

vi. 5 (τῆς φυνείας). Finally on this—In this same epistle it is delightful to find him choosing the (in Palestine and Asia) ever-present olive, with its twinkling and twittering silver-grey leaves and abundant graftings and broken stems and boughs in the windy heights, whereby to picture forth his mighty argument of the oneness of Gentile and Jew in Christ Jesus. It is too long to give in our paper; but let any one thoughtfully read chap. xi. 13-24, and say whether St. Paul does not herein reveal keen observation and delight in the observation of the olive-tree. Coequal proof that St. Paul saw everything and shunned nothing are his many references to games, etc. Who can read these and not see how open his eyes were to what went on among the Greeks? This cannot be over-passed. Let it be observed, therefore, that whether he refers to racing or wrestling it lies on the surface that the metaphors were drawn from the inside and not the outside (1 Cor. ix. 24; Gal. ii. 2, v. 7; Phil. ii. 16, iii. 14). Of the same in kind with these, and more frequent, are the apostle's metaphors fetched from war and weapons. This is an extremely tempting line of illustration of our contention. I limit myself to a single one, viz. 2 Corinthians ii. 14, where he most strikingly compares himself to a captive led in triumph by a conqueror. I cannot dwell on this; but the reader will be rewarded if he read Chase (as before, pp. 183, 184). It is only necessary to name Ephesians vi. 11 *sq.*, which, written from the Prætorian camp (Olshausen), has an unmistakable martial ring throughout. Both sets of metaphors reveal St. Paul's objectivity of observation. The specious rhetoric of Archdeacon Farrar is transmitted into pure nonsense in the light of his open-eyed and informed noting of everything, e.g. Dean Stanley finds a picturesque allusion to "the hill forts of Cilician pirates" in

the apostle's use of ὄχυράματα = πηγυράματα, typifying the intellectual pride of the Greeks.

Time would fail me to enter into minuter details on the apostle's many uses of the ever-changing aspects of nature. Neither may I dwell on his Christ-like use of the shepherd (1 Cor. ix. 7), the soldier (*ibid. et seq.*), the sower (*ibid.* ver. 11), the ploughman (*ibid.* ver. 10), and so really all round of the very "sights and sounds" and scenes and things that surrounded him as they did the Master. I should have liked also to have dwelt—but I can't—on his lifelike word-portraits of character—bitten in as sharply as our Lord's own—of the feast-giver, the hypocrite, the busy-body, the prater, the diner-out (1 Cor. x. 27), eye-service (Eph. vi. 6), the bringer of evil report, the "open sepulchre" (Rom. iii. 13), the evil liver (Gal. vi. 8), feminine vanities, but also the "glory" of their hair, etc. etc. I have, I hope, said sufficient to have made good my contention and conviction that, albeit the apostle's whole soul was so mastered by one supreme purpose, that it gives character to his whole style, he nevertheless reveals by a thousand incidental touches that his was a nature to which God's handiwork and man's handiwork in the world made strenuous appeal. I venture to affirm that, brief as this paper is, I have gone far to demonstrate that if St. Paul had set himself to write an ode to Mont Blanc at sunrise, he had the genius and the knowledge to outdo even Coleridge on his own lines. Indeed, the brain that inspired παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (1 Cor. vii. 31) could have written "the cloud-capp'd towers," etc., of the *Tempest* itself (IV. 1). A first attempt at reversal of a misconception is necessarily tentative and inadequate; but I commend my correction of hasty and unfurnished critics to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

## A Commentary on Jeremiah.

DR. LIDDON is reported to have said that he never had time to renew his acquaintance with his own published works. This excuse I cannot offer for myself, for I often have to turn aside to correct or expand what I have long ago said. Circumstances lately led me to take up a commentary on Jeremiah which bears my name, and I remembered what an unkind stroke had been unconsciously dealt to me by the editor of THE EXPOSITORY

TIMES. I will not presume to question what he says (EXPOSITORY TIMES, November 1891, p. 82) of a smaller book on the evangelical prophet; but will he permit me to ask, why he assumed that no Hebrew scholar in this country had commented on Jeremiah between Mr. Streane in 1881 and Mr. Ball in 1890?<sup>1</sup> It seems a pity that theological

<sup>1</sup> The omission is only apparent. The serial commentaries (*Speaker, Ellicott, Pulpit*) were kept outside the scope of the

students who, as the editor says, value my poor<sup>1</sup> opinions on Isaiah, should be left unaware that there are many things to which I at least attach some value in my "Pulpit" Commentary on Jeremiah, published in 1883-1885 (Kegan Paul & Co.). Only the other day Professor Robertson Smith, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (January 1892, pp. 289-292), propounded a view of the meaning of 'ēšōr<sup>2</sup> (usually treated as a synonym of ḥēgōr, "girdle") which is (so far as I know) not to be found in any of our recent commentaries, but is recognised for Jer. xiii. 1-11 in my Pulpit Commentary. I venture very strongly to recommend Professor R. Smith's article on the word 'ēšōr to all who have any knowledge of Hebrew; it is shown therein that the sense "waist-wrapper," which belongs to the corresponding Arabic word *izār*, suits all the thirteen passages in which it occurs. But with regard to Jer. xiii. (which presents eight of those thirteen occurrences) it had already been shown with reference to Lane's *Lexicon* and Freytag's *Studium der arabischen Sprache* that the sense of "waist-wrapper" was as suitable as that of "girdle" was the reverse. And so, too, in my *Life and Times of Jeremiah*

survey.—See EXPOSITORY TIMES, November 1891, p. 81 (a).  
—EDITOR.

<sup>1</sup> This is Dr. Cheyne's own word.—EDITOR.

<sup>2</sup> Gesenius in his *Thesaurus* gives only one meaning of 'ēšōr, "cingulum, subligaculum;" he mentions the Arabic *izār* without drawing any inference from it.

(1888), I have stated (p. 161) that "I cannot help thinking that the choice of this symbol (a rotting linen *apron*) was dictated by a proverb like the Arabic, 'It is unto me in place of a waist-wrapper.'<sup>3</sup> It is true, the main point had been already seized by Jerome, who explains "cinctorium sive lumbare, quod Dei renibus jungitur populus Israel est"—*lumbare* is "an apron for the loins" (cf. *περιζώμα*, LXX.). Even Orelli, though a good scholar, tacitly rejects this (as an acute reader of his commentary will see). Yet it is correct. It was, however, reserved for Professor Robertson Smith to give a wider application to this sense. The other passages in which 'ēšōr occurs are Isa. v. 27, xi. 5; Ezek. xxiii. 15; 2 Kings i. 8; Job xii. 18 (this passage is rightly explained by Schultens). Other points on which I should think it a privilege if my commentary could help students are the meaning of that knotty passage, Jer. viii. 22, the criticism of Jer. l and li, the Babylonian allusion in Jer. li. 34, and the question of the fulfilment of the prophecy in Jer. xlv. 13, etc. (on which it should also be noted that Maspero, in the *Égyptische Zeitschrift*, 1884, pp. 87-90, denies the correctness of Wiedemann's view, while Pinches, in *Transactions of Soc. of Bible Archaeology*, vii. 216, accepts it).

T. K. CHEYNE.

<sup>3</sup> This proverb gives a beautiful illustration of Jer. xiii. 11, where the point of comparison is not the ornamentalness of the 'ēšōr (as Mr. Ball thinks, following Hitzig), but its nearness to the person of the wearer.

## The Teaching of our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

### THE TWO THEORIES.

WE now enter definitely into a full consideration of those statements as to the Old Testament which are regarded by foreign writers of eminence and learning as fully established by modern criticism; and which, further, are said to be very generally admitted by writers and scholars who have made the nature and composition of the Old Testament their especial study.

We may ourselves admit, at the very outset, that there is an amount of accordance between foreign

scholars and critics as to the general structure of the earlier Books of Holy Scripture, and even to some of the more important details, considerably beyond what we might have expected, when the differences of the points of view of the writers are properly taken into account. It is startling, for instance, to find a venerated writer like the late Dr. Delitzsch in accordance with Professor Wellhausen in many essential matters connected with the Book of Genesis, and to find coincidences of opinion in regard of some of the characteristics of the Pentateuch between writers as divergent from