

presumably of the mass of their Persian subjects. "The ideas and customs," writes M. James Darmesteter, "which are found in the Avesta were already in existence under the Achæmenian kings, but, taken as a whole, they were not the general ideas and customs of the whole of Persia, but only of the sacerdotal caste [the Magi]. There were, therefore, practically two religions in Iran, the one for laymen and the other for priests."<sup>1</sup> It is thus far from being proved that "the truths enunciated or implied in the Gathic hymns" (which *ex hypothesi* the Jews did not read) were "in the air," and were almost unconsciously imbibed by the Babylonian Diaspora to be by them transmitted to their western brethren.

(3) Finally, let us grant again that certain choice spirits in Judaism, during the second century of the Persian supremacy (say, from 430 B.C.), attained to the assured hope of immortality; does it not then become extremely difficult, nay, impossible, to explain the slowness with which such a blessed hope gained acceptance among the mass of the Jewish people? The silence of Ecclesiastes we may explain, but not that of the author of Ecclesiasticus. Jesus ben Sira declares unhesitatingly that "man is not immortal" (17, 30), and he

<sup>1</sup> *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. iv., The Vendidad Introd. pp. xliii. ff.

was no sceptic like Qoheleth. Neither, though Cheyne finds "a strong element of Sadduceanism" (p. 411) in his book, dare we reckon him as a Sadducee in the face of chap. 17, 17 (if his best commentator, Fritzsche, is to be trusted). Yet here is a religious-minded Jew, living in the capital of Judaism, three centuries and a half (c. 180 B.C.) after the commencement of the supposed "Zoroastrian influences," who knows nothing of the higher "life of immortality." Does not this fact also tell strongly against Canon Cheyne's favourite theory?

I would again, in concluding this article, express my sense of the injustice which is done to a great book, for such is the work before us, by the line of treatment here adopted. There is in it very much in the handling of individual psalms to which no exception can be taken, and I have elsewhere expressed my conviction that it is "the most exhaustive and thought-compelling study of the Hebrew Psalter that has ever been given to the Church." In the present case I have been compelled to state frankly a few of the most formidable difficulties in the way of accepting of its results, experienced by one of those younger students, to whom Canon Cheyne appeals, "who are either uncommitted or but half-committed to definite critical views."

## St. Paul and the Objective.

BY THE REV. A. B. GROSART, D.D., LL.D.

It seems to be accepted by many who write of St. Paul that his was so peculiarly and absolutely a subjective nature that he took little or no notice of the objective. Incidental remarks of the Rev. George Jackson, B.A., Edinburgh, in his otherwise fine paper in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (October 1891) on Myers' imperishable poem of "St. Paul," may be taken as representative of the ease with which this assumption is made. He thus writes:—"It has been more than once remarked that in all the addresses and writings of the apostle that have come down to us, there is manifested a curious insensibility to the sights and sounds of nature. Probably not a single physical fact with regard to the many countries through which, in his busy life, he passed could be gleaned from his writings."

This is enforced, if not originated, by a quotation from Archdeacon Farrar's *St. Paul*. As I wish to confute the strongest and most dexterously put statement of the case, I willingly give the passage in full about the apostle's birthplace. "With these scenes of beauty and majesty we are less concerned, because they seem to have had no influence over the mind of the youthful Saul. We can well imagine how, in a nature differently constituted, they would have been like a continued inspiration; how they would have melted into the very imagery of his thoughts; how again and again, in crowded cities and foul prisons, they would have

'Flashed upon that inward eye,  
Which is the bliss of solitude.'

The scenes in which the whole life of David had been spent were far less majestic, as well as far less

varied, than many of those in which the lot of St. Paul was cast; yet the Psalms of David are a very handbook of poetic description, while in the Epistles of St. Paul we only breathe the air of cities and synagogues. He alludes indeed to the temple not made with hands, but never to its mountain pillars, and but once to its nightly stars (Acts xvii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 41). To David the whole universe is but one vast House of God, in which, like angelic ministrants, the fire and hail, snow and vapour, wind and storm, fulfil His word. With St. Paul—though he, too, is well aware that ‘the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly visible, being apprehended by the things that He hath made, even His eternal power and divinity,’—yet to him this was an indisputable axiom, not a conviction constantly renewed with admiration and delight. There are few writers who, to judge solely from their writings, seemed to have been less moved by the beauties of the external world. Though he had sailed again and again across the blue Mediterranean, and must have been familiar with the beauty of those isles of Greece—

‘Where burning Sappho loved and sung,  
Where grew the arts of war and peace,  
Where Delos rose and Phœbus sprung;’

though he had again and again traversed the pine-clad gorges of the Asian hills, and seen Ida and Olympus and Parnassus in all their majesty; though his life had been endangered in mountain torrents and stormy waves, and he must have often wandered as a child along the banks of his native stream to see the place where it roars in cataracts over its rocky course, his soul was so entirely absorbed in the mighty moral and spiritual truths which it was his great mission to proclaim, that not by one verse, scarcely even by a single expression, in all his letters, does he indicate the faintest gleam of delight or wonder in the glories of nature” (vol. i. pp. 17-19).

To myself, in reading the letters of St. Paul, his sensibility and susceptibility to outward impressions, his abounding allusions to aspects of day and night, his vivid observations of the processes of culture and growth in cornfield and vineyard, fertile plain and mountain side, his notation of the ebb and flow of the seasons, his open ear to the winds and glittering rain, his ascents to the very top of the visible creation of God, his intense and frequently intensely sad scrutiny of the mystery of this “unintelligible

world,” as seen in nature and human nature, his lofty measurement of man from face to soul, his ecstatic flights beyond these bounding skies, so run through all of them—like the veining of marble, not mere surface—that my difficulty is not collective but selective proofs. On this I will first let another speak (Chase, in his *Chrysostom*):—“Metaphors play an important part in St. Paul’s teaching. Few writers venture in reference to the greatest subjects to depend so largely on images drawn from every quarter; few blend metaphors as does St. Paul; few, as he, allow a metaphor to drift on and tide over the barrier which separates one thought from another. A commentator’s treatment of Pauline metaphors is a test of his exegetical tact” (p. 180).

I have specified St. Paul’s allusions to, or rather his use of, light. I pause on this first thing. Were not these representative outbursts the utterances of a man who was at home among the grandeurs and glories of the universe—of a man who delighted, adoringly and penetratively, to sweep the starry heavens? “There are celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory” (1 Cor. xv. 40, 41). Again, “God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give *the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ*” (2 Cor. iv. 6)—a poem in one line. When we examine more minutely his references to light, the result is equally striking, e.g. let it be noted how his successive descriptions of the “wonder” of the circumstances of his conversion deeper and brighten (Acts xxii. 11), “for the glory of that light,” compared with the emphatic yet simple “at noonday,” there flashed from heaven encompassingly (φῶς ἰκανόν) “a great light”; and again (xxvi. 13), “a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me.” The progress in vividness is most noticeable. In accord with this is the entire group of Pauline metaphors from darkness and light. His earliest letter (1 Thess. v. 4) has this, “Ye, brethren, are not in darkness,” and it is broadened in Romans (xiii. 12), “The night is far spent, the day is at hand;” and it recurs with new emphasis, “Let us walk honestly, as in the day” (Rom. xiii. 13). Once more, in Ephesians v. 11, “And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness,

but rather reprove them ;” on which Chrysostom, with penetrative insight, observes that “the words, ‘but rather even reprove them’ are a carrying on of the metaphor of light in the context. The apostle has just said, ‘Ye are light :’ the light itself reproves the works done in the dark. When the lamp is set, all men are revealed, and the thief will not enter” (*in loco*). Finally, here, there is the magnificent metaphor of the lighthouse (Phil. ii. 15, 16). Turning elsewhere, that marvellous deepening and widening of Isaiah, “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him” (1 Cor. ii. 9), could not have been written by a man to whom eye and ear were not inlets of glorious things ; yet again, “I planted, Apollos watered” (1 Cor. iii. 6), wherein a garden lying in sunshine speaks. Returning for a moment upon our second quotation (2 Cor. iv. 6), how vividly he has conceived Genesis i. 3 ! These are mere first sheaves of a harvest of nature-allusions to be gathered from St. Paul’s letters almost *ad aper-turam libri* to whoever has seeing eyes, and which no man could have written except one who was “free” of God’s world and its wonders. He had no “wonder,” says Archdeacon Farrar. Is not each one of these few selected texts proof to the contrary ? He was simply filled to “running over” with “wonder” and awe and joy.

But I would now enter into details ; and I shall take the recorded sayings and letters of St. Paul just as they succeed each other in our English Bible, albeit the capable reader will do well to read all of the above examples, and all to follow in the original Greek. We necessarily turn in the outset to the Acts of the Apostles. Instantly we have an exquisite and yet wide and magnificent outlook on the entire visible universe, when at Lystra the wondering people of the place sought to worship Paul as Mercury, and Barnabas as Jupiter. I italicise *bits* that hold in them my contention as to the great apostle’s objectivity—“Which when the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard of, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things ? We also are men of like passions [= nature] with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein : who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless he left not

Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rains from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness” (xiv. 14–17).

The very incidental, almost accidental, circumstances that evoked these words testify that it was the expression of a habitual and potential thought and attitude ; and a thought based on worshipful and delighted contemplation of God and of the glorious “heavens” that He had “made,” and this “earth” of ours, appointed for our “dwelling-place.” And then the spontaneity of the introduction of “the sea,” after sweeping from heaven to earth, and back again from earth to heaven. “And the sea, and all that in them is !” Nor must the added touch, “filling our hearts with food and gladness,” fail to be put over against Archdeacon Farrar’s “no delight.” Then, specifically, we must note the plural (ver. 17) *verods* = the earlier (autumn) and latter (spring) rains (Jas. v. 7 and Deut. xi. 14), and beyond that, the keen swift observation of the suitability of the allusion in his recollection of a fact recorded by Strabo (xii. 6) that the pastures of Lycaonia, where the streams do not enlarge to rivers, are liable to suffer severely from drought (Canon Cook).

We have within the small compass of this instant-born speech such a concentrative description of nature in height and depth as had it occurred in a Greek play it should have been perpetually quoted. Characteristically, nature is bound up by the apostle with Providence ; but none the less noticeable is the proof in his naming of the “fruitful seasons” that he was used to mark blading grain, the purpling vine, the rounding fig and pomegranate, the plenty for man and beast. Archdeacon Farrar’s criticism that Barnabas had some share in the address, and that Humphrey conjectures that it may have been a fragment of some choral song, and that, besides, it is in tone and substance directly analogous to passages of the Old Testament, I have no hesitation in pronouncing to be, as to the former, mere deft special pleading, while by the latter you will rob the most original of our Lord’s sayings of their originality if you pay heed to pale parallels. Not to say that if Barnabas had some share in the address, Paul had also some share. But the entire address is inestimably Pauline ; and this address alone calcines the argued-for “insensibility.”

We have not to read very far in the Acts of the Apostles before coming upon an equally memor-

able declaration of the same observing character in the great address on Mars Hill, in Athens, with the altar to the Unknown God for text, "Whom therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you. The God that *made the world and all things therein*, He, being Lord of *heaven and earth*, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is He served by men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He Himself *giveth to all life, and breath, and all things*" (xvii. 23-25). Does not the very sameness of the presentation in the Lystra and the Athens speech not only traverse Archdeacon Farrar's claim for Barnabas in the former, but go to attest that this was a mould into which the illustrious speaker's thoughts instinctively ran—that to him the book of the visible creation was an open one, and that he was constantly reading in it? He quotes as pat to his audience a saying from one of their own poets; but he leads them past and away from it to the vaster handwriting of God in sky and earth. In the mouth of St. Paul, "He Himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things," may convince that any manifestation of "life," any breathing thing, nay, "all things" (his own words), met his eye, and took captive his adoring and joyous heart.

We have now to "search" the letters of the apostle; and we have just entered on, perhaps, the greatest of them all—to the Romans—when we come upon another of his absolutely spontaneous, objective observations—i. 20, "The invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His existing power and divinity." I put it to an impartial reader and adequate thinker, if this account of practically the same supreme thought does not witness to a historic-biographic fact that the problem of the visible universe, as testifying to the being and attributes of God, was unceasingly before the apostle? He strikes no new note there. It is the essence of a thousand musings and rapturous studies of "the things that are made"; and, to my judgment, it is sheer perversity and stone-blindness not to perceive, through these three recorded references to the visible universe, that, so far from being neglectful of the beauties and glories of nature, St. Paul had an abiding apprehension and an abiding "delight" in them all. The truth is, that if I were called on to gather

into great poetic form my impression of the apostle's attitude toward nature, I should turn to Wordsworth. The key to these references thus far I find here—

"I have felt  
A presence that disturbs me with the joy  
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime  
Of something far more deeply interfused,  
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,  
And the round ocean, and the living air,  
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:  
A motion and a spirit, that impels  
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,  
And rolls through all things."

There is a *differentia* doubtless as between St. Paul and Wordsworth, inasmuch as far more definitely and really the apostle had the sense of "God *over all*," the stupendous PERSON, who "made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things therein," from "great whales" to the lace-work of sea-weed and the stone-flowering of coral. Yet the mode of observation, and the feel of the wording, renders the alleged "insensibility" fantastically false, and the non-delight simply absurd. The recurring references to the "invisible things" reminds me to accentuate here, in passing, that the sublime delineation of Christ, as "far above all principalities and power and might and dominion," shows how grandly and picturesquely he thought out and could represent Christ's glorious position.

Advancing, we come to something still deeper and more passionate. And again Wordsworth is inevitably recalled. I refer to that infinitely pathetic and burdened cry as the apostle listens to the perpetual utterance of creation's pain (viii. 22): "We know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain with us until now." I place alongside of this, immortal words from the same immortal poem already quoted, and the more readily because I have an almost certain conviction that Wordsworth wrote to me in the same letter wherein he acknowledged his obligation to Henry Vaughan in his *Intimations of Immortality*, that he had St. Paul in recollection when he was composing this part of the poem—

"I have learn'd  
To look on nature, not as in the hour  
Of thoughtless youth; but hearing oftentimes  
The still, sad music of humanity;  
Not harsh, nor grating, though of ample power  
To chasten and subdue."

And again—

“That blessed mood,  
In which the burthen of the mystery,  
In which the heavy and the weary weight,  
Of all this unintelligible world  
Is lightened; . . .  
While with an eye made quiet by the power  
Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,  
We see into the life of things.”

That eye I believe St. Paul to have had in his noble head; and, consequently, while he was no singer, like David or Asaph, and much less of a fluent and declamatory tongue, he did show and delight in showing, and was responsive as Æolian harp to the wind, to all finer, subtler, objective influences and “sights and sounds.” How inept is the critic’s assertion that the apostle “manifested a curious insensibility to the sights AND SOUNDS of nature,” in the presence of 1 Corinthians xiv. 10, “There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and no kind is without signification” (*ποσαῦτα, εἰ τύχοι, γένη φωνῶν ἔστιν ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῶν ἀφώνον*)—where the “voices” are of nature, not of languages. Cognate is the earlier allusion to musical instruments (vers. 7, 8), and before that (1 Cor. xiii. 1), to the “sounding brass and clanging cymbal.” The man who wrote these words—and there are many besides—was a listener and observer of the “sounds of nature.”

Searching the letters of St. Paul still further, I am arrested again and again by his observation of man as man in body and soul—an observation that is demonstrative to us of the profound joy with which he contemplated the workmanship of God in our body, and the wonder with which he watched, on the one hand, the manifestation of the soul’s faculties, and, on the other, the restoration of beauty and “glory” beneath the touch of the Holy Ghost. Of the body, it is only needful to refer to Rom. xii. 4, 5; 1 Cor. xii. 14–27. Eye, ear, foot, hand—all had excited his admiration and rewarded his study, so that he inevitably employs the human body as a supreme symbol of the Church of Christ. Nor must it be overlooked how Hegel-like deep is his philosophy of the dependence and interdependence of part and part, and how awful were the chaos if eye lied to ear, or ear to eye, or hand to foot. But the apostle’s musings on the soul are to me still more convincing of his objectivity of observation. I take 2 Cor. vi. 16 . . . “even as God said, I will dwell

in them, and walk in them.” Very thin and meagre are the Old Testament words that are usually supposed to have been the source whence St. Paul fetched this sublime description of the Church of God as a vast temple. This is not the place or occasion for exegesis or even explanation. The one point I wish to accentuate is that the apostle, inspired by the Spirit of God, widens and lengthens and deepens the conception of a human soul, until it rises before him as so spacious and capacious that Almighty God can not only enter and dwell, but “walk” up and down in it. For God “dwells” and “walks” in His Church only as He “dwells” and “walks” in individual souls. Hence the magnificence of the apostle’s conception. All this points to St. Paul’s deep and “delighted” and adoring contemplation of the human soul. These temple references also demand that accent be put on his self-evidencing admiration and wonder over the temple at Ephesus, and its helpfulness to him and to us “to comprehend the breadth, and length, and depth, and height” of the love of Christ (Eph. iii. 19). A vision of that august temple seems to have haunted him, so far was he from not observing either the works of God or of man. Some of his most wonderful appeals start from recollections of the temple of Ephesus and other shrines of paganism. Yes; he did study “the gods many and lords many” (1 Cor. viii. 5). He was not blind to either their beauty or their marvel, though neither could he conceal the tragedy of folly of human worship of them. Besides the supreme temples of Ephesus and Athens, we have a large group of Pauline metaphors drawn from building. I can only note here the blended metaphors of 1 Corinthians iii. 9, “Ye are God’s husbandry, God’s building,” and for comparison and contrast, Ephesians ii. 20 *sq.* Once more how egregious is it to conceive of such a writer as this as inobservant of the things before and around him in his classical journeyings. What a noticing pair of eyes he had, too, of the superabundance in a “great house”! (2 Tim. ii. 20). Another group of Pauline metaphors is still larger and richer, viz. from husbandry (as already seen incidentally). I must compress on this, but take these summarily—(1 Cor. iii. 9) “Ye are God’s tilled land”—a suggestive instance; (2 Cor. x. 13) “according to the measure of the province which God apportioned to us as a measure” (= the portion of God’s vineyard assigned). So Romans

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