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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

students who, as the editor says, value my poor[1] 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 *'ezôr*[2] (usually treated as a synonym of *ḥ^agôr*, "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 *'ezôr* to all who have any knowledge of Hebrew; it is shown therein that the sense "waist-wrapper," which belongs to the corresponding Arabic word *izâr*, 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* (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.'"[3] 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. περίζωμα, 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 *'ezôr* 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. xlvi. 13, etc. (on which it should also be noted that Maspero, in the *Ægyptische Zeitschrift*, 1884, pp. 87–90, denies the correctness of Wiedemann's view, while Pinches, in *Transactions of Soc. of Bible Archæology*, vii. 216, accepts it).

T. K. CHEYNE.

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

[1] This is Dr. Cheyne's own word.—EDITOR.

[2] Gesenius in his *Thesaurus* gives only one meaning of *'ezôr*, "cingulum, subligaculum;" he mentions the Arabic *izâr* without drawing any inference from it.

[3] This proverb gives a beautiful illustration of Jer. xiii. 11, where the point of comparison is not the ornamentalness of the *'ezôr* (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

one another in theological principles as Dr. Dillmann of Berlin and Professor Kuenen of Leyden.

But we must not be unduly led away by these accordances. In the first place, we have to deal with men who have many psychological characteristics in common — great industry, unexampled patience in sorting entangled facts, singular insight into the true adjustment of complicated details; but, with all this, a rashness and precipitancy in conclusion, and, not unfrequently, a very discernible want of proportion in their setting forth of results and ultimate principles. If it be not insular prejudice to say so, we can hardly fail to recognise the absence of that cool common-sense which, in subjects such as those we are now considering, is a gift, a veritable *charisma*, which can never be dispensed with; and without which no amount of industry, no accumulations of learning, will ever ensure trustworthiness, or even verisimilitude, in the results ultimately arrived at.

In the next place, this must not be forgotten,—that there is a fascination in these investigations, in these excursions into the unknown, which exercises a very powerful influence over those who, from any reason, enter into them. It may seem to be due to the simple desire of arriving at truth; but only too often, if an honest analysis of mental motive be made, it will be found that the attractiveness of theory-making, and of forming some consistent view of perplexing phenomena, will account for much of the sort of contagious interest that is felt in Old Testament analysis, and will explain the confidence that is felt in the development of this speculative criticism. It certainly was so, some three-quarters of a century ago, when the origination of the Four Gospels was a subject of the theological activity of the time. Sober writers were led into the most elaborate schemes of Gospel construction. Coincidences of opinion were found among scholars of very different theological views; agreement was almost arrived at as to what was to be deemed the aboriginal Gospel, just as now we are assured, in regard of the Pentateuch, that the primal document—the "Source" as it is termed by Wellhausen—is a discovery of modern biblical analysis about which no reasonable doubt can be entertained.

We must then certainly not place too much reliance on the alleged agreement of leading critics and scholars as to the composition of the early Books of the Old Testament; and most certainly we may pay little heed to the assurance of a recent writer[1] on this subject, that the modern development of historical criticism is reaching results as sure, where it is fairly used, as scientific inquiry.

But it will be well now to enter into details, and to proceed to place these alleged certitudes in contrast with that Traditional view of the characteristics and composition of the Old Testament which, with some modifications, has existed for two-and-twenty centuries; and which, we may very confidently say, will substantially remain to the end. Modifications there may be. Each age as it passes suggests, it may be, some rectifications. Each period of controversy like the present necessitates a closer study, both of matter and of language, and consequently a clearer perception of those details in which surer knowledge enables us to introduce rectifications and corrections. These modifications we may expect, but subversive changes in the estimate of the true nature of Holy Scripture, such as those which we are now invited to accept, will never enter into the *credenda* of the Catholic Church.

We begin, then, by defining what we mean by the term that we are using,—the Traditional view of the Old Testament. We mean that view of the contents, their authorship, and their trustworthiness, that prevailed in the Jewish Church after the final formation of the Canon of the Old Testament, —that is clearly to be recognised in the New Testament,—and has continued in the Christian Church, with but little substantial modification, to this nineteenth century of salvation. Now, however, in the closing years of this century, we are told that this view must, to a great extent, be given up. We are, in fact, called upon to set aside the greater part of the beliefs of the past, and to see in the Old Testament a collection of ancient documents, many of highly composite structure, which came consecutively into existence centuries later than when they have been supposed to have been written; and which, after various re-editings and redactions, only received the form in which now we possess them, in the later, if not the latest, period of the Exile.

What general answer have we to make to these startling demands? Well, to begin with, certainly this,—that the view that we are thus somewhat summarily called upon to dismiss may in substance be recognised as dating from the time of the Apo-

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 357.

crypha. We find in the writings of that period not only the same recognised divisions that were current in the days of our Lord, but a deliberate ascription of sacredness to the ancient books, and especially to the Mosaic Law and to its author, into whose soul Wisdom herself vouchsafed to enter. The Books of the Old Testament were apparently ascribed, as we now ascribe them, to prophets,—the term prophets in the Apocrypha being applied not only to men who "showed what should come to pass," and who spake "from the mouth of the Lord," but who were guided by His Spirit, and ranked with the "friends of God."

We may recognise substantially the same views in Philo, though in a more exaggerated form. With him the Old Testament is ever regarded as one divine whole, breathed through by the Spirit of God, one inseparably connected holy Word, of which the Pentateuch is to be accounted the crown and the glory. The same views are expressed by Josephus, though in more restrained and moderate terms. He too regards the sacred Scriptures as a divine whole. They were written by a succession of prophets, the greatest of whom was the inspired writer of the Pentateuch,—true prophets, yet with separate gifts,—some writing under immediate inspiration from God, others only truthfully and faithfully recording the events of their own times, though never without some measures of divine guidance and direction.

Such generally were the views entertained in the Jewish Church after the formation of the canon of the Old Testament; such the views in the time of our Lord; and such, though not without various modifications in detail, the views entertained by the early writers in the Christian Church, the Eastern Church involving more of the speculative element, the Western more of the formulated and traditional. The broad principles that were maintained were the harmony of the teaching of the writers of the Old Testament, the organic unity of the two Testaments, the self-sufficiency of Scripture for the setting forth of truth, and its blessed and plenary perfection. It is only in heretical writings, and particularly in the Clementine Homilies, that we find any traces of that kind of criticism of the Old Testament with which this nineteenth century has made us so painfully familiar. Even from early days controversy has prevailed in regard of the nature of the inspiration and the infallibility of Holy Scripture, but it is only in the last hundred and forty years, and particularly in the last quarter of a century, that the broad principles of the Traditional view have been deliberately and even contemptuously flung aside, and the genuineness, integrity, and trustworthiness of the Old Testament impugned and traversed by the industrious ingenuity and really limitless assumptions of modern analysis.

This destructive criticism has, however, not been without its uses. It has at last compelled us to study more diligently and systematically the Old Testament. For a very long period the critical study of the Old Testament has been comparatively neglected by biblical scholars. The Hebrew language has to a great extent dropped out of the curriculum of modern theology; the critical questions that have been now brought to the front by men of singular acumen, as well as of untiring industry, come upon us with a kind of startling novelty; and we find ourselves, as it were, taken by surprise, and brought suddenly face to face with questions pressed upon us by experts, to which we are uneasily conscious that we can give no answers that can stand five minutes of steady criticism.

This state of things is, however, passing away. We are at length beginning to realise the gravity of the present state of the Old Testament controversy. The Traditional views are being re-examined under the light of modern discoveries; and efforts are beginning to be made fairly to put in contrast that inspired and trustworthy record of the past bearing the name of the Old Testament, and sealed with a belief of more than two thousand years in its genuineness and integrity, with that strange conglomerate of myth, legend, fabrication, idealised narrative, falsified history, dramatised fable, and after-event prophecy to which modern critical analysis has sought to reduce that which our Church, day by day, calls the "most Holy Word" of Almighty God.

Such a contrast we are now endeavouring to make,—a contrast which it is believed will in itself go far to reassure the perplexed and the doubtful, and will show what we must term the dangerous credulity of those who are advising us, for the sake of the shaken faith of young men at our Universities, to accept the leading conclusions of this revolutionary analysis. To strive to help failing faith is a noble endeavour, but there are limits to the extent to which that help is to be carried. Are

we to have no thought for the countless numbers of those simple trustful believers who, in the language of a modern poet, are leading "lives of melodious days," because clinging to the old faith, and accepting what Apostles and Evangelists, yea, and the dear Lord Himself, have expressly guaranteed to them? Are these babes in Christ to be forgotten? Are good and earnest men to be so over-eager for the comparatively few, as to lose sight of those whose very salvation may be endangered by this precipitancy of literary credulity?

At any rate, let us make our contrast. Let us state succinctly on the one side what we have termed the rectified Traditional view of the composition and authorship of the Old Testament, and, on the other side, the modern Analytical view; and then, further, those modifications of it which English Churchmen of earnestness and piety advise us to accept as helpful to weakened faith, and as that which, to use the words of one of these writers, may "legitimately and without real loss be conceded."[1] Conceded, and to whom? To Edward Reuss and to Graf, to Kuenen and to Wellhausen, and to their followers in this country who adopt, in a greater or less degree, their conclusions. When the contrast has been completed, we will, without entering into any technicalities, let common sense be brought to bear upon the contrast, and endeavour to make a rough but equitable estimate of the preponderance of the probability which the Traditional view may claim over the Analytical view, and the real insufficiency of the arguments on which this latter view appears principally to rely. This done, we will then make our appeal to far higher and more conclusive authority.

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 362.

Some Minor Gains of the Revised Version of the New Testament, and some the Reverse.

By the Rev. Principal Brown, D.D., Aberdeen.

I.

The A.V. abounds in italics where the verb, though not required in Greek, is needed to make a complete sentence in English; it ought not to have been printed in italics. Also, where the idiom of the English language requires more words than the Greek, the indispensable words should not have been printed in italics, as in Matt. ii. 18, "Rachel weeping *for* her children"—where the R.V. prints "for" properly in Roman.

Such superfluities, however, are harmless, but not where they give the wrong sense. Thus in John viii. 6, the A.V. has a long exposition of the sense of an action of our Lord's, which, even if the correct one, translators have no right to do. The case was that of the woman taken in adultery, whom the hypocritical scribes and Pharisees brought to Jesus, wanting to ensnare Him by asking what He would do in such a case. Instead of answering them, Jesus stooped down, and "with his finger wrote on the ground, *as though He heard them not*" (adds the A.V.). On their persisting in demanding an answer, "Jesus lifted up Himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Now observe what follows: "And again He stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, . . . and Jesus was left alone." Beyond doubt, then, His stooping down and writing on the ground was to allow those *holy hypocrites* to slink away, unobserved by Him, and so not be put to shame in His presence. Anyhow, the explanation given in the A.V. should have been left to the expositor.

In Acts vii. 59, "They stoned Stephen, calling upon *God*, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." It is a pity that King James' translators or revisers inserted or left (for I have not the previous versions at hand) the italic word "*God*." For though it expresses what is true, it does not