

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 2—April, 1904.

I.

THOMAS AQUINAS AND LEO XIII.

AS an ecclesiastical diplomat, Leo XIII will no doubt take high rank among the popes of modern times. He had no power to marshal armies and to set in motion crusades against refractory dissenters, as did Innocent III, nor did he exercise the function of fulmination against princes. And yet his moral influence throughout the bounds of all western Christendom has been notably great. He has elevated the papacy to a position of worldwide influence such as it has not had since the Reformation. Not before in their history have the different portions of Protestantism had so kindly a feeling toward a pope. For the moment room has been made even for a feeling of toleration for the papacy itself. Both feelings are due to the impression made by the virtues of Leo's private character. This impression was enhanced by the exceptional mental vigor Leo displayed into a high age and the youthful interest he manifested to the very end in current events, and which has seldom, if ever, been equaled in recent times. This personal sympathy of Protestants, strange to say, has been accorded to Leo in spite of his sweeping condemnations of Protestantism. His encyclicals* have denounced the Reformation, with its novel doctrines, as having produced "sudden tumults and most audacious revolts, especially in Germany." Its so-called philosophy is made the mother of unnumbered pests, such as communism, socialism and nihilism. The ultimate fruit of the Lutheran revolt is the ruin of morals.† In one of his very first encyclicals the evan-

* June 29, 1881; August 1, 1897, etc.

† *Ruinam morum ultimam maturavit, Encyclical, August 1, 1897.*

general principle on the subject in hand. What are we to understand by the reference to our time as one when there is at least some knowledge of the inevitable sequences of nature? Is this partial knowledge which we possess of these sequences to be erected into the principle of inevitable or necessary sequence, and as such treated as a principle of historical criticism in judging the patristic interpretations of the virgin birth? If so, then it will follow that the New Testament narratives, judged by a like principle, must be regarded as interpretations rather than statements of facts. But this raises at once the question of the character and value of the New Testament data, which it is the function of historical criticism to determine.

There are a few typographical errors. Those that occur in the text of the Study are unimportant. The following in the Notes have attracted my attention: P. 33, n. 48, l. 3, after *θενος* insert *ἐπέθειξεν*; p. 46, n. 91, l. 1, after *fidem* omit *nobis fidem*; p. 49, n. 93, l. 1, for *nativitatis* read *nativitas*; p. 53, n. 101, l. 2, for *ῶτήρ* read *Σωτήρ*; l. 5, for *Χαλεπὸν* read *χαλεπὸν*; n. 102, l. 2, for *Ἰησοῦ* read *Ἰησοῦ*; l. 6, for *λέχει* read *λέγει*; p. 55, n. 104, l. 1, for *στριώτου* read *στρατιώτου*.

Princeton.

W. P. ARMSTRONG.

FRAGMENTS OF AN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITURGY IN SYRIAN INSCRIPTIONS. By Prof. W. K. PRENTICE, Princeton University.

This pamphlet is extracted from the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* and contains a number of inscriptions, some of them collected by the author during his recent trip to Syria. These are now published for the first time, with transliterations and translations. Prof. Prentice shows that six of the funereal inscriptions, which he gives, are the same as those found in some of the early extant Christian liturgies. He then assumes that the others which have not yet been found in any extant liturgy, also really belonged to some liturgy which has since been lost.

This is clearly shown for the *Trisagion* and the *Gloria Patri*; but in the other examples, where the words are almost exactly the same in all cases as those found in the Psalter, it is not established with certainty that the persons making the citations quoted them from a liturgy and not merely from the Bible. The rest of the fifty texts are not to be found *verbatim* in the extant forms of the liturgies.

"Many of these, however, are so similar in sense and phraseology to passages in the traditional liturgies, that it is possible in many cases to say in what part of the service they probably occurred. Others, again, while not so suggestive of particular passages in the traditional Christian liturgies, either reflect phrases which are known to have occurred in the Jewish ritual, or contain quotations from the Scriptures—generally, of course, from the Psalms—appropriate to a church service."

One must admit, that it is possible, that all, or most, of these inscriptions are taken from liturgies, as Prof. Prentice claims. Certain it is, that those so taken will form "new and independent evidence as to which of the various manuscripts represents most nearly the original form of the liturgies which they contain." Certain also is it, that these texts will be of great use in determining the Greek text of the biblical verses cited, and that "they may be used as auxiliaries in the literary tradition in obtaining a more accurate knowledge of the ritual and, to some extent, of the doctrines of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries."

We thank the author for his enjoyable, learned and suggestive contribution to the literature of the subject, and await with pleasurable anticipation the publication of the inscriptions gathered by the expedition of which Prof. Prentice was a member.

R. D. WILSON.