

to the poet, and "poured out" instead of "poured forth" for the same reason. We regret to have to point out these inaccuracies in detail, but a translation which claims public attention and challenges public criticism on the merit of literal accuracy, must be judged by the standpoint and according to the standard to which it appeals. Of Mr. Cullen Bryant's version, which makes no claim whatever to verbal accuracy, we have little to say on that score. The chief merit of the American translator lies in the simplicity of his language, the measured music of his perfect form of presentation, and the Homeric spirit which animates so much of the body of the translation. We are far from saying that in the beautiful verse of the American poet we can recognise all the characteristics of the Homeric muse, convinced as we are of the truth of Dryden's dictum that everything translated suffers except it be a Bishop; but we can truly say that there is no version of the *Odyssey* in English which possesses so many attributes of Homeric poetry as this work, although, we regret to say, it is so little known and appreciated in England.



ART. VII.—THE LIFE AND WORK OF ST. PAUL.

The Life and Work of St. Paul. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.
Cassell, Petter and Galpin.

EVERY review we have seen of this work has contained a protest against its faults of style. The complaint is thoroughly justified. In what is, and will probably continue to be, Dr. Farrar's great work, "The Life of Christ," some literary defects of the kind lay open to remark. There was too much fine writing in it; it was, if one may so term it, overwritten; the word painting was exceedingly vivid, but there was over much of it. The mind longed for some repose. The very exuberance of descriptive power wearied the sense of admiration, and the reader longed, every now and then, to be left alone to realise for himself the conditions of the scene, and fill up out of his own living experience the broad outlines of time and place and circumstance. But the fault was one of which the mass of popular readers would not be conscious. There was, moreover, nothing in the language itself to offend the most exact taste. It was ever graceful and ever natural, simple and unaffected, and betrayed no sign of effort or of a conscious straining after effect.

The same credit cannot unfortunately be given to some parts of "The Life and Work of St. Paul." Throughout, and as a rule, there is a superabundance of technical terms, familiar enough to the scholar and to the theologian, but only impressive to the general reader on the principle "*omne ignotum pro mirifico.*" There is

too much display of learning everywhere, and it is forced upon the attention, instead of being simply engrained into the structure of the thought. There is, moreover, an almost affected use of hard words and unfamiliar forms of expression, which contrasts not agreeably with the slipshod vernacular with which they are intermixed. The work abounds in such words as "forthrightness," "connotes," "athleticism," "glossolalia," "isopolity," "eponymous," "flaggelated," "antipathetic," "volitional," "subterraneous plots," etc. Nor does the fault end with this choice of forced and strained words; it extends also to the illustrations employed. It requires, for instance, no small effort to follow the meaning of such a sentence as the following: "No ages are worse, no places more corrupt, than those that draw the iridescent film of an intellectual culture over the deep stagnancy of moral degradation." Again, on the same page we find the following: "What religion there was at this period had chiefly assumed an orgiastic and oriental character, and the popular faith of many, even in Rome, was a strange mixture of Greek, Roman, Egyptian, Phrygian, Phœnician, and Jewish elements. The wild fanatical enthusiasm of the Eastern cults shook with new sensations of mad sensuality and weird superstition the feeble and faded despair of Aryan paganism." The fault is most apparent in the first volume, but it extends throughout both. In the description of Ephesus, in the second volume, the author writes, "Even the poor simulacrum of the Senate came in for a share of their fulsomeness, and received its Apotheosis from their complaisance." Such passages may appear to some people to be very fine writing; to our taste they run into verbiage; the diction is not rich but rank. It is much to be regretted that one who can write so admirably as Dr. Farrar, should not maintain a tighter discipline over his vivid imagination and exuberant command of words. Nor must we omit a few expressions of passing notice to the excessive ornamentation of the whole work. We remember hearing a man of very distinguished learning and ability, remark in regard to Canon Liddon's "Bampton Lectures," that he seemed to have made use of everything he knew. So in the present work, the whole stores of a wide and multifarious reading, and of a learning more varied than accurate, and of a scholarship more versatile than solid, have been used by the author to give variety to his matter, and to relieve, with the lighter graces of literature, the deeper discussions of theology.

But, after all, these faults lie upon the outside. They are the minor imperfections which mar what is, upon the whole, a work of much beauty and excellence. The book will not be so popular, indeed, as Dr. Farrar's "Life of Christ." There the grandeur of the Divine figure, and the narrow local circle in

which our Lord lived and preached, give a unity and concentration to the portrait of His life and labours, which the more incomplete history of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, the more varied interests with which he came into contact, and the wider sphere of his labours do not possess to the same degree. Nevertheless the present volumes, however inferior to the others, will be read with great interest, and may convey much valuable knowledge and many useful lessons. The whole biography of St. Paul is illustrated by a vast mass of information, alike historical, philosophical, and descriptive. Much of it is, indeed, to be found in other books, such as Conybeare and Howson's and Mr. Lewin's "St. Paul," but not presented in the vivid pictorial manner in which Dr. Farrar presents it. This brings us to the characteristic principle of the book. It is the identification in expression, thought, and feeling of the biographer with the subject of the biography. Everything is viewed from the standpoint of the Apostle, and described as it must have been presented to the Apostle's eyes, and to the Apostle's experience. Thus the central figure is St. Paul himself, and all the accumulated details are subordinated to it. What the Apostle must have seen, what he must have done, what he must have suffered; above all, what he must have thought and felt, hoped and feared, remembered and expected, constitutes the very substance of the whole. It is the man everywhere. Hence the beauty and charm of the book. But, at the same time, such an identification is not without its dangers. For an author to throw himself into the position and the habitudes of another man, especially if that other man lived nineteen hundred years ago, in a very different stage of the world's development, and under external conditions which have been utterly changed in the vicissitudes of centuries; above all, if that other man was one of such extraordinary mark, such force of genius, such depths of inward experience, and of such a special mission as St. Paul—needs an immense effort both of the thought, as well as of the imagination. The American, Theodore Parker, in one of his eloquent passages, makes the striking remark, that none but a Christ could have conceived a Christ. The remark is equally applicable to a lower subject. None but a St. Paul could have understood a St. Paul. The eloquent author of these volumes has endeavoured to do it, and to identify himself with the Apostle. So far as he has succeeded, his work is admirable. But it is only slight dispraise to say, that he has not altogether succeeded. The effort is evidently full of risks, and it must have been impossible altogether to avoid them. There is the danger lest the picture presented should not be St. Paul himself, but Dr. Farrar in St. Paul's place, and in St. Paul's name, and thinking, speaking, and feeling as Dr. Farrar in such

a position would have thought, spoke, and felt. The danger has not been escaped. There is one somewhat curious illustration of this. The author makes the discriminating remark that St. Paul appears to have had no love of scenery, no eye with which to observe the beauties of the material world. He notes the fact that in the whole of the Pauline epistles, not "by one verse, scarcely even by a single expression, does he indicate the faintest gleam of delight and wonder in the glories of Nature." He places this peculiarity in contrast with the feelings of other men :

Mungo Park, in a touching passage, has described how his soul, fainting within him to the very point of death, was revived by seeing, amid the scanty herbage of the desert, a single tuft of emerald moss, with its delicate filaments and amber spores; and the journals of those, whose feet in recent days have been beautiful upon the mountains, over which they carried the message of peace, abound in passages delightfully descriptive of the scenes through which they passed, and which they regarded as aisle after aisle in the magnificent temple of the one true God (p. 367, v. i).

But such feelings appear to have been unknown to the Apostle of the Gentiles. Canon Farrar conjectures with much probability that this insensibility to æsthetic impressions extended from natural objects to works of art, such as the temples and statues that adorned Athens, and with which the eye was greeted in every direction, from the Forum to the Acropolis. The reason of this is to be found in the absorption of a soul filled with the world unseen, and so agitated with deep concern for souls as to leave no room for any lower impressions. Yet along the whole course of St. Paul's journeys Dr. Farrar depicts every object that must have met the eye with that pictorial fullness and vividness which a creative imagination and a pliant pen enables him to give to every scene. But, if the Apostle himself was comparatively insensible to such impressions, the eye that has thus recalled them is evidently not the eye of St. Paul, but the eye of Dr. Farrar.

We do not in the least degree impute this as a fault. To the reader it is an infinite advantage; for it enables him to see, not only the Apostle, but also his surroundings; and if the mind is led to view the Apostle himself, passing on in his deep pre-occupation in Divine things, with little notice of the material forms that met his outward eye, this very indifference does but add another feature to the portrait of the man, another element to his character.

But there is another danger inherent in the conception Dr. Farrar has formed of his task. It is that of an unconscious exaggeration. It is no easy task to fill up all the outlines of an eventful and suffering life. In order to reproduce to the mental eye of the nineteenth century, not gifted always with the active

faculty of realisation possessed by Dr. Farrar, it is necessary that the lines of the picture should be strong and broadly drawn. If the drawing be indistinct, there can be no distinctness in the impression produced by it. There must therefore be a clear picture with strong lights and shadows in it. But do the materials exist for such a biography, we may almost say for such an autobiography of the great Apostle? The Acts of the Apostles certainly does not furnish them, and in our opinion the character of that book is mistaken, if it supposed to be in any sense a complete history, or any thing more than a collection of illustrative instances, chiefly drawn from the life of one Apostle, explanatory of the mode in which the primitive churches were established, and of the conflicts through which they passed. If these scanty outlines are to be filled up into an orderly and consecutive history, it can only be done from materials furnished by the Apostle himself, in the epistles which have issued from his pen. But these materials are rather hints than statements, and the hints depend in many cases of single words. There is consequently the greatest possible temptation to an author to press these words into the service of his own theory, to place a meaning of his own upon them, and then to lay on this supposed meaning a weight it will not bear. Into this mistake we think that Dr. Farrar has not unfrequently fallen. For instance, he endeavours to show that St. Paul's views as to the absolute freedom of the Gospel, and the spiritual equality of Jews and Gentiles in the sight of God, grew upon him by degrees; that on his first visit to Jerusalem, he was not himself clear upon the subject, and that he was anxious to submit it to the Church, not as a certain truth of revelation to which he desired to conciliate their acceptance, but as a probable truth on which he wished to get their opinion. In support of this idea he lays stress on the wording of Gal. ii. 2, translated in our version, "Then I went up by revelation, and *communicated* unto them that Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles." For "*communicated*" Dr. Farrar substitutes "*referred*," as if it were a reference to their authority for a decision. He appeals in support, to Acts xxv. 14, where our version has "*declared*." This is really the meaning of the word, and any other notion is fixed on the word by the theory, not gathered out of the word. The word is "*ἀνεθέμην*" and Cremer in his "Biblico-Theological Lexicon," states its meaning to be, to "lay a thing before a person—*i.e.*, to communicate it, to leave it for consideration." We do not mean for a moment to deny Dr. Farrar's assertion, that St. Paul's knowledge grew, as all human knowledge grows. The length, and breadth, and depth, and height, of the truth may have grown on the Apostle in the course of thought and by the light of experience; but the truth itself is the mere corollary of justification of faith, and

was an essential part of the Gospel which St. Paul preached from the time of his conversion, and which he emphatically asserts himself to have received "by the revelation of Jesus Christ." To reduce it into a principle, worked out by the Apostle's reason, even though it was an enlightened reason, and which he only gradually adopted as the great master principle of his apostolic career, is to reduce the divine authority of the truth itself, and to substitute a human element for a divine. The same uncertainty attaches to much of the reasoning conjecturally assigned to St. Paul. A not inconsiderable portion of the book, so far as bulk is concerned, is occupied by matter purely hypothetical. What might have been done, and was not done; what might have been said, and was not said, what might have been recorded, and has not been recorded, are topics treated over and over again, with unlimited diffuseness and rhetorical amplification. There are passages of very considerable length, which end in phrases like this: "To all these questions we can return no certain answer." "Over all these scenes the veil of oblivion has fallen." A notable instance is afforded in chapter eighteen, headed, "Judaism and Heathenism." The chapter contains fourteen pages, and no less than eleven of them are occupied with a purely conjectural train of reasoning, which might have been condensed with ease into two pages, instead of being multiplied into eleven.

We have spoken of the danger of exaggeration, inherent in the attempt to reproduce out of very imperfect materials a complete history of the life and work of the greatest of the Apostles. The accuracy of a portrait largely depends on the skill with which the artist seizes on some characteristic features. A definite conception must have existed in Dr. Farrar's mind, and be reproduced with more or less of exaggeration in his pages, since to make the picture effective to others it is necessary to heighten the lights and deepen the shadows, beyond the simple truth. To this conception we now turn. With what degree of success has Dr. Farrar realised to himself, and presented to others, the grandest human figure of all the saintly heroes of the Bible. To some degree he has succeeded; and if in some respects we still think the picture unworthy, and if faults, such as we have stated, are found in the workmanship, the failure is due to the inherent difficulty of the task; we may say the inherent impossibility of its successful accomplishment; for how shall the thoughts and emotions of an inspired man be fully comprehended by a man who is not inspired. Certainly, there has been no lack of both reverence and admiration in the biographer, who profoundly appreciates the intellectual and spiritual greatness of St. Paul. He lavishes the stores of his burning eloquence in exalting the unparalleled nobility of the

figure he portrays. No loftier conception of mere man can be expressed in words. There has been no lack of diligence in studying every word of the Pauline epistles, and collecting from every side the varied information which can illustrate the history, or throw light upon the writings. There is no lack of that retrospective force of the imagination which throws itself back into the past, and reproduces in the warm colours of life the outward form and inward self of the mighty dead. If entire success had been possible, no person could be better fitted to attain it, so far as intellectual gifts are concerned, than Dr. Farrar; though we doubt whether the same can be said for spiritual sympathies. To a certain extent he has succeeded, and we should do injustice to ourselves, no less than to the author, if we did not express our cordial admiration for many parts of the work. All that portion which deals with the conversion of St. Paul appears to us to be specially admirable. A deep insight into the working of the human heart stands side by side with a devout and adoring acceptance of the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit of God, and the freedom of His operations. No one can read the book without being charmed with its many beauties. But it is the duty of a critic to be critical; and what is needed in an organ of religious opinion is to point out mistakes, and state for the guidance of others how far an author may be safely followed, and how far he may not.

We recur therefore to the conception of the Apostle formed by Dr. Farrar, and represented in these pages. We take St. Paul in the first place as a man, and here his bodily appearance and constitution, powerfully affecting as they necessarily did the character and work, first claim attention. All tradition represents him as a small man in comparison with the full proportions and powerful frame of the Apostle of the circumcision; as a man, likewise of feeble bodily strength, and as one who suffered much from ill health. His own language to the Corinthians establishes the accuracy of the tradition. "His bodily presence weak and his speech contemptible." Conybeare and Howson describe him thus:—

His stature was diminutive, and his body disfigured by some lameness or distortion, which may have provoked the contemptuous expressions of his enemies. His beard was long and thin. His head was bald. The characteristics of his face were a transparent complexion, which visibly betrayed the quick changes of his feelings, a bright grey eye under thick, overhanging united eyebrows, a cheerful and winning expression of countenance which invited the approach and inspired the confidence of strangers. It would be natural to infer from his continued journeys and manual labour, that he was possessed of great strength of constitution.

The first part even of this description appears to be somewhat extreme; for there is nothing in the Apostle's own

language to imply that his bodily appearance was in any way repulsive; he speaks of weakness, not deformity, ἀσθενής ἀσθένεια. The word *πειρασμόν* (Gal. iv. 14) evidently refers to the moral side of his infirmity and implies nothing as to its nature. But substantially the description we have quoted is probably true. But in the hands of Dr. Farrar the whole is exaggerated, and every shadow indefinitely deepened. He has apparently written under the idea that a depreciation of the Apostle's personal gifts would involve a corresponding exaltation of his genius and heroic force. But this is by no means the case. At all events, Dr. Farrar appears to us to go far beyond the truth when he makes the person of the Apostle painfully repulsive. He does not shrink from making use of, and applying to him the sceptical phrase, "the ugly little Jew." The thorn in the flesh, "the stake," as he somewhat pedantically insists on calling it, he believes to have been acute ophthalmia, taking its origin in the first place in the blinding vision on the road to Damascus. The paroxysms of pain arising from this disease were accompanied according to our author by "cerebral disturbance," a phrase which suggests an occasional touch of insanity—a most dangerous admission, as it is a most gratuitous assumption. He further imputes to him "fits of delirium." In another place further on, he states that he was subject to fainting fits, which would imply an affection of the heart, but he suggests no authority whatever for the idea, beyond the highly nervous constitution of the Apostle's frame. Further on yet, he adds the further particular that he was liable to epileptic fits. In an excursus on the thorn in the flesh, he states that epilepsy is a probable conjecture. But surely there is no ground whatever for adding all these things together, accumulating epilepsy on a disease of the heart and a disease of the heart on ophthalmia. He may have suffered from one of these causes, but scarcely from them all. In short, Canon Farrar imputes to the Apostle a whole complication of disorders, which we agree with Conybeare and Howson in thinking, would have made his laborious journeys and indefatigable exertions an absolute physical impossibility. He is further described as sensitive, even to fretfulness, plunged into the most hopeless despondency, a sad, careworn, depressed man, bowed down with sorrow, and eating away his very heart with ceaseless anxiety. There is of course, a measure of truth in all this—men of great energy suffer no doubt from fits of depression, as did the lion-hearted Luther; but they are only the passing clouds of a clear firmament, the passing weaknesses inseparable from the greatness even of the greatest of men. The brave heart, and the noble constancy, and the animating, exalting and refreshing influence of a grand call, and a grand work, which underlay the Apostle's infirmities, have, we think, been too much

forgotten by his biographer, nor has sufficient allowance been made for their effect on the happiness of St. Paul's life. In short, Dr. Farrar seems to have taken one-half of the double-sided description which St. Paul left on record of himself. He depicts the Apostle as troubled, perplexed, persecuted, cast down; but there he stops, or at all events depicts with far too feeble a touch, the other side. The Apostle himself does not stop there, but makes the triumph yet more conspicuous than the suffering—"troubled on every side, but not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down but not destroyed." In spite of all the author's eloquent eulogiums and genuine admiration, this conquering aspect of the Apostle's life is most inadequately represented.

But from St. Paul as a man, we pass on to St. Paul as an Apostle, and here, again, we think, that the author errs by defect in that he sees only one side of his subject. He traces with great fulness and discrimination all the causes which must have determined the course of St. Paul's life, and the influences which must have shaped his views and moulded his character. But the human side is prominent, and the divine side of the apostolic call is thrown into the background. Too much stress is laid all through on the personal qualities and consequent "personal ascendancy" of the man, and too little on the equipment of the Apostle by the overruling will of God, and the inspiring influence of the Holy Ghost. The Apostle himself does not overlook this side of his own history. There is a pregnant passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, to which, so far as we recollect, there is not a syllable of reference in the whole of these two bulky volumes. We allude to the words "when it pleased God who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace to reveal his Son in me." Did not God, whose electing purpose rested on the Apostle from the first moment of his being, determine all the conditions of his life and order the bounds of his habitation? Was not every detail of place and time and circumstance, which moulded the future Apostle, as much predetermined and prearranged by God, as the potter determines by the choice of his mould the form of the plastic clay which he is about to frame into a thing of beauty? Is it conceivable that God should have elected the Apostle from his mother's womb to that great mission which has given shape to all the religious thought of the world, and yet should have left him alone to himself till the moment of his conversion? God's dealings are not thus divided by gaps, and separated into isolated bits; but they are a connected chain, out of which no single link is left without the superintending control of His will. The entire education of the future Apostle, including in the word education every influence, from the smallest to the greatest, which went to

make him what he was, was divinely ordered and entered into God's intelligent scheme for the man who was "a chosen vessel" unto him. The instruments which trained the Apostle were indeed human; but the wisdom which ever ordered them was the will of the only wise God, and that will takes up into itself, as it were, all the human elements, and places on them the seal of his own authority. Now the human instruments which made up the education of St. Paul, Dr. Farrar sees with great clearness, and has described with great force; but the Divine purpose which providentially shaped the whole course of his life and the formation of his character, and which at the set time revealed to him the Gospel he was to preach, and by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost enabled him to make known the "whole counsel of God," Dr. Farrar does not equally recognise. Hence the most unsatisfactory chapter in which he deals with the Apostle's mode of quoting the ancient Scriptures. The author sees in it simply the result of St. Paul's Rabbinic training—a human habit taught in a human school and received from an earthly master; and on this ground he labours to show that the quotations of St. Paul are used as mere illustrations of the truth which was present to his own consciousness, and not as arguments or authoritative proofs. Well, let us suppose that all which Dr. Farrar says on this subject is true. Let it be granted that St. Paul's mode of quotation is, in principle, the same as that of the Rabbis at whose feet he sat in his early years. What then? If, after his conversion and instruction by the Holy Spirit of God he still uses the same method, why should the mode in which he was first taught it detract from its authority? If the Apostle, by inspiration of God, thus uses Scripture, his quotations carry with them the sanction of God Himself as much as if they had been spoken in the audible voice of the Deity out of the clouds of heaven, instead of being imbibed from human teachers in the course of his early education.

This opens the large subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures, on which the limits of space compel us to say very little. The references to it found in these volumes are most unsatisfactory. The author sees the human side, which we recognise as fully as he can do, but he fails to see the Divine side; nor on his principles is there any possible mode of ascertaining what is true in the Word of God, and what is not true, unless it be decided by a verifying faculty in the individual, and as this faculty must differ in different men, what is one man's truth will be another man's falsehood. Nor has any mode been ever suggested in which certain truth can be conveyed in uncertain words, or by which it can be separated from the words that convey it. As to Dr. Farrar, the very mention of a plenary verbal inspiration acts upon him as a red flag on a mad bull.

He can never refer to it, and he does so not unfrequently, without the use of some contemptuous phrase. It would become him to be a little less self-confident, and less fond of charging those who differ from him on this subject with ignorance and folly. In some degree, at all events, the ignorance is with himself; for it is evident as the daylight from his own language, that, like others of his school, he does not understand the doctrine of a plenary and verbal inspiration, or the meaning of those who hold it. For ourselves, we are content to be followers of St. Paul. That the great Apostle believed in a plenary verbal inspiration, and held, in short, that very doctrine on the authority of the Scriptures which Dr. Farrar himself takes every opportunity of holding up to ridicule, Dr. Farrar does not attempt to deny. He says, "The controversial use which he (St. Paul) makes of it (the Bible) is very remarkable. It often seems at first sight to be wholly independent of the context. It often seems to read between the lines. It often seems to consider the mere words of a writer, as of conclusive authority, entirely apart from their original application. It seems to regard the word and letter of Scripture as full of divine mysterious oracles, which might not only be cited in matters of doctrine, but even to illustrate the simplest matters of contemporary fact. It attaches consequences of the deepest importance to what an ordinary reader might regard as a mere grammatical expression" (I. 478). In the face of this admission, how can he go on to say, "This extreme and mechanical literalism; this claim to absolute infallibility, even in accidental details and passing allusions; this superstitious adoration of the letters and vocables of Scripture," as though they were the articulate vocables and immediate autograph of God, finds no encouragement in any part of Scripture. Here appears the ignorance to which we have just alluded. The advocates of plenary verbal inspiration do *not* hold a "mechanical literalism;" nor do they maintain that the Scriptures are the immediate autograph of God, in such a sense as to exclude the freest possible action of the human element. But leaving these words out of the question, what is to be said of the assertion that plenary inspiration "finds no encouragement in any part of Scripture," when he had admitted only a few lines before, that it had the high authority of the Great Apostle of the Gentiles?

With these unsatisfactory passages in mind, we approached with considerable anxiety that portion of the work, which treats of the doctrine embodied in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. We were thankful to find the treatment much more satisfactory than we had feared; that it is entirely satisfactory we do not say. But in the broad meaning of the word, Dr. Farrar maintains justification by faith with great fulness and decision. He adopts in a note Hooker's definition—"The

righteousness wherewith we shall be clothed in the world to come is both perfect and inherent ; that whereby we are justified is perfect, not inherent ; that whereby we are sanctified, inherent, not perfect." He sums up his estimate of St. Paul's doctrine in the following formal proposition : " In the Gospel is being made known to the world that inherent righteousness of God, which by a judgment of acquittal pronounced once for all in the expiating death of Christ, He imputes to guilty man, and which beginning for each individual with his trustful acceptance of this reconciliation of himself to God in Christ, and in that mystical union with Christ, whereby Christ becomes to each man a new nature, a quickening spirit." There are not absent important ambiguities in this statement ; but he adds, in regard to faith and its place in the scheme of Salvation, the following satisfactory explanation : " When St. Paul says that this righteousness of God springs *from faith*, he does not mean that faith is in any way the meritorious *cause* of it, for he shows that man is justified of free grace, and that this justification has its *ground* in the spontaneous favour of God, and its *cause* in the redemptive work of Christ ; but what he means is that faith is the receptive instrument of it—the personal appropriation of the reconciling love of God, which has once for all been carried into effect for the race, of the death of Christ." With this declaration of a true faith we are content to stop. There are some expressions used which might awaken a suspicion that the words " justification by faith " are not used by Dr. Farrar in precisely the same sense as we should use them ourselves ; as, for instance, where he repudiates the doctrine of Anselm, that the atonement was an act of satisfaction to the Divine justice. But into these possible suspicions we do not care to enter. The subject would admit of endless discussion, and the author has not stated his own views with sufficient fulness and precision to enable us to discuss them in detail.

We turn to the more pleasant duty of paying a tribute of honour to Dr. Farrar, for the undeviating firmness with which he maintains throughout these volumes the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, against the speculative and destructive criticisms of the Tübingen School. Here there is no wavering ; no indecision ; no ambiguity. He stands firm from first to last. Thus he vindicates the authority of the Acts of the Apostles against Baur, Zeller, and Hausrath :—" Honesty of course demands that we should admit the existence of an error where such an error can be shown to exist ; but the same honesty demands the rejection of all charges against the accuracy of the said historian, which must be nothing better than hostile prepossession. It seems to me that writers like Baur and Zeller—in spite of their great learning and great literary acumen—often

prove, by captious objections and by indifference and counter considerations, the fundamental weakness of their own system." Speaking of the Epistle of St. James, he writes: "The notion that it was written to counteract either the teaching of St. Paul, or the dangerous consequences that might sometimes be deduced from that teaching, is indeed extremely questionable; and all that we can say of that supposition is, that it is not quite so monstrous a chimera as that which has been invented by the German theologians, who see St. Paul and his followers indignantly, though covertly, denounced in the Balaam and Jezebel of the Churches of Pergamos and Thyatira, and the Nicolaitans of the Church of Ephesus, and the "synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie," of the Church of Philadelphia. He vindicates St. Paul's references to the age of Timothy, against Hausrath (p. 460), and his description of Athens as full of idols, against the sneers of Renan (p. 528). He firmly rebukes those who have ventured to call the Apostle's arguments into question, in words which we venture to commend to his own attention, in regard to the subject of inspiration. "As regards St. Paul's style of argument, those who deem it a falsification of Scripture, a treacherous dealing with the Word of God, which St. Paul expressly repudiates, should consider whether they too may not be intellectually darkened by suspicious narrowness and ignorant prepossessions" (II. 228). On the Epistle to the Philippians we find the following remarks:—

The Tübingen School in its earliest stages attacked it with the monotonous arguments of their credulous scepticism. With those critics if an epistle touches on points which make it accord with the narrative of the Acts, it was forged to suit them; if it seems to disagree with them, the discrepancy shows that it is spurious. If the diction is Pauline, it stands forth as a proved imitation; if it is un-Pauline, it could not have proceeded from the Apostle. The notion that it was forged to introduce the name of Clement, because he was confused with Flavius Clemens, and because Clement was a fellow-worker of St. Peter, and it would look well to place him in connection with St. Paul, and the notion that in Philippians ii. 6-8, the words *form* and *shape* express Gnostic conceptions, and that the words refer to the Valentinian Æon Sophia, who aimed at an equality with God, are partly founded on total misinterpretations of the text, and are partly the perversity of a criticism, which has strained its eyesight to such an extent that it has become purblind" (II. 421).

In the same decided tone the author deals with the theory of a reaction against St. Paul's teaching in Asia (II. 466); with De Wette and his followers, in regard to the Epistle to the Colossians (II. 484); with what he calls the "astonishing objections" urged against the Epistle to Titus (II. 531); and he maintains against a whole army of critics the Pauline authorship of the Epistles to Timothy. On all these points, and others of the same character,

the treatment is most satisfactory, and leaves nothing whatever to be desired.

But we must close, yet not for the want of matter. This review might be indefinitely extended, if we attempted to discuss even a tithe of the questions relative to the Apostle and to his work opened in these pages. We have freely criticised some of the blots, as we conceive them to be, which mar their excellence. There are especially many points of interpretation in which we totally disagree with the author, and his paraphrases of St. Paul's Epistles we think to be the feeblest portions of the whole work, unsatisfactory in conception and poor in execution, neither anglicised Greek nor idiomatic English. Still, we wish to acknowledge again the many excellences of the book, and the loving labour and diligence which the author has evidently expended upon the varied materials brought together to elucidate the person, character, history, and work of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.



ART. VIII.—THE MAGNIFICAT ; OR, SONG OF THE
BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

THE Magnificat is the first voice of joy before the sun-rise.

Sweet is the breath of Morn ; her rising sweet,
With charm of earliest birds.

And as it is in Nature so it was with the breaking of the day of grace. It dawned on the world which was not awake to see it ; yet were there songs and canticles, thanksgiving and the voice of melody. The Virgin Mother, Zacharias, Simeon and the choir of angels sang at the dawning of the day, and their utterances having been preserved for us by the reporter chosen of God, form a little psalter of the Holy Incarnation and Nativity.

In this collection the Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary stands first, so that she who brings the Lord into the world, also leads the praises of His Church, and gives the key-note to the universal choir.

The song, like many other words in Scripture, may either be read as the speaker's utterance of personal feeling, or recited as the Church's expression of permanent truth. Regarding them in the one way, we consider how the speaker meant them ; but in the other, what the Spirit made them. We find in them, as used at the time, more lively emotion ; as used afterwards, more ample meaning. For a due appreciation they must be considered from both points of view. On the present occasion we shall consider them in the first point of view.