a study it is difficult to avoid over-emphasizing the differences of conception that disclose themselves and assigning them too unreservedly to watertight compartments of their own. For instance, Dr Wetter gives us, among many interesting sections devoted to special notions, one on χάρις conceived spatially, or identified with salvation, as a realm into which the Christian is transplanted and thereafter lives in it—a conception which he regards as typical of St Paul's 'eschatologische absolute Weltanschauung'. It seems to me that this conception, translated into practical life in the world as it is, and adapted to its needs, gives us at once the church as the monopolist of grace, with even 'magical' channels for its use, so that the idea of *gratia infusa* is not so alien. But in any case Dr Wetter, I believe, is the first to attempt a study of the history of early Christian thought on the subject. He draws on materials, many of which have only lately become available; and in his use of them he is always interesting.

Phōs is a worthy companion volume to *Charis*. It seeks to find the true historical background of the Christian conception of Baptism as φωτισμός and the baptized as φωτιζόμενοι. In *Charis* much stress was laid on the physical conceptions with which early religious thought is associated, from which it was only gradually disconnected by a spiri-

tualizing process. 'We moderns are all too ready to psychologize Religion and its facts' is the refrain of *Phōs*: early Christianity is to be explained and seen in its true colour and proportions only against the background of popular piety and Hellenistic religiosity; its victory was due as much to its power to absorb as to its power to adapt.

This is a familiar thesis to-day, and the special application of it to the conception of 'light' which Dr Wetter makes is full of interest. What has to be accounted for is the connexion of 'light' with the idea of consecration or initiation and salvation. Classical Greek religion offers no parallel, and the use the philosophers make of the imagery of the Mysteries shews that the mystery-rites are the background of the philosophers' thoughts. By careful study and comparison of references to the Mysteries, pagan and Christian, and to the symbolism of Light in other connexions, Dr Wetter reaches what he regards as the highly probable conclusion that in the Mysteries the Light, regarded as substantial, was the actually present Deity who 'enlightens' the initiated and thereby divinizes them, the process being semi-physical: the divine substance is poured into the adept as a fluid and builds up his new self. For the Hellenist he thinks Religion is the implanting of new heavenly potencies in man whereby he becomes spiritual, 'pneumatic'. The identification of the *Gnosis* with 'light' implies, he argues, the same conception—that of a complete transformation of the man, whereby he is filled with a new divine element by which all darkness is dispelled and it becomes possible for him to see the truth. Dr Wetter finds further confirmation of his theory in relation to Manichaeism and its connexion with Mandaëism, to which he devotes a special section in the light of the latest discoveries and researches, arguing that the really new element in Manichaeism was the personality of the prophet, Mani, himself, and finding the source of the Hellenistic conception in oriental religious ideas of great antiquity.

The two books are a valuable contribution to knowledge, not to be overlooked by students of the New Testament and early Christianity. Dr Wetter's method of approach, from different sides, of his subject involves inevitably a good deal of repetition; but the lines are clear, if the results are not always decisive, and he writes a German that is easy to read.

The Pohle-Preuss Series of Dogmatic Text-Books.

Grace actual and habitual, The Sacraments in general: Baptism, Confirmation, The Holy Eucharist, The Sacrament of Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony, Eschatology. (B. Herder, 68 Great Russell Street, London, 1917, 1918.)

IN a notice of the first six volumes of this series (*J. T. S.* xvi p. 574) I described it as of value to all English students of Doctrine inasmuch as it provides them with an authorized statement of the official teaching of the Church of Rome in systematic form. The six volumes named above complete the series. Any one who is not in sympathy with the working out of a system of Doctrine in all its minutiae, providing answers to every question that can suggest itself to the most curious imagination, would find much in all twelve volumes (and not least in the last six) that would be wholly unedifying to him. In any case there are, I think, some statements and arguments that would be much better omitted¹ and a good deal that would be more effective if it was presented in a different phraseology,² as it might be without departing from the general method of treatment and the position of a Church that knows and has criteria of knowledge that are not available to others. But I make this comment partly in order to call attention to the fact that in some cases Dr Pohle can frankly and fully recognize changes of belief due to the advance of modern science. For example, his discussion of 'the location of Hell', and his reference to the 'erroneous notions' which the Fathers and Scholastics entertained about it, and to 'the unfortunate Galileo case' as 'a warning to theologians' (*Eschatology* pp. 49 ff), point the way to a sounder apologetic than all non-Roman divines are ready to adopt. But his task is easier here because the Church has never actually defined that Hell is a *place*, though, as he says, 'the dogma of the Resurrection seems to entail this conclusion', and, as he implies, the conclusion was universally assumed. The Resurrection of *the flesh*, on the other hand, has been defined, and in this case Dr Pohle's exposition can concede almost nothing to modern beliefs.

Throughout the books Dr Pohle is careful to shew what points have been in dispute in the past or are still open, and always he supplies references to the fathers and the schoolmen, and to modern discussions of the points at issue. It is this scholarly presentation and treatment of

¹ For example, the extraordinarily circular argument about the seven sacraments (*The Sacraments* i pp. 33 ff).

² For example, the last sentence of p. 433 of the volume *Gra*

the subject as a whole that makes the twelve admirably printed and handy volumes a desirable possession for all students of Doctrine.

In *Belief and Creed* (Macmillan & Co., 1918) the Bishop of Ely deals with a good many questions of current controversy of a kind with which the JOURNAL does not concern itself. Scholarship is only interested at two points. One of these is the possibility of the use of a subtle *εἰσροπή* by the author of the Fourth Gospel, as to which scholarship must, I conceive, be content to return an open verdict, with the result that it neither confirms nor bluntly disallows the Bishop's conclusions. The other has to do with St Paul's views about the Resurrection, and the various images he uses to describe the nature of the 'body' and its relation to the body borne in this life. For purposes of scholarship it is unfortunate that Dr Chase's exposition is controlled by a controversial aim. Dr Glazebrook, against whom he writes, had noted three distinct stages in St Paul's thought on the subject. So Dr Chase is led to maintain that no change can be detected and that St Paul was entirely consistent throughout. This, I think, is a more static view than scholarship will confirm. The background of St Paul's thought has not yet been sufficiently explored. Ideas of the 'seed', and the 'garment', and transformation, and divinization, played a large part in the popular Hellenistic piety and the philosophical thought with which St Paul, the Jew and the Christian, was in contact—in relation to which he often expressed himself. It is a thankless task to set about detecting inconsistencies in the thought of a great religious thinker like St Paul; but to attribute to him from first to last a systematized and entirely coherent scheme that is all his own is to defend him on lines that can hardly be made good. They do not seem to me to be the lines of living scholarship.

Women in the Apostolic Church, by T. B. Allworthy (W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, 1917), is a study of the evidence furnished by the New Testament as to the position of women in early Christianity. Mr Allworthy's treatment of the subject is careful and thorough. He shews that the 'equality of the sexes in the spiritual sphere' was fully recognized and he accounts for the fact that the practical consequences of this recognition were limited in range. Mr Allworthy gives us for the first time a connected and critical account of the evidence, with adequate scholarship and sound judgement, and his book is a valuable contribution to the early history of the Church in relation to women.

Using perforce the same evidence, but coming to it with a different type of mind, Dr A. J. Mason in the appendix he writes to *The Ministry*

of *Women* (S.P.C.K., 1919) reaches somewhat different conclusions. Mr Allworthy thinks that the New Testament shews us 'the first attempts of Christians to translate principles into practice', and looks forward to 'the presence in the Church of the Divine Spirit' as the guarantee of further developments. Dr Mason writes as if the limitations of practice noted by Mr Allworthy were themselves dependent on permanent principles ('so long as the race continues, men must be men, and women must be women, and it is upon this truth that St Paul rests when he asserts that women are to be "subject"'), and the whole Committee are responsible for the statement that some of these limitations 'originated in a generation which was guided by the special gifts of the Holy Spirit'. The theological interest of this report of the Archbishop's Committee is concentrated in that sentence, indeed in the phrase 'the *special* gifts of the Holy Spirit'. For readers of the JOURNAL I need not enlarge on its implications. As a contribution to Church history the whole volume is of the highest value and interest. It covers ground which is unfamiliar to ordinary students, who will derive much illuminating information from the appendices by Mr A. H. Thompson and Mr Eeles on the mediaeval period, besides being grateful to the Dean of Wells, the Bishop of Moray, Miss Gardner, and Dr Turner for their help on the earlier period, and to all the writers who describe the present position of the institution of Deaconesses in England, Scotland, and America. The appendix on liturgical forms relating to deaconesses and a number of illustrations add to the value of the book.

J. F. B-B.