

early Spanish monachism—a subject which, like all phases of early Spanish ecclesiastical life, is urgently calling for investigation. It is becoming recognized that in Spain there is little trace of the Benedictine Rule and none of Benedictine monachism during the Gothic period. Hence all fresh light thrown on the indigenous monachism of the Spanish peninsula is most welcome.

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER.

### THE MELETIAN SCHISM AND EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH.

*Le schisme d'Antioche* (iv<sup>e</sup>–v<sup>e</sup> siècle). Par FERDINAND CAVALLERA.  
(A. Picard et fils, Paris, 1905.)

*S. Eustathii Episcopi Antiocheni in Lazarum, Mariam et Martham homilia Christologica* nunc primum e codice gronouiano edita cum commentario de fragmentis eustathianis. Accesserunt fragmenta Flaviani I, Antiocheni. (Parisiis, ap. A. Picard et filium, 1905.)

THESE two works are a contribution to our knowledge of the Church of Antioch during the fourth century. In the former of them M. Cavallera has unravelled the tangled story of the Meletian schism, which is the despair of the ordinary reader of Church history. The authorities are carefully marshalled and their relative value discussed, while a full bibliography supplies the chief modern references upon the subject. The book contains a full discussion of most of the important questions connected with the history, and exhibits signs of much thorough and patient research.

The real significance of the Meletian schism for the history of the Church in the fourth century is a question of importance alike for the general historian and for the student of Christian doctrine. Are we to explain it as the outcome of conflicting doctrinal traditions, or does its significance lie in the region of ecclesiastical discipline, e.g. the question of episcopal ordinations at Antioch? This is the antithesis which M. Cavallera sets before us. On the one hand there are those who, with Dr Harnack, see in Meletius a representative of the new Nicene party, which, while securing the triumph of the Nicenes, modified their teaching by interpreting *ὁμοούσιον* in the sense of *ὁμοιούσιον*. This view is combated by M. Cavallera, who, in his handling of it, shews acquaintance with the criticisms passed upon it by Mr Bethune-Baker in England and Dr Holl in Germany. His own contention is that the many attempts at a *rapprochement* between the parties at Antioch made during the period 362–381 shew that there was a con-

sciousness of the real orthodoxy of the dissentients and that the questions at stake were mainly personal questions affecting ecclesiastical discipline. M. Cavallera strongly defends the essential orthodoxy of Meletius, though perhaps he rather overstates his case and dismisses too lightly the evidence which connects Meletius with the Homoean party (pp. 95 ff). Possibly, too, he assigns too much weight to the language of those who, like Basil, were concerned to make the best of the doctrinal differences in their anxiety to bring about a reconciliation. But on the main question he makes out a good case, and he will be welcomed as an ally by those scholars who are of the opinion that the view of the developement of doctrine in the later stages of the Arian controversy, propounded by Dr Harnack and others, rests upon a precarious basis.

In his Latin thesis M. Cavallera has brought to light an unpublished homily, the authorship of which he claims for Eustathius of Antioch. Appended to this are two supplements containing the fragments of Eustathius and of Flavian of Antioch. Our interest centres mainly in the new homily in *Lazarum, Mariam, et Martham*, found in the seventeenth-century MS *Gronovianus* 12 in the library at Leyden. The portion of the MS containing the homily is a transcript from an earlier MS of the tenth century, and the homily bears the name of Eustathius. What grounds are there for regarding this attribution as correct? M. Cavallera appeals to the close resemblance between a passage in the homily and a similar passage in Eustathius's homily in *Stelographiam*, in both of which there is the same curious comparison of Mary, the sister of Martha, to Jacob. This comparison, which is referred to elsewhere in the new homily, is apparently unique in patristic writings. A second line of argument depends upon the parallels between the Christological teaching of the homily and that of the other fragments of Eustathius. Finally, M. Cavallera applies the test of literary style, though this is not conclusive, as he admits that there are some few discrepancies of style and manner between this homily and the fragments. Of these arguments the second brings us to that which is the really crucial test in the present case. And there is one serious deduction to be made from it. M. Cavallera has adduced various parallels between the Christological teaching of the homily and that of the fragments. But in an appended note at the end of the homily (p. 51) he admits that certain doctrinal expressions (e.g. εἰς τῆς τριάδος, συνδοξαζόμενον τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀδιαίρετως καὶ ἀσυνχύτως) point to the possibility of interpolation. This fact demands a more searching investigation of the whole Christological teaching of Eustathius than M. Cavallera has attempted. Are the characteristic phrases of Eustathius's teaching found in the new homily? And, on the other hand, do the characteristic phrases of the homily appear in

the known fragments of Eustathius? On this point M. Cavallera does not satisfy us, and until he has produced fuller evidence on the point, the decision upon the authorship must remain doubtful, and the possibility that the homily is a later work with a pseudonymous title will remain open.

J. H. SRAWLEY.

## PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

*Rudolf Eucken's Philosophy of Life*, by W. R. BOYCE GIBSON. (A. & C. Black, London, 1906.)

THIS little book seeks to make better known to English readers a writer who enjoys a considerable reputation as a religious philosopher in Germany.

Mr Boyce Gibson, though he is alive to defects of detail in Eucken's system, enthusiastically commends it as 'a scheme of truth which in a very genuine sense of the term will be the philosophy of the future, if the future proves worthy of it'. He regards it as the ripe outcome of the speculative movement which proceeded from Kant, and hopes it may prove a meeting-point for all kinds of idealists.

Eucken's philosophy is called an 'ethico-religious idealism'. It sets out from the category of personality. Emphasizing the unity of the mind, Eucken sees therein an indication of the reality of a personal spiritual life, transcending the world of ordinary experience. His method of inferring this personal life from the activity of the mental unity is neither psychological nor intellectualistic, but what he calls noological. The absolute reality of a superhuman spiritual life in man, Eucken maintains, is the necessary presupposition for the developement of spiritual personality by effort and deeds. Prof. Eucken has affinities with the voluntarist and pragmatist philosophers of to-day. 'Truth', he holds, 'is primarily and essentially a *personal* ideal. The ultimate criterion of truth is not the clearness and distinctness of our thinking, nor its correspondence with a given reality external to it; nor is it the systematic coherency of our knowledge, nor any other intellectualistic standard.'<sup>1</sup> But whereas other current philosophies dethrone reason in favour of will or feeling, Eucken demands that reason must give place to 'the heroic life'. Truth is consequently, for him, 'spiritual fruitfulness', as inwardly realized by the personal experient; and our conception of knowledge must be determined by the meaning we attach to life. It is in the intuitive certainties springing from heroic action that

<sup>1</sup> Boyce Gibson, p. 109.