

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

surprising that it reached negative results as regards the probability of his authorship in cases touching which critics are now generally agreed on positive ones? But it may well be doubted whether the process of applying a more human and humane conception of Paul to the problems connected with the Pauline Epistles has yet been carried out to the full; ¹ and whether it is not able to solve some of the difficulties hitherto felt as regards the Pastorals. We need to remember how the letter to Philemon helped to guide scholars to the right, namely, the positive conclusion as to Colossians; for there is a Philemon element, an element of true human emotion and personality present in these Epistles, which can neither be ignored nor yet dissected out from the remaining matter.

VERNON BARTLET.

*THE RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE OF
THE TRINITY AS PRESENTED IN THE NEW
TESTAMENT.*

(1) IF we could with certainty assign the very words of the Great Commission in Matthew xxviii. 18-20 to the Risen Lord Himself, we might claim that He Himself put the doctrine of the Trinity in the forefront of the confession of Him in baptism. But this view is widely challenged to-day. "Perhaps," says Bruce, "it is not to be taken as an exact report of what Jesus said to His disciples at a certain time and place. In it the real and the ideal seem to be blended; what Jesus said there and then with what the Church of the Apostolic age had gradually come to regard as the will of

¹ Among those whose work is largely influenced by the more flexible and human "missionary" view of Paul, I may instance not only scholars like Lightfoot, Ramsay, and Prof. P. Gardner, but also the younger German School represented by Weinel and Von Dobschütz. The question remains, however, whether the latter group have allowed their new standards sufficiently to modify the "critical" tradition as to the Pastorals.

their Risen Lord, with growing clearness as the years advanced, with perfect clearness after Israel's crisis had come" (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*, i. p. 340). "So also Meyer's commentary, revised by Weiss, is quoted by Bruce to the same effect. "Expressly not as words of Jesus walking on the earth, but as words of Him who appeared from heaven, the evangelist here presents in summary form what the Christian community had come to recognise as the will and the promise of their exalted Lord." "The Trinitarian formula," says Harnack, "is foreign to the mouth of Jesus, and has not the authority of the Apostolic age, which it must have had if it had descended from Jesus Himself. . . . Baptism in the Apostolic age was *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, and indeed *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ* (1 Cor. i. 13; Acts xix. 5). We cannot make out when the formula *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* emerged" (*History of Dogma*, i. p. 79). Even if this conclusion is valid, it is evident that by the time the First Gospel was written the name of Christ had been expanded into the threefold name; and legitimately so, as the revelation of God in Him is that of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The creeds, which are an expansion of the baptismal confession, are all trinitarian. Probably one of the earliest, used in the Church at Jerusalem, is quoted by Cyril in lectures delivered in 348.

*Πίστεύω εἰς τὸν Πατέρα,
καὶ εἰς τὸν Υἱόν,
εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα,
καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας.*

The inward change, of which baptism was the outward sign, brought the believer into relation with God revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

(2) If Christ did not use the Trinitarian formula, yet the revelation is already present in His teaching. (i) In Mat-

thew xi. 25-27 and Luke x. 21-22 we have the utterance in the Synoptic Gospels which most clearly reveals Jesus' self-consciousness. The saying about Father and Son is assigned by Harnack to the *Quelle* or, as it is sometimes called, the *Logia* in this form. "All things have been delivered unto Me by the Father, and no man knoweth (the Son save the Father, neither does any know) the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him." This contrast of Father and Son runs throughout the whole of the Fourth Gospel; and although it is impossible to regard that Gospel as giving the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, yet it is not improbable that the consciousness of this relation of Himself as Son to God as Father filled a greater place in Jesus' inner life than the solitary confession in the Synoptists suggests. At least it can be held that the self-consciousness of Jesus did demand for its explication the later doctrine. (ii) So also in Jesus' ministry the beginnings of the doctrine of the Spirit can be traced. The Baptist foretold that the Coming One would baptize, not with water unto repentance, but with the Holy Ghost and with fire; and the Baptism of Jesus is best understood, whatever difficulties the narrative may present, as the endowment of Jesus Himself with the power of the Spirit of God, manifested especially as the record of the Temptation suggests, in the working of miracles. It may be said that here we are still within the circle of the Old Testament thought: but in the discussion in the Upper Room, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, we find a distinct doctrinal advance. I find it impossible to believe that we have here only reflexions of the evangelist, without any basis whatever in his reminiscences of Jesus' teaching. Undoubtedly the evangelist's own peculiar terms are here used; but even if the discourses express the evangelist's own experience of the divine presence in comfort and help with himself, unfolding the meaning of

the life and teaching of his departed Lord, nay making him realise that the Father in the Son was with him still, surely some starting-point for that experience there must have been in some promises and assurances of the Master Himself. To me it seems probable that Jesus in His earthly life did anticipate the Spirit's presence in His community. We have in the Gospel according to Luke the command to the disciples to tarry in Jerusalem until they were clothed with power from on high (xxiv. 49), and in Acts that power is expressly identified with the Holy Spirit (i. 5, 8). The conception here, however, need not go beyond that of the Old Testament.

(3) Regarding the account of the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost there is wide difference of opinion. Scholars are generally agreed that the gift of tongues was not the ability to speak foreign languages; and that in so representing it in the narrative either the author or the source has fallen into error. The abnormal psychic phenomena are such as accompany intense religious emotion, not uncommon features of a religious revival. The permanent characteristic of the Apostolic Church after Pentecost is described in the words "full of the Holy Ghost." This, Dr. Bartlet in his commentary on Acts suggests, might often, especially where the article is absent, be rendered "full of holy enthusiasm" (Note D, pp. 386-8). Certainty, confidence, courage were the inward signs of the presence and power of the Spirit. To the Spirit also were ascribed the varied gifts (not merely the abnormal phenomena of speaking with tongues, etc.) for the common service with which believers were endowed.

As Paul's full treatment of the subject in 1 Corinthians xii.-xiv. shows, while he recognised the existence and even the value of the abnormal phenomena, he subordinated these to less showy, but more useful gifts of ministry in the

Church ; and he in his teaching advanced beyond the common position in regarding the Spirit not merely as the Giver of varied endowments, but as the divine Agent in sanctification. By him the Spirit was contrasted with the flesh, and the fruit of the Spirit with the works of the flesh. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 22). It is true that Paul often writes as though the distinction between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit were for him not definitely fixed. Not only is the Spirit the Spirit of Christ as well as of God, but he even declares that "the Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 17). We must be always on our guard against forcing the rigid ecclesiastical dogma on the still fluid speech and thought of the Apostolic age. So closely was the life in the Spirit related to faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord, that in experience there could be no separation of the work of the Spirit from the work of Christ. While this must be maintained against a dogmatism which disregards historical exegesis, yet on the other hand the language of the New Testament forbids an identification of the Spirit with Christ, for there are several passages in which the doctrine of the Trinity is distinctly suggested.

(4) Although the spiritual gifts are regarded as the work of the Spirit, yet Paul associates the Spirit, the Lord, and God in dealing with the subject. "Now there are diversities of gifts ; but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all" (1 Cor. xii. 4-6). Most significant is it that the most distinct expression of the threefold name is in the Apostolic Benediction. In 1 Corinthians we have the words "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you" ; but in 2 Corinthians it is expanded into "the grace of the Lord

Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." It is not as a burden to man's thought, but as a blessing to his soul, that the three-fold Name is given. This is the doctrine of the Trinity in its religious aspect ; and we should study it most profitably in this connexion. (i) We may first of all notice that the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ contains as its antecedent the love of God, and as its consequent the fellowship of the Holy Spirit : in the Christian experience of Christ as Saviour and Lord the knowledge of the love of God and the consciousness of the fellowship of the Spirit are already given. It is from this historical reality that we must start to reach the eternal truths about God. It is not by speculation that the Doctrine of the Trinity is to be understood, for speculation has often misrepresented and distorted the truth ; it is by experience the truth can be known. (ii) Grace is the one word of inexhaustible significance that characterises the life, teaching, work and suffering of Jesus Christ. It is love stooping, seeking, suffering, saving, and blessing that is expressed ; but the total historical reality of what Jesus is and does is alone the adequate commentary on the word. If we may venture to apply our theological distinctions, grace is the transcendent love of God so immanent in the life of man as to share his sorrow, shame, suffering, death, darkness and desolation. It is love vicarious, sacrificial, and redemptive. It is God's emptying of Himself in Christ's becoming poor, to enrich and fill with the fulness of His blessing mankind. May I suggest in passing that divine *kenosis* is implicit in divine grace ? (iii) But the names of the subject of grace suggest a *plerosis* correspondent to the *kenosis*. Jesus is the name of the human Saviour, Christ is the title of the divinely promised Deliverer and Ruler, Lord is the recognition of Him not only as authoritative Teacher, but also as atoning sacrifice, and as supreme Head

of His Church, as exalted to God's right hand, as claiming the same honour and obedience as God Himself. "The primitive community," says Harnack, "called Jesus Lord, because He had brought the offering of His life for it, and because it was convinced, that He, awakened from the dead, was sitting at God's right hand" (*Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 97). Paul's declaration of his monotheistic faith in 1 Corinthians viii. 6, "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him," shows clearly that the Lordship of Jesus Christ was so conceived as not to imperil such a unity of the Godhead as must be maintained over against the "gods many, and lords many." The relation of the one Lord to the one God, the Father, Paul, having Christ's own warrant, expressed in the word Son. In Colossians i. 13-17 Christ is described as "the Son of His Love" as well as "the image of the invisible God" and "the firstborn of all creation." (iv) If the phrase "love of God" does not expressly name God Father, the conception of love implies not only God's Fatherhood towards men generally, but as the phrase "Son of His love" suggests, to Christ uniquely. I must confess that I am not much attracted by any speculative constructions of the Trinity; but the attempt to show that God as love must be both subject and object and so embrace difference-in-unity seems to me to be the least open to any objection. To conceive God as eternal Love is impossible without recognising some such immanent relation in the Godhead. The Son is first of all the object of the love of God Himself, and then the channel of that love to mankind in His grace. The grace of the Son is the expression and exercise of the love of God. (v) Pentecost followed the Resurrection, and the fulness of the Spirit in individuals followed on the confession of Christ in Baptism. The special endowments and the

moral renewal of the believer were the distinctive work of the Spirit, but were conditional on faith in the love of God through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. The word *κοινωνία* invites closer attention. The English "communion" expresses only one meaning of the word: the French "communication" another, and the German *Gemeinschaft* a third. Klöpffer renders the word *Antheilnahme*, *Theilhabung*. From the sense *communion* we can pass to that of *community* by way of the meaning *joint participation*, and thence to *intimacy*, *intercourse*, and finally to *collection* as a *benefaction jointly contributed* (see Theyer's Lexicon). This study of the word is not unimportant. The *charisms* of the Spirit are not merely gifts to the individual, but gifts enjoyed only because jointly possessed. The participation in the Spirit or communication from the Spirit is within and not apart from the community of believers. We must remember Paul's *organic* conception of the Christian Church in 1 Corinthians xii. It is as the body of Christ and as severally members of it that believers enjoy the gifts of the Spirit. The Christian individual is complete spiritually only within the Christian society. Personality is fulfilled only as it transcends individuality as exclusive and separative, and becomes social, participation in the common life of a society. For me the Christian society does not depend on any external organisation for its organic unity, however desirable and advantageous such outward embodiment may be. But community of faith is the issue of the experience of God as Father, Son, and Spirit. The significance of this conclusion for the doctrine of the Trinity will appear in the subsequent discussion.

(5) The doctrine of the Trinity as it is presented in the New Testament is rooted in Christian experience. The threefold name of God corresponds to a threefold apprehension of God in the Christian salvation, as God in all,

through all, and over all, who to mankind is Father, as God incarnate to reveal and redeem in the historical personality of Jesus Christ the Son of God, as God imparting His own life in manifold spiritual gifts within the Christian community in the Holy Spirit. But the significance of this fact may be challenged on the ground that there are antecedents in Jewish thought for the entire doctrine. (i) Throughout the Old Testament the presence and activity of God in the world and man is ascribed to the Spirit. All exceptional endowments, especially the prophetic, are due to the Spirit of God. In later Jewish thought the Spirit is never altogether endowed with personality, but there is a slight tendency to personify. (ii) In the Old Testament also, especially the Wisdom literature, the Word or the Wisdom of God is personified. Philo, whose Jewish faith was affected by Greek philosophy, introduces the Platonic doctrine of ideas in his conception of the Logos. To remove God from direct contact with matter is the aim of his teaching: this is not the Old Testament attitude for which God is constantly and directly in the world. One sentence may be quoted, "God generated all things (out of matter), not touching it Himself, for it was not right for the Wise and Blessed to come in contact with indeterminate and mixed matter; but He used the incorporeal powers whose real name is ideas, that each genus might receive its fitting form" (quoted in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, ii. 207). These powers or ideas are all comprehended in the Logos, which is almost represented as a person. The *Memra* in Palestinian Jewish theology is not so much the Divine Reason as the Divine Word, God active in nature or history, and this is personified, and almost hypostatized. (iii) While in the Old Testament the Messiah remains a human ruler, in the Son of Man of the Similitudes in the Book of Enoch he becomes a supernatural intermediate being.

(6) These facts being fully recognised, can the New Testament doctrine of the Trinity be regarded as merely the development of these ideas? Several considerations must be urged before an answer can be given. (i) We must carefully distinguish between the spiritual, eternal, divine reality that religious faith apprehends, and the intellectual forms in which it finds expression. Even if the Fourth Evangelist borrowed the term *Logos* from Philo, Philo's idea does not account for the impression the historical reality of Jesus, known to him, as I believe, as an eye-witness of the earthly ministry, made on him, an impression so great, that he must use this term to express the value for the thought and life of man of this personality whom he had known in the flesh. Even if Paul's representation of Christ as the Man from Heaven was affected by Apocalyptic Jewish ideas, yet these ideas do not explain his experience of salvation through the grace of Jesus Christ. The fact that phenomena analogous to the abnormal features connected with the Spirit's presence and power in the Apostolic Church were to be met with in contemporary Judaism, and that in religious revivals in the Christian Church similar experiences have been repeated, does not dispose of the new life, joy and hope that came to believers. It would be too much to say that the Christian Church borrowed only terms, and was uninfluenced in thought by its environment; but can its distinctive experience be so accounted for? (ii) But had the Christian Church borrowed even more than it did it remains to be proved that what was borrowed had no truth in it. If in the Old Testament and in Judaism there was the tendency to represent God's presence and operation in the world by such conceptions as Spirit and Word or Wisdom, we must not dismiss the idea as speculative, but must ask ourselves if the reality did not necessitate such modes of representation. If both poetry and philoso-

phy were led so to think of God, does that not suggest at least that God may be most fitly so thought of? (iii) We must to-day test the truth of this conception of God for ourselves. Is the reality of our experiences of the world and of ourselves most adequately interpreted so as to answer not only the questions of our minds, but also to meet the needs of our souls by a Unitarian or a Trinitarian conception of God? I shall attempt an answer in the last section of this paper; it is sufficient at present to insist that the question remains to be answered, even if the Christian Church in its doctrine was influenced by its environment.

(7) Before addressing ourselves to this question, we must glance at the ecclesiastical dogma of the Trinity based on the New Testament teaching. (i) The formula for the Trinity is three persons in one substance, as for the Incarnation, two substances (or natures) in one person. I have elsewhere minutely examined the terms used, and must not now go over the same ground.¹ All that for my present purpose I need say is that the formula seems to me to be as unsatisfying to piety as it is inadequate for theology. The term substance is both ambiguous and vague. It may mean both a single entity and the class to which it belongs. If it be urged that the idea of God itself implies solity, that of the divine class there can be only one, it may be pointed out that the term person is so ambiguous that it might suggest three individuals in one class of divine beings. The term substance, further, does not express at all that fullness of the divine life which would explain how within oneness there can be manifoldness. The term does not guard the unity of the Godhead, nor does it show how there may be difference-in-unity. The term person, as used in the Creeds, did not mean what it now means, as the conception of personality was undeveloped in Greek thought, and owes

¹ The *Expository Times*, May to August, 1912.

much in the deepening and widening of its meaning to Christian thought. To-day it is apt to be used as equivalent to individual, and so there has slipped into popular Christian thought a quasi-polytheism. The persons in the Godhead are regarded as members of a family, or partners in a firm. (ii) Athanasius, starting from the conception of redemption, insisted that God alone can redeem, and that, therefore, Christ must be conceived as God. To him the imperative idea was the unity of Father and Son. For him the terms *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία* and *φύσις* are interchangeable to express this numerical unity. "He had no word," says Harnack, "by which to describe Father and Son as different subjects, and indeed he never felt it necessary to seek for any such word" (*History of Dogma*, iv. p. 35). In the Cappadocians we may discern a change of emphasis. *ὑπόστασις* is now distinguished from *οὐσία* or *φύσις*, and regarded as equivalent to *πρόσωπον*. While the one substance is not merely the generic conception, it is not entirely one subject; for within the one substance there are three distinct subjects, though not individuals. The stress is shifted from the unity to the difference, and so a door is opened for a popular tritheism, which the subsequent change of meaning in the word person has still further encouraged. In Augustine the conception of the unity of the Godhead is, as in Athanasius, in the forefront. As the Trinity as a whole always acts, even the incarnation was the work of the whole Trinity. Although God was incarnated as Son, the incarnation was not the act of the Son alone, but of the whole Godhead. These illustrations will suffice to show the two theological tendencies which seem to be almost inevitable in the ecclesiastical dogma with its categories. Can we get categories which will make the unity and the difference not alternative, but reciprocal?

(8) The value of the doctrine for the Christian faith to-day

is dependent on the adequacy of the formulation for Christian thought. It is the religious interest that must control the speculative effort. As presented in the New Testament the doctrine is rooted in and grows out of Christian experience, the experience of the revelation of God's Fatherhood, and redemption from sin in Jesus Christ, and of the life in God as children of God, enjoying the divine fellowship, and endowed with divine gifts. The ecclesiastical dogma is to us to-day so defective because it does not keep close enough to this experience. We must try to discharge a twofold task, to show how necessary this doctrine is to Christian experience still, and to state the doctrine in such modern categories as will keep it near that experience. Religion cannot rest in pantheism, which removes the distinction between God and man, nor yet in deism, which disturbs the communion of God and man. Religion must have a God both above and near, or in philosophical terms transcendent and immanent. The sense of dependence and submission is as essential as the sense of communion. The moral difference between God and man gives fixity in the religious consciousness to the metaphysical difference. But the God near must be near both within and without, in the self and in the world; the immanence must be objective as well as subjective. Without the sense of God within the soul intense personal piety would be impossible. The tendency of piety has been, perhaps, too exclusively to turn itself inward, to depend on personal vision, emotion, impulse. But this excessive subjectivity makes the individual too dependent on his changeful moods, exaltation and depression alternate too frequently when God is sought within alone. Man for his complete development depends both on nature and society, and these cannot have their full religious significance for him unless he can find God in both. There is so much in the world and in mankind that challenges the

inward assurance of God, that the religious man needs to find the confirmation of this inner witness to God in the outward certainty that God is and works in nature and in society. Especially in face of sin, sorrow, suffering and death faith in God can be sustained only by convincing evidence of a redemptive divine presence, purpose and power in the world and in man. That redemption must soar as high as God's throne, and stoop as low as man's abyss of need. How can this distance be measured? How can the absolutely transcendent God, whom the heavens cannot contain, become so completely immanent in the world and man as to share utterly the earthly lot of man to save him unto heavenly life?

For objective self-expression in nature and society, and for subjective self-communication in the soul of man, there must be self-limitation in God. The transcendent can be the immanent God only by kenosis. We cannot without contradiction conceive the eternal God as changing Himself in time, for while time may be real for God in His relation to the world, the life of God in Himself cannot be subject to time; accordingly if we are to think of kenosis, as we are compelled to do, we must regard it not as temporal act, but as eternal process (the inadequacy of the word *process* must be recognised fully). If God expresses Himself, and communicates Himself in such self-limitation to man, if His revelation is not to be concealment, and His impartation denial of Himself, we cannot but think of Him as eternally being as He expresses and communicates Himself to us. This is not a speculative construction; it is surely making explicit the implicit logic of religion; God above, around, within; God in time as in eternity; God in sorrow, suffering, death, as in blessed perfection, is what the soul craves. Does not the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, and that alone, adequately meet the demand? The transcendent God

is ours in the *Father*, whose very name gives promise of the *immanence* objective in the *Son* as incarnate in Jesus Christ to save man, the consummation of a process of divine revelation which is also redemptive, and the *immanence* subjective in the Holy Spirit, the renewer and perfecter of the soul of man. But as personality is necessarily social the subjective immanence issues again in objective, in the Christian community, in which the revealing and redemptive process is continued and extended until the consummation, God all in all, the divine kenosis completed in the divine plerosis.

(9) Can we find a formula for this conception of God more adequate than that of substance and persons? (i) It seems to me that we must start with the conception of the one God as personal; the unity is best conceived in terms of personality, not as reality in man merely, but as ideal for man. God is subject thinking truth, feeling blessedness, willing holiness, self-expressive, self-communicative and self-completing in love. But to be conceived thus as personal God cannot be conceived as abstract unit, but as concrete unity, and that involves difference within unity. He must be subject and object, purpose and action, etc. This psychological analogy is familiar enough. Where the difficulty comes in is at this point. If the unity be personal, are the differences within God personal in such sense as the use of the term three persons suggests? If each "person" be personal in the same sense as the unity, then we must repeat of each the psychological analogy, and so within each difference we must postulate differences, and so *ad infinitum*. (ii) I have felt this difficulty so acutely till quite recently, that I have insisted on the unity of God as personal, and preferred, while recognising their inadequacy, the terms "mode" and "principle" to "person." In using this language, however, I have always insisted that

the mode of perfect personality cannot be described as impersonal, but must be conceived as personal. There is an intermediate conception between a person in the current sense and a power ; and even " a power " is an abstraction unless conceived as in some sense personal, for our conception of even physical force is derived from our exercise of will in action. (iii) But recent reflexion has relieved the difficulty for my mind. The modern conception of society as organic has modified, and must still more modify the conception of personality. We must think of personality in the measure of its perfection as transcending individuality in the sense of exclusiveness. Human personality is rational, moral, and religious only as it is social. Each individual grows in personality through manifold relations to other individuals, and out of the interplay of individuals in society arises a social sentiment, ideal, purpose, character, in which the individuals participate according to the degree of their development. Spencer was utterly mistaken when he denied to society a corporate consciousness because it lacked a common sensorium. The more advanced a society the more distinct is this corporate consciousness ; and the more developed personally the individuals within it are the more sensitive and responsive to it are their consciousnesses. Self-consciousness finds its fulfilment in this common consciousness. A man is more fully man as he is husband, father, citizen. The intension of personality grows with its extension ; the wider the relations, the fuller the individuality. There is even in human society an over-soul which is expressed in all souls, and in which souls find their realisation. If it be urged that this is an abstraction, surely from the standpoint of religion we may affirm that this corporate consciousness is reality in God as immanent in individual and society alike. (iv) But if human persons may transcend their exclusive individuality in such a social unity,

real in, and revealing God as love, may we not conceive God Himself as organic social personality? May not the one life of the personal God be expressed in the manifold personal life of Father, Son and Spirit and the different personal life of Father, or Son, or Spirit be realised in the common life of the personal God? As individuals in society form an organic unity, so may we conceive Father, Son, and Spirit each as personal, yet one in the personal God. (v) This ideal of society as organic would surely command a more august authority over selfish individualism, if we could vindicate the contention that it is the earthly shadow of the heavenly substance of the triune God. Should not the Christian Church realise that ideal more fully than any other human society can? If the Christian fellowship did realise the common life of each in all, and all in each, there would surely be given to it a clearer vision of, a closer communion with, and a greater resemblance to the Triune God. Is it too bold a suggestion that we have had revealed in history the difference of Father, Son, and Spirit, but the revelation of the unity of God in Father, Son, and Spirit waits the consummation when all saints are one, even as Father, Son, and Spirit are one God?

A. E. GARVIE,

DR. VOGELS ON THE OLD SYRIAC GOSPELS.

In the first number of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* for 1912, there is a review of my edition of the Old Syriac Gospels by Dr. Hugo Gressmann, which, though highly favourable and sympathetic as regards my own work, makes this observation (p. 161), "Aber eben so wichtig wie die Auslassungen sind die Auffüllungen, ja noch wichtiger, denn die Auffüllungen, die allerdings im *sin*