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A LIBERAL COUNTRY PARSON.

IN MEMORIAM P. C. S. DESPREZ.

The Country Parson has often been the theme of outside criticism of various kinds. He has been depicted in idyllic colours as the embodiment of religion and charity, culture and refinement, and he has been assailed as a tyrannical "Black Dragoon," the impersonation of greed, worldliness, intolerance, and religious coercion. It may be safely affirmed that neither of these ideal portraits represents the average country parson as he exists in the 19,000 and odd parishes of England. As a rule, he is not the ecclesiastical bigot and selfish tyrant pourtrayed by demagogues; nor, again, is he the model of culture and progressive enlightenment which enthusiastic friends would have us suppose. As to the latter point, if truth be told, his mental characteristics are not "sweetness and light," so much as staleness and a sombre, ecclesiastical twilight. His general environment being stagnation and immobility, those qualities imperceptibly colour his intellectual processes and conclusions. He is just as distrustful of novelty in science or theology as his neighbour, the squire, is of political innovation, or as his agricultural parishioners are of new-fangled methods of farming. His ideas recur with the monotony of the seasons and the occupations of country life. Removed from great centres of population and intellectual activity, he stands aloof and apathetically watches
the currents of speculation as they sweep past. New discoveries are made, new theories mooted, new truths established, oftentimes bearing the closest relation to traditional Christianity; but they pass on and leave no trace on the placid surface of his mind. Probably he regards intellectual fermentation as a temporary disturbance of the normal course of things as it is stereotyped in his own ideas and in the traditions of his order. He watches the unquiet thought-streams as they rush past with the same hope as Horace's countryman, and doubtless with the same result:—

"Rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis; at ille
Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis œvum."

Into such a current of new truth, even when it has manifested clear proof of perpetuity—a "volubility" destined to endure—he is not inclined to precipitate himself. In short, he is no more stirred by the movements around him than his weather-beaten church-tower is moved by a passing gale of wind.

No doubt there are manifold causes, the operation of which serve to account for, if not altogether to justify, this intellectual apathy and stolidity. Into these it is not our present purpose to enter. We merely wish to note the fact that there are occasional exceptions to this ordinary type of country parson. For that matter, it would be nothing short of a miracle if there were not. It is quite inconceivable that the greatest possible stress on uniformity of teaching, the most rigid dogmatic requirements, the most stringent discipline, should succeed in repressing all spontaneity and individuality in a body so numerically large as the English clergy. Accordingly, we have a few rare specimens—veritable black swans—among country parsons, of men who are well abreast of the foremost culture of the age, whose intellectual susceptibilities are keenly alive to every undoubted advance in science, philo-
sophy, or Biblical criticism; who cordially welcome new truth, not as antagonistic, but as supplementary to the old; who vary their pastoral work with studies of such writers as Renan, Baur, Ewald, Kuenen;—men who, with the genuine scholar's instincts, prefer the Hebrew or Greek texts of their Bibles to the best commentators; and who, among interpreters, have recourse to those whose opinions are likely to be free, rather than to exegetes who are committed to foregone conclusions, and whose views may therefore be predicted with an exactitude which renders actual consultation superfluous. No doubt a cleric of this type labours under some difficulty in adapting the results of his learned leisure to the edification of his rustic flock. In this respect his condition is vastly inferior to that of his town brother, who can generally command at least a small percentage of intellectual and appreciative hearers. But, happily, the press is free, and the country parson who has anything worth saying on the subjects of theology and literature will have no difficulty in securing an audience.

One of these exceptional country parsons was the late Vicar of Alvedistone, to whose life as a thinker of quite modern sympathies a few pages of The Modern Review may not unfittingly be dedicated.

Mr. Desprez, as his name indicates, was of French extraction. His father, René Charles François Soulbieu, was a French Refugee of good family, who played a not undistinguished part in the bootless struggle of La Vendée. He fled to England about the year 1800, and ultimately settled at Clifton, where he opened a school for noblemen's sons, and where Philip, the subject of our memoir, was born in the year 1812. After a home education instinct with more than the usual elements of liberal and refined culture, Philip was sent to school to Dr. Goodenough, in College Green, Bristol, where he remained seven or eight years. At the end of that time
as he was not very strong, his parents were advised to send him on a sea voyage. Accordingly, he sailed for Jamaica, with some idea of settling in that island as a coffee-planter. A nine months' residence sufficed to make such a career absolutely distasteful to him, and he returned home recruited in health, and with the firm resolve to devote his life to study and the earnest pursuit of truth. His own wish now was to go to Cambridge, but, unhappily, he was diverted from this purpose by his father, who had obtained promise of preferment for him conditionally on his acquiring the Welsh language. Accordingly, he was sent to St. David's College, Lampeter, and after passing through the curriculum of that institution with a facility that afforded him much food for amusement in after life, he was ordained Deacon in 1835, and licensed to the curacy of Llangorse, in the diocese of St. David's, where he remained nearly two years. In 1837, he was appointed to another Welsh curacy in the same diocese. In these two parishes he was accustomed to preach in Welsh every Sunday; but it cannot be said that his affection for Wales or its language had been increased by his somewhat forced acquaintance with them. In after years he was wont to mourn this Welsh episode in his career as a waste of valuable time so far as general culture was concerned. The language had no literature that rendered its acquisition worth making, and he often wished he had given to German the studious hours devoted to it. The retrospect was the more unsatisfactory because he ultimately failed to obtain the preferment which he had been promised. In 1837, he married Caroline, the only daughter of William and Mary Carden, by whom he had a numerous family, six children being now living. In 1838 Mr. Desprez left Wales, and removed to the parish of Biddestone, in North Wilts, where he remained twelve years, and left behind him a restored church and parsonage as mementoes of his parochial activity. During the whole
of this time no marked change seems to have taken place in his convictions. His intellect was of that eager, receptive kind which is willing to meet new teaching half way, but which, on account of its mobility and warmly sympathetic nature, performs its functions best when acted upon by external agency. There was little of this intellectual excitation to be obtained in a sequestered agricultural parish. Nevertheless, real mental activity must find some outlet for its discharge. Beliefs that it cannot or will not change in substance it can remould in form. Mr. Desprez was as yet a staunch Evangelical; but even now he began to assert his independence and love of freedom by the singular originality and freshness which characterised his presentation of his chosen doctrines. He was also a cordial hater of everything that bore the semblance of Romish superstition and tyranny.

Mr. Desprez's intellectual career may be said to have commenced on his removal to Wolverhampton, in 1850. Here he received, for the first time in his life, those intellectual stimuli of large congregations and crowds of sympathising friends, that were so congenial to a man of his warm, sensitive, and vivacious temperament. He held the curacy of St. George's Church, an enormous building, capable of seating 8,000 people, which, however, he soon managed to fill. He was also appointed to the Evening Lectureship of the Collegiate Church. These influential posts furnished him with a motive for severe mental labour, which he had hitherto lacked. He was naturally induced to take greater pains with the composition of his sermons and lectures. The additional study thus necessitated brought him face to face with his dogmatic standpoint, and a process of disintegration now set in, which in the course of the next few years reached a point he could never have anticipated. About this time, too, he developed that talent for pulpit oratory, which subsequently gave him a high position as a
popular preacher in London. He possessed, probably in virtue of his parentage, just those aptitudes for elocution and oratory which we are accustomed to identify with the highest order of French pulpit oratory. His sermons were marked by the clearness of thought and diction, the Gallican verb and vivacity, the alternate fire and pathos which are generally recognised characteristics of French preachers, from Bourdaloue to Lacordaire. Add to this, that his voice, though not powerful, possessed infinite varieties of subtle inflection; while an ear exquisitely sensitive to music enabled him to use his vocal organ with the greatest effect. These various gifts made him also well known in his private circle of friends as an admirable reciter of poetry, whether serious, pathetic, or humorous. Few who heard him will forget his inimitable manner of reciting portions of Scott's "Marmion," and his reading of "John Gilpin" imparted a new zest of humour to Cowper's well-known ballad.

Mr. Desprez was finally roused from his "dogmatic slumber" by a diligent study of the question with which his name will continue to be identified in the theological literature of the present day—that of the Second Advent. A series of lectures he had projected on the later chapters of the Apocalypse drew his attention to the works of Cumming and Elliot. Dissatisfied with their arbitrary interpretation of the "vials," "seals," "trumpets," and other phantasmagorical conceptions of the sacred visionary, he determined to prosecute the study of the Apocalypse from the very beginning. This he accordingly did, and the lectures he delivered as the outcome of his studies he afterwards collected and published in a volume having the title, "The Apocalypse Fulfilled in the Consummation of the Mosaic Economy and the Coming of the Son of Man." The argument of the book may be succinctly defined as making the Fall of Jerusalem the end of the Mosaic and
Christian dispensations, and finding in the same event the fulfilment of all passages foretelling the end of the world (i.e., of the age) in the New Testament. The view had already been propounded by scholars of no small eminence—Mr. Desprez acknowledged his own obligation for the first suggestion of it to Moses Stuart—but no one ever elaborated the theory so fully or carried it so unreservedly to its extreme logical implications as he himself did.

The spirit of intellectual independence with which he undertook the work is so characteristic of his general method, that we must quote a few sentences nobly expressive of it from his Preface:—

My sole aim and object has been to elicit truth, and to attain this I have done what my readers must do likewise. I have renounced all dependence upon commentaries, canons, councils, or Fathers, and have searched the Scriptures for myself. The result is the exposition now offered. If it is to be condemned for its novelty, that novelty may be considered as an indication of the genuine Protestant feeling which has prompted such an investigation. To affirm that progress may be made in mental, moral, physical, but not in spiritual science is a thought worthy of the dark ages.

This work forms a turning-point in Mr. Desprez's life. Its novelty, which he was not afraid to avow, was less in the general theory than its detailed application. Here the neology became distinct and embarrassing, for the result of his Apocalyptic studies was to change, at least in their speculative and authoritative aspects, all his conceptions of Christian doctrine. Inasmuch as the teaching of Christ and his apostles was entirely directed, according to his opinion, to the "end of the age"—i.e., "The Fall of Jerusalem,"—this event must be accepted as the consummation and conclusion of the original Christianity of the Gospels. The doctrines of the Christian faith had their destined range limited by the same events, and could only possess for after ages a partial and unauthorised significance. This was the standpoint from which Mr. Desprez's confidence in the distinctive
dogmas of Evangelicalism first became undermined. His estimate of them related not so much to their inherent truth, or their practical value, as to their validity from the point of view of Christ and his apostles. No doubt, other considerations subsequently helped to confirm his prepossession. The injustice and immorality of some of the dogmas of Evangelicalism, the needless mystery of others, were inherent attributes which must needs have affected his final depreciation of them, added to which the tide of German thought with which he came in contact about this time supplied a critical element to his dogmatic relaxation, and helped to sunder him still further from his old creed. He was in later life fond of boasting that before German theology had obtained footing in England, and long before "Essays and Reviews" had been heard of, he had himself, ex proprio motu, arrived at some of the best-ascertained results of English liberal theology. His boast was doubtless true, though his starting-point was more eschatological than rationalistic. He did not, however, recognise for the time that the issue of German speculation was just as adverse to his particular view of the exact and literal fulfilment of New Testament prophecy as it was to the more accredited dogmas of the Christian Church; nor did he foresee that the German enlightenment which he welcomed as an ally was destined eventually to undermine and destroy in his own convictions, his theory of Christianity.

As Mr. Desprez afterwards found reason to abandon the views enunciated in his "Apocalypse Fulfilled," no criticism of them need be here attempted. The defects of his hypothesis as a full and reasoned conception of Christianity are striking and palpable. It makes no distinction between the standpoint of Christ and that of his apostles on the subject of the Messianic kingdom. It ignores the important facts of Christ's repeated refusal to assume the Messianic office as it was conceived by his countrymen, and his repeated repression of Messianic
expectations on the part of his disciples. It leaves out of consideration the spiritualisation of Messianic hopes—in harmony with Christ’s general inversion of Jewish teaching—indicated by the notable words, “The kingdom of God is within you.” It offers no reason why the predictive powers of Christ, recognised so fully up to A.D. 40, should be limited by that date. It makes the subsequent history of the Christian Church a riddle baffling solution. It takes no account of the more permanent bases, ethical and spiritual, on which the religion of Christ was really founded, and which alone are adequate to account for its growth. It overlooks the fact that Second Advent expectations have in reality exercised an inappreciable influence on the growth of Christianity as a whole, their action being generally spasmodic and temporary. If any reader is inclined to ask the question—in what light did Mr. Desprez regard the doctrines of the Christian Church which he professed to teach?—the answer may be given in his own words. Speaking of the alarm which might be created by his theory that the Second Advent was already past, he says, “It remains to be tried whether the ideas of a finished salvation, a perfected Christianity, an open kingdom of heaven, a life-state in Christ, an eternal reign in an eternal kingdom already set up, might not have a more constraining influence upon mankind than the questionable theory of an uncertain coming.”

Notwithstanding its startling conclusions, Mr. Desprez’s work achieved a fair measure of literary success. The book speedily ran through two editions. Evidence from all sides convinced him that, whatever the defects of his work, it supplied a real want. It helped to dissipate the periodical terrors which Advent prognostications, such as those of Dr. Cumming, tended to create, and it offered a reasonable interpretation of some of the most difficult passages in the New

Testament. Its conclusions were also adopted by many who refused to see in them any polemical relation to the ordinary dogmatic teaching of the Church. On the other hand, the book caused some disquiet among the timid members of his own flock, and this was probably not allayed by the modified tone of Mr. Desprez's pulpit teaching and his gradual adoption of a different standpoint in dealing with Christian dogma. He therefore deemed it expedient to quit Wolverhampton. Before doing so, he published a little work on Jonah, which was a popular synopsis of Mr. Layard's Nineveh discoveries. This book seems to have had a considerable sale. He used to say that of all his writings this had paid him best.

In 1858, then, Mr. Desprez left Wolverhampton, to the great regret of many of his parishioners, who presented him with a valuable testimonial. Removing to London, he was licensed to the curacy of St. Barnabas, King's Square; but he only retained the cure for a few months. He next took the curacy of St. Paul's, Walworth, when his parish labours and eminent pulpit abilities met the appreciation they merited. His incumbent being compelled to leave the parish, the congregation presented a petition to the Bishop that he would confer the benefice on Mr. Desprez; but the petition was, more episcoporum, refused. His congregation followed him, however, to his next cure of Emmanuel Church, Camberwell, where again his labours and oratorical talents were fully recognised, and where he experienced much kindness from his people. On leaving this parish for his first preferment, he was presented with a testimonial, consisting of an address together with a purse of one hundred guineas.

In the early part of 1863, Mr. Desprez was offered, by Dr. Rowland Williams, Vicar of Broadchalke, the incumbency of Alvediston. After some deliberation, he resolved to accept it. The parish—a very small one—is situate nearly
midway between the towns of Salisbury and Shaftesbury. The village may be described as a number of tree-sheltered houses occupying the centre of a broad amphitheatre formed by a circle of rounded Wiltshire downs, with outlets to the east and west. The church and vicarage—adjoining each other, and partly hidden by trees—stand a little way up on the northern declivity, and command a picturesque view of the cottage-besprinkled groups of trees in the valley beneath. In this secluded spot Mr. Desprez settled down as a country parson for the remaining seventeen years of his life. Although there were some serious deficiencies in his new lot—the chief of them being the smallness of the living and the absence of those excitements of intellectual society and crowded congregations so welcome to a man of his ardent, sensitive nature—these were in some respects counterbalanced by the greater independence of his position and by more abundant leisure for the studies which had now become a necessity of his existence.

Mr. Desprez's first occupation on arriving at his new parish was the completion of his vicarage-house, he being the first resident incumbent of the parish. To this necessary work he was able to add, some years afterwards, a new church and new schools. But together with these works of material reconstruction and parochial organisation there was proceeding pari passu a movement of an opposite tendency in his own thought. Like every genuine truth-seeker, Mr. Desprez had no objection to retrospective analysis of long-cherished convictions. Though no one held more tenaciously to a belief than he did, especially when it was the self-evolved product of his own research and intellectual exertion, he readily admitted that every conviction of a reasoning man should be founded upon as much demonstration as the subject-matter admitted of. He was not like those spurious truth-seekers who, having once erected their thought-system, afterwards evince the most
insuperable dislike to having any portion of it criticised or tested—a position, it may be added, which of right pertains not to truth-search, but to dogmatic infallibility. Up to the year 1865, or thereabouts, Mr. Desprez was firmly convinced of the truth of the position he had adopted in "The Apocalypse Fulfilled;" but he now began to review his theory. He commenced systematically to read foreign authorities on the subject of his studies. For the first time in his life he read the works of Renan, Colani, Strauss, Hilgenfeld, Langen, and other writers of various schools of thought who had treated the Messianic question. On this occasion, therefore, he approached the subject from a different and broader point of view. The issue was no longer between himself and the disciples of Cumming and Elliot. He was no longer the outspoken advocate for the literal fulfilment of all the prophecies in the New Testament—indeed, his growth in liberal ideas made him indifferent to the establishment of a theory which would satisfy the exigencies of plenary inspiration. Accordingly, the question presented itself for his decision, Was it possible that the Apocalypse he had once declared to be "fulfilled" was never fulfilled at all? Were all the eschatological passages in the New Testament the outcome of national hopes and aspirations of the Jews, destined never to be realised? He considered the question long and carefully, and at last—though not without severe mental trial—he came to the conclusion that the theory he had held so long, and on the elaboration of which he had spent the best years of his life, was groundless, and must be abandoned. This resolution involved a fresh start in his theological inquiry, as well as a wider field for his survey; but he immediately set to work to reconsider the whole Messianic question from the beginning. He now commenced a systematic study of the Book of Daniel, which he rightly styled "The Apocalypse of the Old Testament."
The result of his investigation was his complete satisfaction that this Book, together with other cognate literature of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, forms the chief point of departure for the Messianic beliefs of the Jews. His interpretation of the Book he gave to the world in his work called "Daniel: or, The Apocalypse of the Old Testament," and his neighbour, Dr. R. Williams, wrote an "Introduction" for it. But Mr. Desprez's adoption of the Messianic theory necessitated a re-reading of the Book of Revelation—the Apocalypse of the New Testament. That mysterious Book had to be studied afresh, not as a problem with a foregone solution, but as a question which for the most part was still "open." It had to be re-considered, not by the steady light of Josephus and the actual historical events that took place at the fall of Jerusalem, but by the flickering ignis fatuus of Jewish imagination and Theocratic aspiration. Mr. Desprez's interpretation follows in the main those outlines which, originated by the Tübingen school, have been generally accepted by the leading commentators of the Continent, and which may be said to centre round the expectation of the return of Pseudo-Nero. In this part of his task Mr. Desprez derived great assistance from M. Renan's well-known work, "L'Antichrist."

A final recast of these two treatises and their combination in a single volume, was the crowning effort of Mr. Desprez's literary life. Hardly more than twelve months before his death he carried through the press his "Daniel and John," the work which must now be regarded as containing the last phase of his intellectual development. While readily acknowledging the value of this remarkable book, it is our opinion that it would have been better if Mr. Desprez could have undertaken the study of the whole question, without having committed himself to the hypothesis of "The Apocalypse Fulfilled." There are traces, for instance, in his "Daniel and John" of the polemical and aggressive
tone employed in his former book against Second Advent fanatics. The latter work also suffers from the incorporation of notions which, however suitable to the earlier, were inconsistent with his ultimate standpoint.

If, for example, he gave up the theory that the Second Advent was already passed, he might have allowed, as a mere contingency, the possibility of some similar event, the product of the natural evolution of Christianity, in the yet remote future. The finality which arbitrarily closes the region of imagination and possibility to human speculation is less tolerable in religion than in science or philosophy. Again, he still regards the Church and its teaching from his old standpoint as an afterthought, an unauthorised survival of the genuine Christianity that ceased at the fall of Jerusalem; whereas, if the Church perpetuates the moral and spiritual teaching necessary to humanity, nothing can be more assured or more enduring than its basis. Indeed, this aspect of Christianity is brought home to Mr. Desprez so vividly in "Daniel and John," that he cannot help acknowledging it; and he accordingly does so in one or two passages of great eloquence and beauty. Here is one:—

"While Jesus certainly founded his Messianic career upon the apocalyptic model presented in the Book of Daniel [a hazardous assertion, self-confuted by what follows], this was neither the essence of his doctrine, nor the secret of his power. For these we must look to his sublime conceptions of the Fatherhood of God, the superiority of his matchless sayings, the loveliness of his pure and devoted life, and the grandeur of his self-sacrificing and heroic death. Unwisely, therefore, do they imperil Christianity who would make it answerable with its life for every adventitious circumstance, whether of miraculous event or of Messianic hope with which it stands connected. Above and beyond all these, its adaptation to the religious instincts and spiritual wants of man.
afford at once a proof of its divine origin and a pledge of its continuance."

It is hard to see what basis of inherent authority, what guarantee of perpetuity could be stronger than this. Mr. Desprez might also have allowed a somewhat wider margin for theories allied with and yet different from his own. A less slavish deference to the co-equal authority of every passage in the New Testament—a relic of his plenary inspiration period—might have suggested the propriety of discriminating between the actual utterances of Christ and those attributed to him by his followers, for nothing is more conceivable than that Christ's expressed forecast of the ultimate moral supremacy of his Gospel might have been sensualised by disciples, whose sole conception of power and sovereignty was material. Here and there, too, there is an unnecessary tone of dogmatic certainty as to interpretations which have been fruitful of diversity of opinions in the past. While allowing the overwhelming probability that Daniel's "Little Horn" refers to Epiphanes, and John's "Antichrist" to a Nero redivivus, it seems unreasonable to enounce these hermeneutic likelihoods in terms of certainty, which could not be exceeded if their object were an axiom of Euclid. But it must be conceded that this overstraining of a probable theory was inevitable to a man of Mr. Desprez's ardent temperament. The very clearness and vivacity with which he seized on new truth, and which enabled him to present it in its most vivid and apprehensible form, rendered him comparatively indifferent to objections or qualifications. Like some other eminent thinkers, he seemed inclined to narrow his range of vision in order to acquire greater perspicuity and sharpness of definition. It is quite in harmony with this intellectual idiosyncrasy that he never could see the use of philosophy, and always professed his inability to understand metaphysics.

But, notwithstanding these incidental defects, Mr. Desprez’s "Daniel and John" remains a work of which English hermeneutics may well be proud. For the first time in England the eschatological passages, which take up so great a part of both the Old and New Testaments, have received a consecutive and systematic exposition. The book is marked by the fulness of research, the fearless independence of thought and method which, though common in Germany, Holland, and France, cannot be said to be as yet acclimatised among ourselves. Its style, like all Mr. Desprez's writing, is marked by clearness and flexibility, and is perpetually enlivened by passages of fervid declamation or calm, sustained eloquence. As to the novelty of its conclusions to the English reader, its author rightly regarded this, when necessary to the paramount interests of truth, as a characteristic of Protestantism.

With the publication of "Daniel and John" Mr. Desprez's literary career came to an end. He had achieved what he regarded as a satisfactory termination of his life-study. Years before, he had been anxious to unite in a single completed work all his Apocalyptic labours, and his ability to accomplish this was to him a source of heartfelt gratitude. But with the accomplishment of his work came the cessation of life. During the spring and summer of 1879, his health rapidly deteriorated. His great mental powers began to succumb to successive attacks of paralysis. At last, on Sunday morning, the 5th of October, he placidly slumbered into Eternity. He had exchanged a terrestrial "Apocalypse," dim, dubious, uncertain, "unfulfilled"—the fitful fluctuating vision of a lifetime—for a celestial and definitive "Apocalypse Fulfilled."

As men in mythic story died of light,  
So in full day, Death quenched the thought-dimm'd life  
While—emblem of his errand, mercy-rife—
The Sabbath sun-rise chased away the night.
What vision fairer to the yearning sight
Worn with Earth’s dimness—and the weary quest
For Truth supreme—the Soul’s Divine unrest—
— The finite “groaning for” the Infinite?
“More light!” the poet cried, saluting Death,
Withal bewailing Life’s Truth-hiding mask,
— The twilight-doubts that share its vital breath.
Truth-seekers, hence be not your ardour blenched;
What nobler meed of effort can you ask
Than that your light in light of Heav’n be quenched?

John Owen.
THE TIDES OF THE INNER LIFE.*

It is an old complaint that there is infinite difficulty in keeping those "heights which the soul is competent to gain;" nay, in preventing ourselves from falling from their sunlit summits into the dark guls below. Whether there may have been on earth human spirits, so supremely faithful and blessed that from the first upspringing within them of the fountain of life, its waters have flowed on in unbroken, ever-widening, ever-deepening stream, "sliding towards the ocean of God and eternity," it is not for me to say. But assuredly for the majority of religious men and women the course of the inner life is far different from this. It is, if I mistake not, even in true saints, subject to strange and scarcely accountable fluctuations, causing them to pass from conditions of rapturous faith and immediate vision into states of comparative coldness and depression, when they walk no more in the direct sunshine, but rather in the twilight of a day which has set; nay, even in the dark shades of night till their Sun arises once again. And for lesser and weaker souls, for the great mass of us all, the case is worse than this. There is an alternation of strong emotion and vivid interest in spiritual things and keen sensitiveness of conscience and power of prayer, followed by dryness and coldness of heart, and return upon earthly passions, and deadness

* This short Paper was written a few years ago, and printed by a friend in India. It is so unlikely that it can be known to more than a very few English readers, that I have willingly consented to the kind wish of the Editor of The Modern Review to republish it, with a few alterations.—F. P. C.
to the sense of sin, and inability to proffer any petitions which (even to the suppliants' consciousness) have a chance of being heard on high. For one week, one month, in specially happy cases, perchance, for one or more years, the man lives with the sense that religion is the supreme reality in a world of shadows; the next he spends as if it were a shadow in a world of realities. At one period the smallest lapse from his ideal of duty causes him sharp pangs of remorse. At another epoch he commits serious transgressions, and breaks every rule he has laid down for his conduct, doggedly and indifferently, like a blind and deaf man seeing and hearing nothing. Now he seems to breathe the airs of Paradise in a world where even sorrow and pain turn to joys in the sight of the Divine Love, and over which bends the blue sky opened wide to his prayer, even up to the heights of the Eternal Throne. And now he suffocates amid the vapours of sin and doubt, while the heavens above him are brass, and the earth beneath him, iron.

It is needless to give words to the longing of every man who has felt these dread oscillations, to put an end to them for ever, to compel the needle of his soul to point evermore truly to the pole of God's goodness, and to prevent himself from falling again into that state of moral syncope which, like an intermittent disease, seizes him at often recurring intervals. The tears shed in youth over such lapses are not all bitter, for they are poured only over the unworthy past, and there is confident hope of better things for the future. But as years go by, and the days of "withered prayer" and indifference and unfaithfulness recur again and yet again, the grief with which the man contemplates them is deepened almost to despair by his growing sense of inability to contend against their inroads, and his experience of the futility of his resolutions and of the transitory nature of even his strongest emotions. When the days have come and gone in which the soul has been admitted to such perception of
the Divine Love as that it has seemed to grasp it as the Life of Life, and the man has said to himself, "Surely, surely it is evermore impossible that I shall sin against Love like this," and after a little while the vision (though never forgotten) has failed, and he has once more sunk into coldness and carelessness and sin—when this awful chapter of mental history has been gone through, it seems as if there were no room more for expectation of permanent amendment and restoration, and nothing left to do but to let the slow tears drop on the grave of the heart's holiest hopes. If it were possible to know how to prevent these deadly seasons of coldness from returning to kill the blossoms of autumn, even the winter of life might bear its fruits. But the case seems well-nigh beyond help. All the ancient and positive religions of the world—notably the Judaic, Brahminical, Moslem, and Catholic Christian religions—have elaborately provided for these fluctuations by the machinery of frequently recurring seasons of penitence and rejoicing, confessions, fasts, and festivals. For those of us who cannot accept at second hand such a framework of times and seasons wherein to set our lives, and who feel that God alone, speaking in our hearts, and not the lips of any priest, must tell us when to rejoice and when to be sorrowful—for us, I say, all such machinery is of course inapplicable, and we are compelled to bear with our own unaided strength the strain of these oscillations. When our hearts are left bare and dry, and the rain and the dews of heaven fall not upon them, we have no artificial engines of revivals and penance, no Eucharist or Soma Sacrifice, no Passover or Ramadan, wherewith to refresh them; nay, rarely an Apollos to water what a Paul has planted. Yet more—those of us who believe in the goodness of God, as the followers of no traditional creed are wholly permitted to do, knowing Him to be altogether loveworthy, cannot but regard our own lapses into indifference and coldness with double-
edged horror and shame. It seems as if there can be nothing of good left in a heart which can be dead to such an appeal; and no hope for a soul which, having once tasted of that heavenly grace, can be false to the vows it has made to it. Where, then, is help for us to be found, since we cannot, will not, accept the sentence of eternal banishment? What shall we do to bind ourselves with chains of iron in our waking hours, so that when the deathly sleep falls on us, we shall not wander away in our heavy trance to sin and destruction? It is for souls which have solved this solemn question (if such there be amongst us) to give us their reply, for which, I, for one, should bless them from the depths of my heart. I have but intended in writing this paper to point out the nature of the great trouble (since somewhat is gained when we thoroughly recognise "that no temptation has befallen us but that which is common to men"), and to point out one or two mistakes often made about it, which, I apprehend, tend not a little to deepen the gloom it throws over many of us to our spiritual hurt.

It seems very important that we should distinguish the nature and origin of such alternations of religious feelings as those which I have described. Apparently there are, at least, three or four causes at work which produce them.

First.—There are such oscillations of the emotional parts of our nature, unquestionably due to physical causes over which we have little or no control, and regarding which it is idle to torture ourselves with regrets or repentance. An immense number of fatal mistakes have been made in this matter in bygone years by pious souls, who have rushed to a priest when they needed a physician, and counted themselves debarred from Heaven's love, when all they needed was Heaven's own sweet air and light from which they shut themselves out. In our time there seems little danger of this class of error, for the materialism of modern science
has permeated all our minds, and we are much too ready to say that the "spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak;" when the "flesh" on which we lay the blame is strong enough, were the spirit truly faithful to duty. Still, there are, doubtless, states wherein persons, in imperfect health, pass a definite portion of life in which there is actual physical inability to rise to the higher or warmer phases of emotions. The individual is in an effete, dull, enervated condition. The intellectual powers may appear to be in working order, but the sentiments are as if a sponge had been passed over them, and the man may, with perfect coldness and indifference, think of a topic which, in his normal state, moves his soul to its depths. In such a strait, it is obvious that the sufferer can, in no way, be responsible for feeling numb and dead to the claims of religion, and no better advice can be offered than that, while keeping as near to God as his sad state permits, he should distinctly absolve himself of wilful sin or negligence, and accept the sorrowful blank as a trial to be patiently endured, not a lapse to be repented. Those who have known such experiences have borne the testimony that if when it was utterly impossible to rouse the soul to love God, there was yet the will and effort to lie passive at His feet, to do and bear all His will; then, when the cloud was lifted at last, the joyful discovery was made that greater spiritual progress had taken place through the hours of darkness than in long periods of happier life. But here the caution seems very needful that we should be quite sure it is the body, and not the spirit, which is in fault, and the test of this seems plain enough. If, while we are dull and cold towards God, we retain all our human affections, warm and clear and vivid, if we are alive to every motion except those connected with religion, then we have only too good reason to doubt that it is our physical frames which cause our state, and are bound to look further, even deep, into our consciences for its explanation.
Secondly.—Overwork has very nearly the same effect on the spiritual condition as the languor of disuse. The man who, in the fulfilment of his duties, labours with brain or hands from dawn till night, and, harassed by a thousand cares, scarcely finds a solitary half-hour in the day wherein to be alone with his thoughts and with God, inevitably soon experiences a numbness of soul analogous to the weariness of the invalid. The emotions of awful reverence, of tender gratitude, and of solemn penitence cannot swell the heart in the midst of a crowd of busy thoughts, any more than a man can be affected by music heard in the rattle of a noisy street; and by degrees such sentiments, if not exercised, dwindle and disappear. The question asked by his Evangelical friend of the abolitionist, Clarkson: "Was he not afraid of neglecting his own soul amid his labours for the cause of the Negroes of Jamaica?" had thus a grain of real meaning, albeit every true Theist must applaud Clarkson's reply, "that he left God to take care of his soul while he did His work." How far the ordinary duties and pursuits of life should be permitted to encroach on the narrow margin of time, which religious men have nearly always reserved for "entering into their closets and shutting the door" on the world and its cares, is one of the most difficult of practical questions in many a life. To find that religion is receding from us while earthly interests grow keener, and heaven is farther away while "the world is more and more," is surely warning enough that something is wrong with us, and that we must revise the plan of our days.

Thirdly.—There is the great and terrible cause of religious fluctuations,—actual negligence and sin. Here there can be no exculpation; no question of whether we are to blame for the lapse from the pure air and serene stillness of the mountain tops to the clouds and storms of the valley. We may have made the descent either in one wild plunge, or in a series of imperceptible slidings through vanity and self-
indulgence into selfishness and sin. The result is the same, and nothing but retracing our steps with bleeding feet can restore us to our former place. How often this can be repeated, how many times God will have pity on us and call us back quickly, or how long we may be left to descend, and into what abysses we may fall, ere the Almighty arm lift us up all bruised and stained, who shall foretell? Here is the real terror—the one tremendous terror—of the religious life. Where is the saint amongst us who will teach us how to deal with it, how to keep on climbing higher and higher towards righteousness and truth and love, since if we but stand still upon the steep ascent we unfailingly slip down and fall?

As it is nearly always in our relations to our fellow-men that such lapses begin, as it seems as if we should always remain faithful to our vows, could our lives be spent alone with God, it would appear that it must be by the introduction of some new and higher law of charity that our safeguard must be found. As I have said elsewhere, "He who will teach us to love the unlovely will lead us into a land where our sun shall no more go down." But how this is to be done, I cannot tell. The Christian world to which its great Instructor tried to teach it eighteen centuries since, seems not to have begun to learn it yet. We shall, indeed, have God for our Father; when we have really taken to heart the Brotherhood of Man.

And, lastly, there is, I believe, a cause for the oscillations of the spiritual life different from any of those which I have named. There are surely a Divine flood-time and a Divine ebb-tide, no less than there are periods of human fluctuations. Not that God can really change or be nearer to us at one time than another. Such a thought is idle. But it may, and (as it would appear) it does please Him to act on our spirits intermittently, to let us sometimes feel His nearness, and sometimes "lift lame hands of faith and grope," and find Him not. Sometimes it is a light touch suddenly melting the heart with a glow of gratitude or penitence;
sometimes yet more and fuller revelation which is granted, and which for the time lifts up the soul into that true heaven, which has no need of the sun to lighten it. And then, again, months and years pass away, and no such sense is vouchsafed to us; no spark of love comes to kindle the fuel in our hearts, and we dwell in the shadow where once we rejoiced in the light. Like the prophet of old, we are called to live in the strength of the mysterious bread which has been given us for forty days of fasting. Why it should please our Father in Heaven to make this the law of our spiritual being (at least in the lower stages of progress), is not for us to say. Perhaps we may see that only by such means can we really undergo the education of this world, seeing that no pain could affright, no pleasure tempt, no trial touch the soul, while lasted for us the high meridian hour of communion. Even such a spirit as that of Christ came under the same law, since even he endured upon the cross the sense of absence and loss. In Gethsemane, when the resolution of self-devotion is made, there come angel-thoughts to strengthen the martyr. But on Calvary there is no voice to say, "This is my beloved Son," but "darkness over all the land," out of which comes the cry, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

If these things be so, we need neither fear nor be astonished when it befalls us to lose the higher happiness of religion, and to pass our days on the dry and dusty road of duty, instead of on the Delectable Mountains. If we are ever so happy as to stand self-acquitted of negligence or conscious lapse into sin, then the withdrawal of the vivid sense of the Divine presence need not alarm, however much it must grieve us. We may well "wait patiently for the Lord," for He will surely return and refresh us in His own good time. Nay, is He not near as ever to us even now with a double blessing in His hand for the obedience which is rendered in the hour of deadness of heart and dimness of vision?  

Frances Power Cobbe.
A RECENT DISCUSSION OF ROMANS IX. 5.

As the Editor of this Review is able to allow to his contributors a little more of the "liberty of prophesying" than is to be found in the pages of the Expositor, I avail myself of this advantage to offer the reader some account of a discussion, as to the punctuation and purport of this verse, which was recently published in the Magazine just named, between Canon Farrar and Dr. Sanday on the one side and myself on the other; as well as some further elucidation of the subject which the Editor of the Expositor did not consider admissible as a part of the second paper which he published with my signature.

In the Expositor for March last Canon Farrar has an article entitled, "Various Readings in the Epistle to the Romans," in the course of which he notices this verse, rendering it thus:—"Of whom according to the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." Of this rendering Canon Farrar remarked, "That it is correct I myself believe, because (1) it is the most natural way of taking the words; because (2) it was so understood by the Early Church; and because (3) in all liturgical ascriptions to God the Father the word 'blessed' (εὐλογητὸς) comes before, and not (as here) after, the word 'God' in the original. But since in most uncialis there is no punctuation worth speaking of, and in some cursiveis the stop is placed after 'according to the flesh,' so as to make the following words an utterance of praise (God who is over all be blessed for
ever!); and since Julian positively asserted that Paul has nowhere called Jesus God; many eminent modern commentators reject the punctuation of our Authorised Version."

This statement was evidently not sufficient to place the question of the punctuation of the verse fairly before the reader; and in the May number of the same Magazine I was permitted to offer some remarks on the subject. Of these the following is the substance:—

The words may properly be rendered thus: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom Christ came, as concerning the flesh. He who is God over all is blessed for ever." This is exactly the Greek order; the words "as concerning the flesh" standing, not before "Christ came" but after, a circumstance which is evidently in favour of the separate punctuation of the verse.* For the Authorized pointing it is urged by Canon Farrar (1) that it is the most natural way of taking the words. But how does this appear, seeing that St. Paul, although in his Epistles he has used the word God nearly six hundred times, has nowhere applied it to Christ, except in this very doubtful instance, and in one other which is equally disputable?† The word εὐλογητὸς, again, is never applied to Christ in the New Testament, but only to God. If, then, we may judge from the usage of the Apostle, the rendering of the Authorised Version is clearly not the most natural.

For the same rendering, it is further alleged (2) that the words were so understood "by the early Church." This statement requires qualification; but for the moment it may be conceded, and a few remarks on the point are reserved for a later part of this paper. Meantime, it may

* A still closer rendering of the words is this, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom is the Christ, as concerning the flesh. He who is over all God is blessed for ever;" and this rendering is preferable both for grammatical reasons and on account of the context.
† Tit. ii. 18.
be observed that even the ancient Church, as represented by the Fathers who quote or refer to the words, was by no means infallible. How little its testimony may be worth, Canon Farrar has himself informed us in the same article which has given occasion to these remarks. He tells us, in so many words, that "even the Fathers are often led by theological prejudice to insincere handling of the Word of God." It may be added that their philosophical speculations and, in particular, their theory of the Logos incarnate in Christ, exercised a great and misleading influence on their interpretation of the New Testament. These ancient writers are, in truth, often credulous and uncritical, and it easily follows that their testimony in a question of this kind is by no means conclusive, and may properly be disregarded, provided always that sufficient grounds exist (as in the present case) for disregarding it.

(3) As to the position of the word εὐλογητὸς, this is said to show that the words are not a doxology. This may, in a certain sense, be granted. The words are not an exclamation, nor are they a doxology in the optative sense, but only in what has been termed a declarative or affirmative sense. In this respect, they are closely parallel to Rom i. 25—

τὸν κτίσαντα, ὃς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, and to 2 Cor. xi. 31: ὁ Θεὸς . . . . ὁ δὲ εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. In these two instances, the words are introduced in much the same incidental and parenthetical manner as in the case before us, and εὐλογητὸς stands in a similar position.

In regard to the evidence of the manuscripts, it is clearly incorrect, or rather it is not the whole of the truth, to say that "there is no punctuation worth speaking of." Dr. Liddon had previously said, still more carelessly, that "two cursive MSS. of the twelfth century are the first that have a stop after σάρκα." The fact is, that of the four most ancient and important uncial Aleph, A, B, C, the latter three (which are referred to the fifth, the fourth, and the sixth
centuries respectively) contain the stop, leaving the following words to be read as a distinct sentence. A and C have not only a stop, but a space to make room for it. C has also a space, but the small cross which stands for a stop in that manuscript is doubtless from some hand much later than the date of the MS. There may have been a point originally;* but this manuscript, as is well known, is in places much discoloured and difficult to read, and it is so in this passage. Whatever doubt there may be as to a point having originally existed, there can be no doubt as to the space, which is the more important consideration. In the Alexandrine MS. (A) both space and stop are a prima manu. Nor are these the only MSS., uncial or cursive, in which this break, either stop or space, is found, although they are the oldest and most important. The most eminent modern authorities—such critics as Lachmann, Winer, Meyer, Tischendorf, Davidson, Jowett—have adopted this punctuation, and some of them have expressly defended it.† A recent commentator on the Epistle to the Romans, Dr. Sanday (in Bishop Ellicott's Commentary), thus sums up his observations on the question here discussed:—

"Weighing the whole of the arguments against each other, the data do not seem to be sufficient to warrant a positive and dogmatic conclusion either way. The application to our Lord appears, perhaps, a little more probable of the two. More than this cannot be said."

The foregoing remarks having in substance been sub-

---

* Since writing as above, I have been informed that the point may be perceived; but I did not myself see it when examining the MS. some time ago in the Bibliothèque Nationales.

† Very many other modern scholars of the highest authority (nearly all the most important) might be enumerated as having taken the same side. They are certainly not orthodox English clergymen like Dean Alford and Canon Farrar; but the list includes such names as Paulus, Bretschneider, Fritsche, Ewald, De Wette, and I do not know that their want of orthodoxy, from the English point of view, need be considered as a disadvantage in any of them in a question of this kind.
mitted by the Editor of the *Expositor* to Canon Farrar and Dr. Sanday, these gentlemen replied to them in the same number of that magazine. In effect, both writers hold that the fact of the presence of the stop in the uncials above mentioned does not add any appreciable weight to the case for a new punctuation of the verse. That fact, at the most, simply amounts to this—that some few unknown copyists in the centuries named deviated from the construction generally received by the Fathers, and are entitled to little or no consideration in comparison with the latter. But even granting this, still, if the punctuation of the manuscripts be referred to at all, it should at least be accurately and fully given, and not passed over in the hasty and misleading way in which Canon Farrar referred to it, as "not worth speaking of." Evidently, it is worth speaking of, and not uninteresting; although different opinions may fairly be held as to its value. This must be admitted, seeing that stops occur in the MSS. in places where we should not expect to find them, and sometimes where it is not possible to recognise any break in the construction such as is now understood when a full stop occurs. But, on the other hand, this is not always the case. Not unfrequently these stops correspond exactly to the sense, as in the case of the full stop which is found in the Vatican MS. (B) after the word ἄμεν at the close of Rom. ix. 6. One thing appears to be quite clear—the occurrence of the point in MSS. belonging to the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries respectively should render it impossible to speak of this punctuation as a "modern innovation," as I have heard it termed, or as occurring for the first time in cursive MSS. of the 12th century.

Whether, again, we should attribute a full distinctive value to the stop after σάρκα, should surely depend, not on the interpretation followed by speculative Fathers full of the Logos philosophy, but on the context of the passage itself,
and most especially on St. Paul's actual use of the word \( \theta\varepsilon\nu \). On this latter point there can be no doubt whatever, for the case of Titus ii. 13 can by no means be made to appear an exception to that usage.

The objection to the authorised punctuation founded upon the Apostle's use of \( \theta\varepsilon\nu \) is met by Canon Farrar in a way which is too curious to be passed over without notice. I give his words:—"We quite fearlessly assert that our Lord's full Divinity is found implicitly and explicitly asserted in every single Epistle of St. Paul, as well as writ large in the Epistles of the second imprisonment and the Pastoral Epistles. With 1 Thess. iii. 11; Phil. ii. 6; Coloss. i. 15, ii. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 4—6; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Ephes. v. 27, &c., before us, who can have one moment's doubt that St. Paul would hesitate to speak of Christ as God?" With these passages full in view, and very carefully considered, I have certainly the very utmost doubt. But to say this will appear to be only to set assertion against assertion, and this determines nothing. Yet at least the fact remains untouched, that St. Paul has nowhere in express terms spoken as Canon Farrar thinks he would not have hesitated to speak; and further, there is not one of the passages referred to which, when looked at a little below the surface, will justify any very certain inference that he could ever have done so. For when so looked into, one by one, they are found either to have no bearing on the question in dispute, or the only inference they warrant is one to the opposite effect.

We may take as examples three of these passages which are the most likely to be thought effective as proof texts by orthodox readers.

(1) Philip. ii. 6. Paul here recommends the Philippians to be lowly-minded, because Christ was so; "who, being in the form of God, thought not the being equal with God a thing to be seized, but emptied himself." Here,
evidently, the writer does not "speak of Christ as God," but only says that he was "in the form of God." These words are doubtless obscure; but the obscurity is not removed by adopting an explanation which surely involves what is incredible, implying as it does that the Eternal Being put off His Deity for a time and appeared on earth as a man in lowly circumstances; and that for this self-abasement He was in some mysterious way exalted and rewarded by having a name given Him which is above every name! This interpretation, at all events, does not remove the difficulty, or clear away obscurity, or leave any resulting meaning which can give satisfaction to a thoughtful mind. Most probably the Apostle does not mean "the form of God;" but "the form of a god;" and this may simply refer to the Messianic exaltation which St. Paul everywhere shows us that he conceived to attach to Jesus Christ. By virtue of this, Christ was, and to the Apostle's view might have been, "in the form of a god." He was entitled, as the Messiah, to the rights and glories of that great character; yet for a time he gave up these, did not claim them, but emptied himself, and lived on earth as a common man. For this his obedience even unto death, God exalted him (the Apostle says) and gave him a pre-eminent name. This interpretation of the passage at least makes sense of it. It corresponds also to the historical circumstances of the case, and the high terms in which Paul everywhere speaks of the risen Christ. But it does not make him "God," and it may still be held that the Apostle at least did not commit himself to any such conclusion, whatever may have been done by ill-judging Fathers and others of later times.

In opposition to this interpretation it may be said that the words ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ἐπάρχων, being in the form of God, and in particular the word ἐπάρχων, denote an original or essential existence, as distinct from outward appearance, and
what can it refer to except that hidden, mysterious nature which was for a time abandoned? Such a force of the word ὑπάρχων is extremely questionable in New Testament and Pauline usage; for the word occurs in numerous cases in which it will be found to be impossible to ascribe to it any such meaning.* But, granting its existence in this instance, the original or prior condition which it may imply is simply that belonging to the Messianic character, which for the time was laid aside.

(2) In Col. i. 15, also appealed to by Canon Farrar, Christ is spoken of as the "image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation." Whatever this may mean, it surely does not warrant the assertion that St. Paul would not "hesitate to speak of Christ as God."

(3) In 2 Cor. xiii. 14, the reference to the Apostle's language appears to be equally unfortunate. It is, indeed, more than equally inapposite. It is conclusive against the assertion here in question. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God." What can more clearly show that the writer here again, as elsewhere, conceived of Christ and of God as two separate objects of thought? That they are here joined together in one sentence can by no means justify the conclusion that Paul conceived of them either as one and the same Divine Being, or as each separately and equally God.

But Canon Farrar not only holds that St. Paul would not hesitate to speak of Christ as God, but he has also his evidence ready to show that he could have termed him even "God over all." The usual proof texts are at hand for this purpose; and they are about equally conclusive with those which have just been considered. Canon Farrar asks the question, "Is not 'over all' the conception of

* The reader will easily see this in a Greek Concordance; compare, for example, Rom. iv. 19. In such cases ὑπάρχων is simply equivalent to being, existing, and can mean nothing more.
ON ROMANS IX. 5.

Isaiah ix. 7; Daniel vii. 13, 14; Matthew xxviii. 18; Ephesians i. 20—23; 1 Peter iii. 22; Hebrews i. 8, &c.?" In reply, I would observe as follows:—Isaiah ix. 7 does not refer to Christ at all, and is never applied to him in the New Testament. In the verses referred to in Daniel and in Matthew xxviii. 18, 19, the "Son of Man" in the one case, and Jesus in the other, are represented as having all power "given;" and how does such an expression show that he to whom it was given was conceived of as "God over all?" The "all" may, indeed, be limited, as Canon Farrar suggests, by referring it to the fact that the Messianic dominion was to be over unbelieving Jews and Gentiles, as well as Christians; but still he who holds that dominion evidently, in the conception of the writer of these verses (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19), does so by the gift, the appointment, of another, and such expressions cannot, therefore, justify the application of Rom. ix. 5 to Christ. In Ephes. i. 20, Christ is said to be raised from the dead and "set" on high, and here again to receive all that is ascribed to him by the gift of One that "hath put all things under his feet." Similar remarks apply to 1 Peter iii. 22, and very specially to Hebrews i. 8, 9, in which we see that the "Son" is a God who has "fellows," and that there is even One who "appointed" him and "anointed" him; and so here again therefore the conception cannot be that of a being who was originally and in his own nature "God over all." In all these passages, I submit, the words referred to by Canon Farrar entirely fail to justify the argument which he would build upon them.

There remain still a few words to be said in regard to the interpretation put upon this verse by the Fathers. There can be no doubt that most of these writers, from Irenæus downwards, did apply the words, "God over all," to Christ. But most probably they did so in the sense in which they appear to have been accepted by Epiphanius. An expression
of this Father shows us that Christ was so described, because of his own words, when he said, "All things are committed to me by my Father." "On this account," Epiphanius adds, "He is God over all" (See Tischendorf's quotation from Epiphanius, in his long, critical Note on Rom. ix. 5). Eusebius, too, speaks of Christ as "the only beloved and only begotten Son of Him who is the only God and over all" (See the words in Tischendorf, in the same note). The Fathers, holding the Logos doctrine, could easily, and would almost of necessity, apply the words to Christ; but then the Logos was God, with the earlier of these writers, in no absolute sense, but only in an inferior and secondary sense; Christ, therefore, as the Logos incarnate, was "over all" by delegation only, as the representative of the invisible God, not as being himself the absolutely supreme and only true God. This may be illustrated from two passages cited, one from Origen and the other from Eusebius, in Norton's "Statement of Reasons," in which those Fathers term it a rash and a daring thing to say that Christ was God over all, Origen adding, "We believe him [the Saviour] when he said the Father, who sent me, is greater than I." In another place Origen speaks of Christ as the "image of the invisible God," and also of "the holy prophets and apostles" as his "fellows" (Origen de Princip. II. vi. 3, 6). From such expressions it seems clear in what sense the earlier Fathers looked upon Christ as God and as "over all." It could, by no means, be a supreme divinity which they attributed to him, but only the same kind of communicated, representative Godhead which had already long before been attributed to the Logos by Philo. In the statements of this writer it may, indeed, be a question whether even a separate personality is really attributed to the Logos. Of this, however, there can be no doubt in the case of the Fathers, because of the separate personality of him in whom, as they said, the
Logos became incarnate. And, in truth, this is the one new element which the Fathers added to the ancient conception, as it is also the special addition made to that conception in the Fourth Gospel.

This Gospel, however, as Canon Farrar is careful to inform us, is the authority which he follows in his doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and not the Fathers. The distinction does not appear to be of great importance: for what if the whole conception of the Logos, whether in the Fourth Gospel or in the Fathers, is essentially artificial, a mere mode of thought, substantially corresponding to nothing really existing, so far as we can know, in the nature of things human or divine? Believing it to be so, with all due respect to the Fathers and to any other writer of ancient times who adopted the same mode of thought, we may decline to follow them in speaking of Jesus of Nazareth as "God over all," even in the Logos sense. They are no adequate or authoritative exponents of the teaching either of Paul or of Christ. And I say this partly for the reason before stated as given by Canon Farrar himself, when he speaks of the "theological prejudice" of the Fathers, and their "insincere handling of the Word of God;" and partly for a reason already alluded to, which is even more weighty, and which is as applicable to the Fourth Gospel as to the Fathers. This is the impossibility of regarding as the central and most characteristic essence of the Christian Gospel a doctrine which in its origin and development was so entirely a product of Greek speculative philosophy, and which in all essentials was held by Philo long before a word of either Gospels or Epistles was written. The fact that the writer of the Fourth Gospel, whoever he was, adopts the same mode of conception, gives no conclusive authority to the Logos doctrine as one to be permanently received as divine truth. The source of that doctrine remains the same, not in Christian
teaching, but in Gentile philosophical speculation. It may be termed a graft upon Christianity, a corruption, we may say, of the simplicity of the Gospel, but it does not belong to its essence. And, indeed, very probably, with the fourth Evangelist it was no more than a way of saying what Paul also says, that God was with Christ and in him, the divine source of his wisdom and power; not that Christ was God, in any proper sense of this word, but simply that he was the Instrument, the Minister, the Son, through whom God spake in these latter days to the world, as in former times He had spoken unto the fathers by the prophets.

In conclusion, it is clear that neither Canon Farrar nor Dr. Sanday insists upon the Authorised punctuation in this passage; but, although with an avowed leaning in its favour, they both allow that the other is properly admissible. I have already quoted the words of Dr. Sanday to this effect as found in his Commentary on the Romans. In his second paper in the Expositor (September, 1879) in reference to the proposal to place a stop after σάρκα and commence a new sentence with the following words, he observes, "I do not doubt that the words may be properly, that is grammatically, so divided and so interpreted." This is all that I contend for. Canon Farrar expresses himself much to the same effect, writing at the close of his May paper (Expositor, p. 402) that he had come to "the very same conclusion" as Dr. Sanday in his "Commentary." Here the matter may very well be left. The Authorised punctuation is no longer insisted upon as necessary, but admitted to be at least doubtful, and a matter only of personal preference; and this by two English scholars so competent and so orthodox as Canon Farrar and Dr. Sanday.

Both these gentlemen express their surprise that any one should be in doubt as to St. Paul having held the doctrine of the Logos, and refer to the introductory verses of the
Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians as affording conclusive evidence that he did so. The question is too large for discussion as a part of the present paper, and must stand over for some future opportunity. I will only observe that, even with the two passages just named fully in view, it is to me by no means certain that the Apostle was a holder of the Logos philosophy. The contrary conclusion I think by far the more probable.

G. Vance Smith.
FARRAR'S ST. PAUL.*

He is a bold man who proceeds to write a life of the Apostle of the Gentiles within ten years after publishing a life of Christ. A writer who deems half that period adequate for the preparation of an account of St. Paul's career covering thirteen hundred pages, displays, certainly, that self-confidence which is an indispensable condition of a rapid and brilliant popularity. Yet we fear that such fluency of pen may prove fatal to solid and enduring fame.

In endeavouring to form a judgment of Canon Farrar's large and handsome book, we are met at the outset by a certain difficulty in determining for what class of readers it is intended. Its style and tone would seem to indicate that it is addressed less to students than to the great mass of those who read the Scriptures for edification, and in this aspect we are able to extend to it a great measure of approval. It is stated in the preface that the object of this work is to do for the Acts, and the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, what the author's Life of Christ was intended to do for the Gospels—namely, to enable the reader to obtain "a definite, accurate, and intelligible impression of St. Paul's teaching; of the controversies in which he was engaged; of the circumstances which educed his statements of doctrine and practice; of the inmost heart of his theology in each of

its phases; of his Epistles as a whole, and of each Epistle in particular, as complete and perfect in itself." The whole subject is accordingly woven into a narrative, in which the Epistles appear in what is thought to be their proper places, the more important parts of them being presented in a new version, which is meant to reproduce as closely as possible, without regard to elegance, the exact force and form of the original. Canon Farrar could not execute this task without producing a work in many ways interesting. We have the same vividness of treatment, the same wealth of illustration, the same vigour of statement and exuberance of style as in the former work. An extensive knowledge of the history and antiquities of the period is brought to bear on every point. The author's Talmudical reading is constantly, and often effectively, made use of. Illustrations and parallels are brought from the literature of all ages. A wonderful air of reality is often given to the story by indicating how the events appeared from the point of view of each different actor. To many this ingenuity in attempting to satisfy a natural curiosity will have its charm. We often feel disappointed that the story stops where it does, and Canon Farrar is not a writer who follows too strictly the Hebrew apopthegm which he quotes—"Learn to say, I don't know." He benevolently suggests the continuation, and helps us to imagine what arrangements Paul made with the High Priest after his conversion; in what terms Gallio may have written to his brother Seneca after the Apostle had been brought before him; what thoughts may have filled the mind of the Apostle as he made his way from that interview back to "his lodging in the squalid shop of Aquila and Priscilla;" and why Luke did not wake up Eutychus when he saw him falling asleep. Those who are interested chiefly in the external and personal elements of the New Testament history will find in this work an illustrated guide, which will meet many of their wishes. In reading it they
will also reap this great advantage—that the Epistles, those of them especially which bring us in contact with the real life of the Churches, will speak to them not as doctrinal treatises, but as the living words, dealing with great questions, of an intensely-living man.

But this work claims to be more than a commentary and a repository of illustrations. The view which it sets forth of the life and work of the Apostle Paul is based upon a certain position in criticism, and is appealed to as a justification of that position. The author claims that the truthfulness and consistency of his sketch prove the soundness of his views regarding the Acts and the Epistles (i. 11). It is stated that the object of these volumes is not controversial; yet they contain a good deal of controversy. The names of the great Tübingen scholars, and of their followers in France and in this country, frequently appear on the pages. The writer asserts that he has carefully studied the objections urged against the authenticity and the statements of the New Testament writings. He has remained unconvinced by what he has read. This is not to be wondered at, as the modern criticism has appeared to him in the light of a pure work of destruction. In its character as a work of construction, as an attempt to find the central line of development of Christian thought and life to the creed and structure of the Church, there is no evidence in these volumes that he has comprehended it. His criticisms deal only with points of detail. In reading the works of Baur and his followers, he appears to have kept his mind strictly on the defensive, noting down the rejoinders which could be urged at each particular point. By criticism such as this, it is well known that the Tübingen theology refuses to be judged. The attempt has been made in this century as it never was made before, to show that in the early history of Christianity there was a real development to which an energetic con-
fict of parties and of views within the Church materially contributed, and in their relation to which the New Testament writings are to be arranged if we are really to understand them. This theory has been worked out in many different ways, and in points of detail its upholders are far from being agreed. It rests its claims not on its details, but on the consistency and likelihood of the picture which it gives of the first Christian century. Canon Farrar is right in appealing to his sketch of the Apostle Paul as a whole in proof of his critical opinions. But should he not have judged the Tübingen theology in the same way? The question is whether the Paul of the Tübingen theology or the Paul of Canon Farrar, or any other who may yet appear, will best approve himself as a reality to the mind of an age like this—which of them is fittest to survive? Of course, the picture which will at last prevail must be consistent with the sources, duly sifted and weighed; but it must also be thinkable, and have a living connection with what went before and what came after. It is from this point of view that Canon Farrar very naturally wishes his work to be judged.

Our author's critical position must first be stated. It is a very simple one. He holds that we have thirteen Epistles by the Apostle Paul. With regard to each disputed Epistle, it is stated that the arguments against its authenticity have been carefully examined and found wanting. On the Pastoral Epistles there is less confidence of tone, their case being discussed in a separate excursus of sixteen pages. The Acts is held to be a homogeneous work, compiled by Luke, the author of the third Gospel. Here, however, some notable concessions are made to modern criticism. The author is able to allow that the work was "an ancient Eirenicon, intended to check the strife of parties by showing that there had been no irreconcilable opposition between the views and ordinances of St. Peter and those of St.
Paul;” “that subjective and artificial considerations may have had some influence in the form and construction of the book;” “that it gives a picture of essential unity between the followers of the Judaic and the Pauline schools of thought which we might conjecture from the Epistles to have been less harmonious and undisturbed;” and that in it we “more than once see Paul acting in a way which, from the Epistles, we should have deemed unlikely” (i. 8). We also find it said that Luke had a purpose which guided him in the choice of his materials (ii. 294), and that his object was to show the fundamental unity which existed among Christians, and not to dwell upon the temporary differences which unhappily divided them. In spite of all this, it is held, nevertheless, that in its main outlines the work is a genuine and trustworthy history. From the fact that the Apostle refers to a number of events in his experience which are not recorded in the Acts, it is seriously inferred that his life was too many-sided to be fully recorded either by himself or his biographer, and that there may have been phases of character which have not left a distinct reflection in the Epistles. In cases where the Book of Acts contains apparent contradictions, these, it is argued, must be unimportant, or else so careful a writer would not have left them side by side. Thus the history, as Canon Farrar writes it, partakes of the character of a harmony, and labours under all the disadvantages of that system. For remarkable feats in the way of harmonising, we may refer to the account of the gift of tongues, and to that of the conversion of the Apostle Paul.

One word more before we leave this part of the subject. In a note at the end of the second volume, p. 608, we find it admitted that pseudonymity and literary deception were regarded in antiquity as very different things, and that the word “forger” is inaccurate as applied to authors of pseudonymous Epistles. An author holding such a view
would have done well to avoid the use of an opprobrious term, and to employ some circumlocution. The use of the word "forger" in connection with Epistles of the New Testament, implies an argument on the question of their authenticity, which Canon Farrar allows to be an illegitimate one. Yet we find the word used without explanation in the text and notes of earlier parts of the work, with reference to the authorship of the Colossian and the Ephesian Epistles (ii. 454, 486, 488). In the latter passage, the argument implied in the word is actually stated and relied on. We are told that an imitator must have "deliberately intended to deceive the Church and the world;" that "the spirit in which a forger would have sat down to write, is not the spirit which could have poured forth so grand a Eucharistic hymn," and that the writer, if not the Apostle Paul, must have "deliberately sat down with a lie in his right hand to write a false superscription." The word "fraudulent" is also applied to the author of the Acts (i. 113), should the statement be inaccurate that Paul was a scholar of Gamaliel. In this connection it may also be noted that Canon Farrar twice imputes to those critics who question the genuineness of Pauline Epistles, the motive of wishing to get rid of doctrines contained in these works (ii. 451, 540). Their position may surely be accounted for on other grounds.

When we turn to the picture of the Apostle Paul, with which we are presented in these volumes, and on which their author relies as justifying his critical position, we find it often somewhat difficult to know exactly what is the gist of Canon Farrar's statements; the abundance of his rhetoric makes it hard to define his positions; but perhaps it may be possible to state the broad outlines of his picture, so far as they concern our purpose, without serious misrepresentation.

The first thing that strikes us about the Paul of this book
is, that his life is determined, not from within, by the necessities of his thought, but mostly from without, by the various influences which act on him from time to time. Each change in his action, each development in his doctrine is explained by considering the circumstances in which at that time he happened to be placed. Beginning with his conversion, we find that there had been a certain mental preparation leading up to it; that his contact with the Christians had been causing him to glide into their doctrines, and that his conscience revolted against the business on which he was coming to Damascus. His seeing Jesus is accounted for by the well-known hypothesis of a vision, which was not produced by any external object. His conversion, however, was an absolute miracle; it was by the direct intervention of God that he became convinced of the resurrection of Jesus, and of his power. The belief in his mission to the Gentiles did not spring at once by a logical necessity from his belief in a crucified Messiah; it was miraculously introduced into his mind along with a number of other beliefs and expectations, and it was capable of wavering. After his conversion, he at once sought retirement in Arabia, partly with the view of assuring himself, on the spot where Mosaism originated, that he was really in possession of a truth capable of supplanting that system. In this retirement, the painful malady began, which, throughout the rest of his life, depressed him, and rendered his consciousness morbidly sensitive. On returning to the world, he did not preach to the Gentiles, but preached to the Jews at Damascus a gospel precisely similar to that of the twelve. He went up to Jerusalem expecting to find great pleasure in the society of the brethren there, and learned much from Peter about the life and teaching of the Lord. But, failing to gain a footing among the body of the disciples, he might at this time have been lost to the work of the Church, had not Barnabas come forward to vouch for his sincerity. He
then preached in Jerusalem the same doctrine as at Damascus. Retiring to Tarsus, he lived, for a time, in seclusion, waiting for the call to preach to the Gentiles, which it had been promised that he should receive. The beginning of his preaching to the Gentiles occurred at Antioch, where that work had been going on for some time before his arrival. He had before this been pondering the subject of a mission to the Gentiles, and finding evidence in favour of it in the Old Testament Scriptures; yet it was Barnabas who now for the second time saved him for the work of Christianity, and placed him face to face with the occupation, which otherwise he might not have taken up. By the ordination of the Church of Antioch, he received the full title of Apostle, and was accredited to the Gentile mission. There was nothing novel in his earlier preaching. His sermon at Antioch in Pisidia was formed on the speech of Stephen, which he had heard, and the preservation of which, in the Acts, we owe to his reporting, and on that of the Apostle Peter. It contained the germ of his later doctrines.

At this period of his activity the Apostle preached circumcision as a rule for the Jews, as a charitable concession for the Gentiles. He preached a Gospel of Universalism, as Peter had done before him, representing God as one to whom the son of Abraham was not dearer than any one in any nation who feared Him and worked righteousness; and it was implied, rather than stated, that circumcision was not essential for a Christian. What first led him to regard the question as one of capital importance, was the espionage of the false brethren at Antioch; but even at this point his views on the subject were far from being final, and he went up to Jerusalem not without misgivings that he might be wrong. He went there to obtain a decision on the question, and was confirmed in the conviction that he did right in dispensing with circumcision, by the discovery that the Apostles there
had no clear light to throw on the subject. After gaining
over the pillar-Apostles to his view, he yielded to the clamour
of their bigoted and undisciplined Church, and caused Titus
to be circumcised. This was not a surrender of the position
he had now become resolved to maintain, but merely a
stretch of charity: the rule being proved by the exception.
His words to the Galatians on the subject have an apologetic
tone. He returned to Antioch clear in his views and
conscious of his power, and inspired the Church there with
his own convictions. He discharged a painful duty in his
rebuke of Peter's tergiversation. It is not certain whether
the words in which, in narrating this occurrence, he goes on
to state his own position of justification by faith only, were
spoken to Peter or not. In spite of this painful scene, he
always maintained friendly feelings towards Peter and the
other Apostles of the Jewish Church, which they did not
fail to reciprocate.

His thought and teaching after this point took such
directions as the circumstances of his travels and the needs
of the Churches impressed on them. To the hindrance
which altered his route (Acts xvi. 6), the visit to Galatia was
due; and Canon Farrar concludes very strangely that had
that hindrance not been interposed the Epistle to the
Galatians might never have been written, and the whole
course of Christian theology might have been entirely
changed. At Athens we are told that he preached the
Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that he preached the
Cross. The latter statement, however, is contradicted a few
pages further on. At Corinth the subject of his preaching
was the Messiahship of Jesus, and the broad fact of a
 Redeemer crucified for sin. The vow which he undertook
at this time is "significant as a proof of his personal alle-
giance to the Levitical institutions, and his desire to adopt
a policy of conciliation towards the Jewish Christians of the
Holy City."
Such is Canon Farrar's account of the earlier ministry of the great Apostle. At this point we reach the firmer ground of the four great Epistles, of which the author considers that the two to the Corinthians were written first. We venture to think that the treatment of these Epistles is the most satisfactory part of the work. Canon Farrar is at home in the rich and varied incident to which they introduce us. He excels in breadth of treatment rather than the minute matters of criticism or in the power of tracking the Apostle's path through his elliptical and unfamiliar arguments. Here we sometimes notice a tendency to escape to some theological notion with which we are more familiar. Nor will the position taken up with regard to the disturbers of the Churches of Galatia and Corinth hold water, that they were isolated and unaccredited fanatics, against whom the Apostle might have appealed had he chosen—(why did he not choose?)—to the unbroken sympathy felt for him by the head of the Church at Jerusalem. In spite of that drawback, however, the biographer is very capable of sympathy with the Apostle, and possesses both the generosity and the intensity which are needed for entering into the practical position, and making the old words assume once more the light and heat with which they glowed at first.

After enjoying the Epistles under Canon Farrar's guidance, it is a painful change to be taken forthwith to the scenes of the last visit to Jerusalem, where the Apostle is made to appear in a sadly different light, and parts at once with his doctrine and his pride. The argument for the impossibility of the Apostle having made a public exhibition of his conformity to the law is stated, indeed, with great force and candour; but we are presently told that two principles laid down in the Epistles are sufficient to explain the Apostle's action, the first being his willingness to waive what was indifferent for the sake of charity, and the second
the propriety of each man's remaining in the state in which he was. He did not think it worth while to cease to be a Jew. Yet Canon Farrar betrays his sympathy with John Knox, whom he quotes as asserting that on this occasion the Apostle did wrong. In speaking of Paul's finess before the Sanhedrin, he acknowledges that the Apostle was guilty of conduct unworthy of him. In extenuation it is pleaded that our strict ideas of veracity are peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon race, and cannot be looked for in the ancient world. By a doubtful piece of exegesis it is also suggested that the Apostle afterwards expressed regret for his conduct on this occasion. Before Festus we find Paul preaching with the force of long familiarity, and with intense conviction, the same doctrine as that of Peter in the first days of the Church at Jerusalem.

Canon Farrar believes that the Apostle escaped the Neronian persecution, and wrote the seven later Epistles from a second captivity in Rome. The reason why the teaching of these is so different from that of the great Epistles, though all the eleven were written within a period of ten years, is again that new circumstances had arisen and called for the statement of new doctrines. It is asserted that the Christology of the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians is to be found in the earlier letters too. These Epistles were due to the rise in Asia Minor of a tendency to Gnostic views, in which, though it had not assumed the dimensions of a heresy, the Apostle foresaw great danger to his Churches. In the Pastoral Epistles, Canon Farrar allows that there is a marked failure of vigour on the part of the Apostle, and that the distinctive characteristics of his energetic years have receded to the background. Such is the picture of the great Apostle of the Gentiles which we are asked to regard as so consistent and satisfactory that it justifies the critical position on which it is based. What are we to say of it?

Great as the merits of Canon Farrar's work are in some
directions, it would be going too far to say that he has succeeded in bringing the figure of the Apostle clearly before us. To a certain kind of skill it might not be impossible to work into one history the Paul who wrote to the Galatians, the Paul of the Acts, and the Paul of the later Epistles. Canon Farrar does little to show the unity of these several characters. He deals with each in succession, and argues that it is not impossible that they may be the same, but his art wants subtlety to fuse them into one. His Paul, therefore, it must be said, is devoid of any living continuity; his days are not linked each to each by natural piety; we see neither the root of his growth nor the unity of his form. He is a personage without a backbone either of thought or principle; his views are formed, not by the operation of an intensely logical mind, but by the pressure of varying circumstances. Many of his acts are forced on him by influences against which his higher nature rebels, and for some of them, and these are not the least important, he has to seek an apology.

Did space allow, we could point out that Canon Farrar's delineation rests on an exegesis of the Acts and the Epistles which, for the sake of the harmony believed to exist between these sources, is forced at some points to do violence to their natural meaning. It is of more moment to point out how impossible it is to realise to our minds the history as he states it, and how, for want of an internal principle of growth, he is frequently obliged to call in the supernatural to help on the course of events, even where the texts do not suggest it. Let it be considered, for example, how it is possible that the Apostle's great doctrines could ever retire to the background of his mind. They have held their place in the history of the Church, and appeared again and again as the watchwords of true religious revivals, and it is not likely that their author could himself
forget them by change of scene or by the advance of age. Before his principles had sunk to quiescence in the minds of his followers, and long before the zealots of Jerusalem, whom the Apostles were so little able to control, had desisted from their hostility, how could the Apostle write Epistles on the unity of the Church in which Jew and Gentile appear standing peacefully on one platform, and the new doctrines are softened down so as to be inoffensive to every one? It is impossible to compress such a development as this within the limits of ten years.

The reason of Canon Farrar's failure to produce a lifelike representation, in spite of all the liking he has for his subject, lies primarily in a deficient conception of the progress of theology in the times of the Apostles. The first authority for the life of Paul lies undoubtedly in his own Epistles; there, and there only, do we receive any information as to the history of his mind and the growth of his thought. And the life of Paul was the outcome of his thought, as few lives have ever been. His doctrine and himself were one. He was prepared for it from the beginning, and it was no mere theological opinion, but a great spiritual impulse of the age which took up its residence in him. And he who would know Paul must know his doctrine. He must understand what was the logical outcome to the Jew of the notion of a crucified Messiah, and see how the earlier Apostles were not logical enough to apprehend the meaning of Christ crucified, and therefore fell into inconsistency. Then he will not fail to see that to Paul, Christ crucified and the mission to the Gentiles were not two doctrines, but one, and that there could be no doubt for him, after his conversion, what he was to do, and little doubt, perhaps, even at the beginning of his ministry, what battles he would have to fight. What was precisely the belief of the original Apostles? What was precisely the difference between that belief and the
doctrine of Paul? Without clear views upon these questions, no living grasp of the history of the Apostolic age is possible. In the absence of a strict discipline in this part of the subject, such as the labours of Holsten have made more possible to us than before, the work of Canon Farrar has fallen into great confusion. The preaching of the older Apostles at the very outset of Christianity is credited with notions which were the mature result of Pauline thought, and Paul is represented as preaching to the very end the elementary doctrine which, from the first, he had felt to be an inadequate rendering of the great fact of Christ crucified.

And as the foundation of this work is not laid deep enough in the great elements of the Apostle's thought, so its superstructure is dwarfed and cramped by the supposed necessity of confining all the stages of Pauline thought in the New Testament to the short space of the Apostle's lifetime. To a writer whose hold on the great standards of Paulinism contained in the principal Epistles is but loose, it appears the natural policy to accept all the works which have come down in the Apostle's name, and to set himself to account for their changed subjects and tone as best he may. To one who finds it hard to persuade himself that works so different from the great Epistles as some of these are, can proceed from the same hand, and who has apprehended the conditions of authorship in ancient times, as Canon Farrar himself has stated them, a much wider and more imposing view of the history of the first Christian century reveals itself. The forces at work within the Church sufficed for the production not only of hymns (which are frequently referred to in the second volume of this work), but also of great Epistles in which the new thought of the Church was so adequately expressed, that believers admitted these productions to a place beside the first documents of their faith, and did not frown upon the fiction that they
were written by the hand of the mighty dead. In like manner, the desire was satisfied to obtain a representation of the history of early times which might better correspond to the growing sense of unity than the glimpses of a stormy epoch to be found in the earlier Epistles. The materials were collected for this end from various quarters, and so the Church obtained its Eirenicon, a history not perfect but suited to its needs, in which old controversies were dimmed over, and a picture was held up on which an uncritical and peace-loving generation could gaze with satisfaction. There were brave men before Agamemnon, and there were noble writers after Paul, who owe it to their own modesty, as well as to the literary habits of their age, that their names are unrecorded.

From Canon Farrar’s frankness and openness of mind, we are persuaded that he will be glad of an opinion on his work written from a point of view which he has not seen fit to adopt.

Allan Menzies.
ON JANUARY 1, 1880,
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THE first need of a New Periodical is justification: the purpose of this Prospectus is to justify the publication of the MODERN REVIEW.

No task is less possible than accurately to measure and co-ordinate the intellectual and spiritual forces of the observer's own times. Yet no thoughtful man refrains from the endeavour.

All wise men admit that there must be some and may be much error in their estimates of current mental movements; but both those whom it elates and those whom it afflicts agree that a rapid and even irresistible disintegration is now affecting old beliefs long held in reverence. Such disintegration is the work of a Modern
Philosophy described as Positive, that term implying allegiance, not to a Master, but to a Method.

We live at a time in which Magazines have acquired unprecedented influence in the formation of the national mind. Increasing multitudes feed their intellectual life, in no small measure, on articles in Periodicals. The attitude of current magazine literature towards that disintegration of belief which is in process becomes, then, a matter of moment. It is a mark of the growing strength of Free Inquiry that the ablest Reviews of the day give space impartially to champions of Ancient Creeds and exponents of the Positive Philosophy.

Close observation, however, reveals the fact that types of Orthodoxy, more or less deeply pledged to Tradition, and types of Agnosticism, more or less distinctly Atheistic, divide the chief hospitality of these Reviews between them; while types of Religious Belief spiritual, yet reasonable, fail of adequate expression. It ensues that Religion and Science, Faith and Reason, tend to be popularly regarded as contradictories; nor will it be disputed that the opinion is rapidly spreading that such is their relation.

If, then, there are men who, amid many diversities of thought and habit, yet agree in fervent loyalty to the principle of Free Inquiry, in fearless welcome to the teachings of Modern Science, and in deep conviction that the sanctities of Faith and Hope must be permanently characteristic of sound manhood, these constitute a third