

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 1—January, 1906.

I.

TERTULLIAN AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

SECOND ARTICLE.

IN the last number of this REVIEW* it was pointed out that any approach which Tertullian may have made toward formulating a doctrine of a really immanent Trinity will be revealed by attending to the responses he makes to five questions. These questions are: (1) Whether he intends a real distinction of persons, in the philosophical sense of the term, by the distinction he makes between the divine "persons"; (2) Whether he supposes this distinction of persons to belong to the essential mode of the divine existence, or to have been constituted by those prolations of the Logos and Spirit which, according to his teaching, took place in order to the creation and government of the world; (3) Whether he preserves successfully the unity of God in the distinction of persons which he teaches; (4) Whether he conceives deity in Christ to be all that it is in the Father; and (5) Whether he accords to the Holy Spirit also both absolute deity and eternal distinctness of personality. We shall endeavor now to obtain Tertullian's responses to these questions.

(1) The interest with which we seek Tertullian's answer to the

* THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, October, 1905, pp. 529-557.

expressions of truth with sentences and clauses that may mean many things or nothing, and we are left still wondering whether the fault is with Swedenborg or the reader.

Princeton.

PAUL MARTIN.

VI.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

THE NAPOLEON MYTH. By HENRY RIDGELY EVANS. Containing a Reprint of *The Grand Erratum*, by JEAN BAPTISTE PÉRÈS, and an Introduction by Dr. PAUL CARUS. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1905. Svo; pp. 65.

The purpose of this booklet is clearly set forth in the Introduction by Dr. Carus. The reader is to learn "how rapidly folklore tales attach themselves to a dramatic figure of history; and Napoleon's case is perhaps the better for a student, because his personality is still within clear remembrance of the last but one generation and the legends have developed under the very eyes of a civilized world, whose historians were in the habit of recording facts with accuracy and whose writings are still within reach." But this statement does not tell the whole truth. There is an ulterior motive revealed in the following characteristic utterances (p. 5): "The Christian Gospels are not simply narratives of the life of Jesus, but they are the story of Jesus as the Christ, embodying ancient traditions not only of the Jewish notion of a Messiah but many other kindred hopes . . . The Jewish Messiah conception had been modified and deepened by the Persian doctrine of Mithra, the virgin-born viceroys of God's kingdom on earth; the Babylonian Marduk, the Conqueror of Death and mediator between God the Father and men, and also the world-resigning Buddha of India. The picture of Jesus in the New Testament is not strictly historical, but it contains historical facts. It is the story of Jesus, the Nazarene, as interpreted by those who believed that he was the Christ."

Pages 11 to 21 are devoted to a republication of Jean Baptiste Pérès' *Grand Erratum: the Non-existence of Napoleon Proved*. This celebrated pamphlet, written in 1827 and translated into most of the languages of Europe, but of late quite rare, was an attempt, in the interest of conservative theology, to reduce to an absurdity the purely negative tendencies of the rationalistic criticism of the Scriptures then in vogue. In order to travesty the arguments of these critics, Pérès reviews the leading facts of Napoleon's life, and shows that after all "the supposed hero of our century is nothing more than an allegorical personage, deriving his attributes from the sun." No attempt on our part to characterize the author's "demonstration" of his propositions could do justice to his exceedingly clever satire. The debate, to be appreciated, must be followed in its details. Every reader at all conversant with the extravagant claims of the higher critics will realize the appropriateness of republishing this celebrated burlesque at this time, and will feel duly grateful to Mr. Evans for having prefixed it, in this little book, to his own "occult" study of the "mythical Napoleon."

Indeed, if we may be forgiven for indulging in so odious a comparison, we have found Pérès far more interesting than Evans. The author has, it must be admitted, made a careful study of the mythopoetic elements in Napoleon's life. But his account lacks definiteness of purpose, so that the reader is more mystified than instructed or pleased. We are tempted to be ungracious enough to say that the many illustrations of the book—reproductions of celebrated paintings of Napoleon—charmed us more than the author's story of the "mythical Napoleon."

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.