

THE
TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE:

VIEWED IN CONNEXION WITH THE ENTIRE SCHEME OF

THE DIVINE DISPENSATIONS.

BY

PATRICK FAIRBAIRN,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

In vetere Testamento novum latet et in novo vetus patet.
AUGUST, QUÆST. IN EX. LXXIII.

SECOND EDITION, MUCH ENLARGED AND IMPROVED.

TWO VOLUMES IN ONE.

PHILADELPHIA:
SMITH & ENGLISH, 36 NORTH SIXTH STREET.
1854.

P R E F A C E.

THE two volumes here offered to the public, are in substance a republication of those, bearing the same general title, which appeared, the one in 1845, the other in 1847; yet not without considerable differences. The principles brought out on the subject of Typology are, with a few slight modifications, the same in this as in the former edition, and the same view is consequently exhibited of the nature of the connection between the Old and the New Testament dispensations. The portion of the work, however, in which the principles of the subject are formally investigated, has been entirely re-written, and, by means both of omissions and additions, of alterations in thought and style, has been rendered more distinct in statement, and, it is hoped also, more clear and conclusive in argument. The remaining portion of the first volume, which treats in detail of primeval and patriarchal times, has been yet more materially changed, and by much the larger proportion of this part of the volume, as it now stands, differs from the corresponding volume of the former edition. Various fresh topics are here for the first time introduced, and in the discussion of others a more natural and appropriate method has been adopted. By adhering more closely to the guidance of Scripture, and keeping more carefully in view the progression in the Divine plan, a better, and to my own mind at least, a more satisfactory view has been presented of both the religion and the history of the periods before the Law. Several things, which

might otherwise appear to be defects in the earlier records of Scripture, and which have often been felt to be somewhat anomalous, are thus seen to be entirely in place, and to have naturally arisen from the method of the Divine procedure.

The second volume differs both less frequently and less materially from the corresponding volume of the former edition. Occasional alterations, however, have been introduced throughout the volume; and several new sections have been added toward the close. A good deal of supplementary matter, closely connected with the main theme, has been thrown into the form of Appendices, a portion of which has already appeared elsewhere, and a portion also belonged to the first edition. But the larger part of an Appendix, in the first volume of that edition, on the restoration of the Jews, that, namely, which treated of the prophecies supposed to refer to the subject, has been omitted here. The chief reason for this omission is, not any change of opinion regarding the interpretation of those prophecies, but a conviction that the subject enters too largely into Old Testament prophecy to be quite satisfactorily discussed in so short a compass. And it is my intention, if time and opportunity are given, to institute a separate inquiry into the nature, function, and characteristics of Prophecy in general, in which occasion will be taken to resume what has been for the present withdrawn.

In making the alterations and improvements above referred to, I have not overlooked either the suggestions that have been privately tendered, or the strictures that have appeared in the public journals. The latter have not certainly been always made in the most genial and courteous spirit; though I feel that, on the whole, much more is due from me of grateful acknowledgment than of reasonable complaint. And as in the historical survey, which forms the Introduction, I have deemed it needful to notice at some length a hostile attack in a periodical on the other side of the Atlantic,

I should not do justice to my own feelings if I did not also refer to a lengthened critique, which appeared in another Transatlantic Periodical—the Princeton Review—not less distinguished by the kindliness of its tone, than by the discriminative spirit of its remarks. It is impossible, in the treatment of such a subject, to give universal satisfaction. And I have no doubt, that even where there is a general acquiescence in the views that are unfolded, there may still appear, notwithstanding the additional pains taken to avoid them, certain faults and imperfections in the mode of execution. But in this respect, as well as others, impartial and competent judges will not refuse a certain measure of indulgence, especially when it is considered how little has been hitherto done for the correct treatment of the Typology of Scripture, and through how many intricate and perplexing topics the path of inquiry necessarily leads. It may justly be deemed matter of thankfulness, if any solid footing has been gained in such a field, and if but a few leading principles have been established with such a degree of certainty, as may be sufficient to pave the way for further investigations.

Fault has in some quarters been found with the extensive range of subjects embraced in the course of discussion, and especially with the large space devoted to the consideration of the Law in the second volume. It might, no doubt, have been possible to have considerably narrowed the field, if the object had been simply to pick out from the earlier dispensations, such portions as more peculiarly possess a typical character. But to have treated the typical in such an isolated manner, would have conduced little either to the proper elucidation of the subject itself, or to the satisfaction and enlightenment of intelligent readers. The Typology of the Old Testament touches at every point on its religion and worship. It is part of a complicated system of truth and duty ; and we cannot possibly attain to a correct discernment and due appreciation

of the several parts, without contemplating them in the relation they bear both to each other and to the whole.

Some, on the other hand, will probably feel dissatisfied at the omission, or comparatively brief treatment of certain controversial topics, which are agitated in the present day, and which partly depend for their settlement on the view that is taken of subjects belonging to the Old Testament dispensations. The proper object, however, of a work of this nature, is rather to lay a right foundation for the fair and legitimate use of Old Testament materials in matters of controversy, than actually to make that use in every case that might occur. There are cases in which a certain application of the views taken of Old Testament subjects to present controversies, could not fitly be avoided ; but even in these it was necessary to keep within definite limits, to prevent the discussion from becoming unduly protracted.

With these explanations, the Work, in its more enlarged and matured form, is submitted to the judgment of the Public, and commended to the blessing of Him, whose ways it seeks to unfold and vindicate.

PATRICK FAIRBAIRN.

ABERDEEN, *November* 1853.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME FIRST.

BOOK FIRST.

	Page
Inquiry into the Principles of Typical Interpretation, with a view chiefly to the determination of the real nature and design of Types, and the extent to which they entered into God's earlier dispensations.	
CHAP. I. Historical and Critical survey of the past and present state of Theological opinion on the subject,	17
... II. The nature, use, and design of Types considered with an especial reference to what are commonly designated Ritual Types, or the Symbolical Institutions of Old Testament worship,	59
... III. The same subject continued, but with a view more especially to the solution of the question, Whether or how far the historical characters and transactions of the Old Testament may be regarded as Typical?—Historical Types,	78
... IV. Prophetical Types, or the combination of Type with Prophecy—Alleged double sense of Prophecy,	100
... V. The interpretation of particular Types—specific principles and directions,	137
... VI. The place due to the subject of Types as a branch of Theological study, and the advantages arising from its proper cultivation,	167

BOOK SECOND.

THE DISPENSATION OF PRIMEVAL AND PATRIARCHAL TIMES.

	Page
Preliminary Remarks,	191
CHAP. I. The divine truths embodied in the historical transactions connected with the Fall, being those on which the first Symbolical Religion was based,	
. . . II. The Tree of Life,	200
. . . III. The Cherubim (and the Flaming Sword),	214
. . . IV. Sacrificial Worship,	221
. . . V. The Sabbatical Institution,	248
. . . VI. Typical things in history during the progress of the first Dis- pensation,	265
SECT. I. The Seed of Promise—Abel, Enoch,	
. . . II. Noah and the Deluge,	273
. . . III. The New World and its Inheritors—the Men of Faith,	280
. . . IV. The change in the Divine Call from the general to the particular—Shem, Abraham,	288
. . . V. The subjects and channels of blessing—Abraham and Isaac, Jacob and the twelve Patriarchs,	296
. . . VI. The Inheritance destined for the Heirs of Blessing,	307
APPENDIX A. Typical forms in Nature,	
. . . B. The Old Testament in the New,	379
I. The Historical and Didactic portions,	382
II. Prophecies referred to by Christ,	389
III. The deeper principles involved in Christ's use of the Old Testament,	394

	Page
IV. The applications made by the Evangelists of Old Testament Prophecies,	403
V. Applications in the writings of the Apostle Paul,	410
VI. The applications made in the Epistle to the Hebrews,	418
APPENDIX C. The doctrine of a Future State,	425
... D. On Sacrificial Worship,	445
... E. Does the original relation of the seed of Abraham to the land of Canaan afford any ground for expecting their final return to it?	450

 ERRATA.

- At page 66, line 25, *for* "latter" *read* "later"
 — 172, — 22, *for* "arguments" *read* "agreements"
 — 232, — 19, *for* "inhabitest" *read* "inhabiteth"
 — 266, — 2, *for* "in acting" *read* "an acting"
 — 308, — 24, *for* "as" *read* "than"
 — 450, — 7, *for* "P. 357" *read* "P. 377."

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE.

BOOK FIRST.

INQUIRY INTO THE PRINCIPLES OF TYPICAL INTERPRETATION, WITH
A VIEW CHIEFLY TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE REAL NATURE
AND DESIGN OF TYPES, AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEY ENTERED
INTO GOD'S EARLIER DISPENSATIONS.

CHAPTER FIRST.

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE PAST AND PRESENT STATE OF
THEOLOGICAL OPINION ON THE SUBJECT.

THE Typology of Scripture has been one of the most neglected departments of theological science. It has never altogether escaped from the region of doubt and uncertainty; and many still regard it as a field incapable, from its very nature, of being satisfactorily explored, or cultivated so as to yield any sure and appreciable results. Hence, it is not unusual to find those who otherwise are agreed in their views of divine truth, and in the general principles of scriptural interpretation, differing materially in the estimate they have formed of the Typology of Scripture. Where one hesitates, another is full of confidence; and the landmarks that are set up to-day are again shifted to-morrow. With such various and contradictory sentiments prevailing on the subject, it is necessary, in the first instance, to take an historical and critical survey of the field, that we may distinctly perceive what has been done in the past, and what remains yet to be

done, in order to the establishment of a well-grounded and scriptural Typology.

I. We naturally begin with the Christian Fathers. Their typological views, however, are only to be gathered from the occasional examples to be met with in their writings; as they nowhere lay down any clear and systematic principles for the regulation of their judgments in the matter. Some exception might, perhaps, be made in respect to Origen. And yet with such vagueness and dubiety has he expressed himself regarding the proper interpretation of Old Testament Scripture, that by some he has been understood to hold, that there is a fourfold, by others a threefold, and by others again only a twofold sense in the sacred text. The truth appears to be, that while he contended for a fourfold *application* of Scripture, he regarded it as susceptible only of a twofold *sense*. And considered generally, the principles of interpretation on which he proceeded were not essentially different from those usually followed by the great majority of the Greek Fathers. But before stating how these bore on the subject now under consideration, it will be necessary to point out a distinction too often lost sight of, both in earlier and in later times, between *allegorical* and *typical* interpretations, properly so called. These have been very commonly confounded together, as if they were essentially one in principle, and differed only in the extent to which the principle may be carried. There is, however, a specific difference between the two, which it is not very difficult to apprehend, and which it is of some importance to notice in connection especially with the interpretations of patristic writers.

An allegory is a narrative, either expressly feigned for the purpose, or—if describing facts which really took place—describing them only for the purpose of representing certain higher truths or principles than the narrative, in its literal aspect, whether real or fictitious, could possibly have taught. The ostensible representation, therefore, is either invented, or at least used, as a mere cover for the higher sense, which may refer to things ever so remote from those immediately described, if only the corresponding relations are preserved. So that allegorical interpretations of Scripture properly comprehend the two following cases, and these only :

1. When the scriptural representation is actually held to have had no foundation in fact—to be a mere mythos, or fabulous description, invented for the sole purpose of exhibiting the mysteries of divine truth ; or, 2. When—without moving any question about the real or fictitious nature of the representation—it is considered incapable as it stands of yielding any adequate or satisfactory sense, and is consequently employed, *precisely as if it had been fabulous*, to convey some meaning of an entirely different and higher kind. The difference between allegorical interpretations, in either of these senses, and those which are properly called typical, cannot be fully manifested till we have ascertained the exact nature and design of a type. It will be enough meanwhile to say, that typical interpretations of Scripture differ from allegorical ones of the first or fabulous kind, in that they indispensably require the reality of the facts or circumstances stated in the original narrative. And they differ also from the other, in requiring, besides this, that the same truth or principle be embodied alike in the type and the antitype. *The typical is not properly a different or higher sense, but a different or higher application of the same sense.*

Returning, then, to the writings of the Fathers, and using the expressions *typical* and *allegorical* in the senses now respectively ascribed to them, there can be no doubt that the Fathers generally were much given both to typical and allegorical explanations,—the Greek Fathers more to allegorical than to typical,—and to allegorical more in the second than in the first sense, described above. They do not appear, for the most part, to have discredited the plain truth or reality of the statements made in Old Testament history. They seem rather to have considered the sense of the latter true and good, as far as it went, but of itself so meagre and puerile, that it was chiefly to be regarded as the vehicle of a much more refined and ethereal instruction. Origen, however, certainly went farther than this, and expressly denied that many things in the Old Testament had any real existence. In his *Principia* (Lib. iv.) he affirms, that “when the Scripture history could not otherwise be accommodated to the explanation of spiritual things, matters have been asserted which did not take place, nay, which *could* not have taken place ; and others again, which though they might have occurred, yet never actually did so.” Again,

when speaking of some notices in the life of Rebecca, he says—“In these things, I have often told you, there is not a relation of histories, but a concoction of mysteries.”¹ And, in like manner, in his annotations on the first chapters of Genesis, he plainly scouts the idea of God’s having literally clothed our first parents with the skins of slain beasts—calls it absurd, ridiculous, and unworthy of God, and declares that in such a case the naked letter is not to be adhered to as true, but exists only for the spiritual treasure which is concealed under it.²

Statements of this kind are of too frequent occurrence in the writings of Origen to have arisen from inadvertence, or to admit of being resolved into mere hyperboles of expression. They were, indeed, the natural result of that vicious system of interpretation which prevailed in his age, when it fell, as it did in his case, into the hands of an ardent and enthusiastic follower. At the same time it must be owned, in behalf of Origen, that however possessed of what has been called “the allegorical fury,” he does not appear *generally* to have discredited the facts of sacred history; and that he differed from the other Greek Fathers, chiefly in the extent to which he went in decrying the literal sense as carnal and puerile, and extolling the mystical as alone suited for those who had become acquainted with the true wisdom. It would be out of place here, however, to go into any particular illustration of this point, as it is not immediately connected with our present inquiry. But we shall refer to a single specimen of his allegorical mode of interpretation, for the purpose chiefly of shewing distinctly how it differed from what is of a simply typological character. We make our selection from Origen’s homily on Abraham’s marriage with Keturah (Hom. vi. in Genes.). He does not expressly disavow his belief in the fact of such a marriage having actually taken place in real life, though his language most naturally bears that meaning; but he intimates that this, in common with the other marriages of the patriarchs, contained a sacramental mystery. And what might this be? Nothing less than the sublime truth, “that there is no end to wisdom, and that old age sets no bounds to improvement in knowledge. The death of Sarah (he says) is to be understood as the perfecting of virtue. But he who has attained

¹ Opera, vol. ii. p. 83, Ed. Delarue.

² Ibid. p. 29.

to a consummate and perfect virtue, must always be employed in some kind of learning—which learning is called by the divine Word, his wife. Abraham, therefore, when an old man, and his body in a manner dead, took Keturah to wife. I think it was better, according to the exposition we follow, that the wife should have been received when his body was dead, and his members were mortified. For we have a greater capacity for wisdom when we bear about the dying of Christ in our mortal body. Then Keturah, whom he married in his old age, is, by interpretation, *incense*, or sweet odour. For he said, even as Paul said, ‘We are a sweet savour of Christ.’ Sin is a foul and putrid thing; but if any of you in whom this no longer dwells, have the fragrance of righteousness, the sweetness of mercy, and by prayer continually offer up incense to God, ye also have taken Keturah to wife.” And on he goes to shew, how many such wives may be taken; hospitality is one, the care of the poor another, patience a third, each christian excellence, in short, a wife; and hence it was, that the patriarchs are reported to have had so many wives, and that Solomon is said to have possessed them even by hundreds, he having received plenitude of wisdom like the sand on the sea-shore, and consequently grace to exercise the greatest number of virtues.

We have here a genuine example of allegorical interpretation, if not actually holding the historical matter to be fabulous, at least treating it as if it were so. It is of no moment, for any purpose which such a mode of interpretation might serve, whether Abraham and Keturah had a local habitation among this world’s families, and whether their marriage was a real fact in history, or an incident fitly thrown into a fictitious narrative, constructed for the purpose of symbolizing the doctrines of a divine philosophy. If it had been handled after the manner of a type, and not as an allegory, whatever shade of meaning might have been ascribed to it as a representation of gospel mysteries, the story must have been assumed as real, and the act of Abraham made to correspond with something essentially the same in kind—some sort of union, for example, between parties holding a similar relation to each other, as Abraham did to Keturah. In this, though there might have been an error in the special application that was made of it, there would at least have been some appearance of a probable ground for it to rest upon. But woven into the fine alle-

gorical form it assumes under the hands of Origen, the whole, history and interpretation together, become like "the baseless fabric of a vision." For, what connection, either in the nature of things, or in the actual experience of the Father of the Faithful, can be shewn to exist between the death of one wife and the consummation of virtue in the husband; or the marriage of another and his pursuit of knowledge? Why might not the loss sustained in the first case as well represent the decay of virtue, and the acquisition in the second denote a relaxation in the search after the hidden treasures of wisdom and knowledge? There would evidently be as good reason for asserting the one as the other; and, indeed, with such an arbitrary and elastic style of interpretation, there is nothing, either false or true in doctrine, wise or unwise in practice, which might not claim support in Scripture. The Bible would be made to reflect every hue of fancy, and every shade of belief in those who assumed the office of interpretation; and instead of being rendered serviceable to a higher instruction, it would be turned into one vast sea of uncertainty and confusion.

In proof of this we need only appeal to the use which Clement of Alexandria, Origen's master, has made of another portion of sacred history which treats of Abraham's wives (Strom. L. I. p. 333). The instruction, which he finds couched under the narrative of Abraham's marriage successively to Sarah and Hagar, is, that a Christian ought to cultivate philosophy and the liberal arts before he devotes himself wholly to the study of divine wisdom. The way he takes to make out this is the following:—Abraham is the image of a perfect Christian, Sarah the image of Christian wisdom, and Hagar the image of philosophy or human wisdom (certainly a very ill-favoured likeness!). Abraham lived for a long time in a state of connubial sterility—whence it is inferred that a Christian, so long as he confines himself to the study of divine wisdom and religion alone, will never bring forth any great or excellent fruits. Abraham, then, with the consent of Sarah, takes to him Hagar, which proves, according to Clement, that a Christian ought to embrace the wisdom of this world, or philosophy, and that Sarah, or divine wisdom, will not withhold her consent. Lastly, after Hagar had borne Ishmael to Abraham, he resumed his intercourse with Sarah, and

of her begat Isaac ; the true import of which is, that a Christian, after having once thoroughly grounded himself in human learning and philosophy, will, if he then devotes himself to the culture of divine wisdom, be capable of propagating the race of true Christians, and of rendering essential service to the church. Thus we have two entirely different senses extracted from similar transactions by the master and the disciple ; and still, far from being exhausted, as many more might be obtained, as there are fertile imaginations disposed to use the sacred narrative after the form of their own peculiar conceits.

It was not simply the historical portions of Old Testament Scripture which were thus allegorized by Origen and the other Greek Fathers, who belonged to the same school. A similar mode of interpretation was applied to the ceremonial institutions of the ancient economy ; and a higher sense was often sought for in these, than we find any indication of in the epistle to the Hebrews. Clement even carried the matter so far as to apply the allegorical principle to the ten commandments, an extravagance in which Origen did not follow him ; though we can scarcely tell why he should not have done so. For, even the moral precepts of the Decalogue touch at various points on the common interests and relations of life ; and it was the grand aim of the philosophy, in which the allegorizing then prevalent had its origin, to carry the soul above these into the high abstractions of a contemplative theosophy. The Fathers of the Latin church were much less inclined to such airy speculations, and their interpretations of Scripture, consequently, possessed more of a realistic and unimaginative character. Allegorical interpretations are, indeed, occasionally found in them, but they are more sparingly introduced, and less extravagantly pushed. Typical meanings, however, are as frequent in the one class as in the other, and equally adopted without rule or limit. If in the Eastern church we find such objects as the tree of life in the garden of Eden, the rod of Moses, Moses himself with his arms extended during the conflict with Amalek, exhibited as types of the cross ; in the Western church, as represented, for example, by Augustine, we meet with such specimens as the following :—“ Wherefore did Christ enter into the sleep of death ? Because Adam slept when Eve was formed from his side, Adam being the figure of Christ, Eve as the mother of the

living, the figure of the church. And as she was formed from Adam while he was asleep, so was it when Christ slept on the cross, that the sacraments of the church flowed from his side.”¹ So again, Saul is represented as the type of death, because God unwillingly appointed him king over Israel, as he unwillingly subjected his people to the sway of death ; and David’s deliverance from the hand of Saul foreshadowed our deliverance through Christ from the power of death ; while in David’s escape from Saul’s hand, coupled with the destruction that befel Ahimelech on his account, if not in his stead, there was a prefiguration of Christ’s death and resurrection.² But we need not multiply examples, or prosecute the subject farther into detail. Enough already has been adduced to shew, that the earlier divines of the Christian church had no just or well-defined principles to guide them in their interpretations of Old Testament Scripture, which could either enable them to determine between the fanciful and the true in typical applications, or guard them against the worst excesses of allegorical license.³

¹ On Psalm xli.

² On Psalm xlii.

³ Those who wish to read farther regarding the typical and allegorical interpretations of the Fathers may consult Bishop Marsh’s Eleventh Lecture on the Interpretation of the Bible, Davidson’s Hermeneutics, or Klausen’s Hermeneutik, where the subject is treated with some diversity, and also at some length. The major part of our readers perhaps may be of opinion that they have already been detained too long with the subject, believing that such interpretations are for ever numbered among the things that were. So we had ourselves almost begun to think. And yet we have lived to see a substantial revival of the allegorical style of interpretation in a work that has only of late been issuing from the press, and a work that bears the marks of an accomplished and superior mind. We refer to that portion of Mr Worsley’s *Province of the Intellect in Religion*, which treats of the *Patriarchs in their Christian import*, and the *Apostles as the completion of the Patriarchs*. It is impossible not to regret that one who can think and write so well, and who has unfolded such spiritual and elevated views of the divine life, should in this part of his scheme of doctrine lay for himself so fanciful a foundation, and while maintaining the reality of the facts recorded in patriarchal and apostolical history, should yet transfigure them into something entirely ideal and visionary. His notion respecting the Patriarchs briefly is, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob respectively “ present to us the eternal triune object” of worship,— Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; that the marriages of the Patriarchs symbolize God’s union with his church, and with each member of it ; and especially is this done through the wives and children of Jacob, at least in regard to its practical tendency and sanctifying results. In making out the scheme, the names of the persons are peculiarly dwelt upon as furnishing a sort of key to the allegorical interpretation. Thus Leah, whose name means wearisome and fatiguing labour, was the symbol of “ services and

II. Overleaping the dark gulf of the middle ages, we come down to the period of the Reformation. At that memorable era a works which are of little worth in themselves—labours rather of a painful and reluctant duty, than of a free and joyful love.” “She sets forth to us that fundamental repulsiveness or stubbornness of our nature, whose proper and ordained discipline is the daily task-work of duty, as done not to man, nor to self, but to God.” Afterwards, Leah is identified with the ox, as the symbol of stubbornness and wearisome labour; and so “with Leah the ox symbolizes our task-work of duty, and our capacity for it,” while the sheep (Rachel signifying *sheep*), symbolizes “our labours of love, *i. e.* our real rest, and capacity for it.”—(P. 71, 113, 128.) One may guess from this specimen what ingenuities require to be plied before the author can get through all the twelve sons of Jacob, so as to make them symbols of the different graces and operations of a Christian life. We object to the entire scheme,—1. Because it is perfectly arbitrary. Though Scripture sometimes warrants us in laying stress on names, as expressive of spiritual ideas or truths connected with the persons they belonged to, yet it is only when the history itself lays stress on them, and even then they never stand alone, as the names often do with Mr Worsley, the *only* keys to the import of the transactions; so that where acts entirely fail, or where they appear to be at variance with the symbolic ideal, the key were still to be found in the name. Scripture nowhere, for example, lays any stress upon the names of Leah and Rachel; while it very pointedly refers to the bad eyes of the one, and the attractive comeliness of the other. And if we were inclined to allegorize at all, we should deem it more natural, with Justin Martyr (Trypho, c. 42.) and Jerome (on Hos. xii. 3.) to regard Leah as the symbol of the blear-eyed Jewish church, and Rachel of the beloved church of the gospel. Even this, however, is quite arbitrary, for there is nothing properly in common between the symbol and the thing symbolized—no real bond of connection uniting them together. And if by tracing out such lines of resemblance, we might indulge in a pleasing exercise of fancy, we can never deduce from them a revelation of God’s mind and will. 2. But farther, such explanations offend against great fundamental principles—the principle, for example, that the Father cannot be represented as entering into union with the Church, viewed as distinct from the Son and the Spirit; and the principle that a sinful act or an improper relation cannot be the symbol of what is divine and holy. In such a case there never can be any real agreement. Who, indeed, can calmly contemplate the idea of Abraham’s connection with Hagar, or Jacob’s connection with the two sisters and their handmaids—in themselves both manifestly wrong, and receiving on them the stamp of God’s displeasure in providence—should be the chosen symbol of God’s own relation to the Church? How very different an allegorizing of this sort is from anything sanctioned in Scripture will be shewn in the sequel. As for the correspondence between the apostles and the patriarchs individually—which Mr Worsley, in his last volume, endeavours to make out as necessary to the full symbolic exhibition of divine truth and righteousness—it appears to us so entirely destitute even of the semblance of verisimilitude, that any refutation is unnecessary. The mere facts that, according to his scheme, Peter, the first of the apostles, answers to Simeon, the least favourably known and most unimportant of the heads of Israel, and Andrew to Judah; while Simon Zelotes, the all but unknown apostle, represents a higher phase of the Christian life than Simon the son of Jonas—such facts shew how fanciful the scheme is which Mr Worsley has here been labouring to build, and how completely the evangelical narrative has been made to assume the form of his own preconceived notions.

mighty advance was made, not only beyond the ages immediately preceding, but also beyond all that had passed from the commencement of Christianity, in the sound interpretation of Scripture. The original text then at last began to be examined with something like critical exactness, and a steadfast adherence was generally professed, and in good part also maintained, to the natural and grammatical sense. The leading spirits of the Reformation were here also the great authors of reform. Luther denounced mystical and allegorical interpretations as "trifling and foolish fables, with which the Scriptures were rent into so many and diverse senses, that silly poor consciences could receive no certain doctrine of any thing."¹ Calvin, in like manner, declares that "the true meaning of Scripture is the natural and obvious meaning, by which we ought resolutely to abide;" and speaks of the "licentious system" of Origen and the allegorists, as "undoubtedly a contrivance of Satan to undermine the authority of Scripture, and to take away from the reading of it the true advantage."² In some of his interpretations, especially on the prophetic parts of Scripture, he even went to an extreme in advocating what he here calls the natural and obvious meaning, and thereby missed the more profound import, which, according to the elevated and often enigmatical style of prophecy, it was the design of the Spirit to convey. On the other side, in spite of their avowed and generally followed principles of interpretation, the writers of the Reformation-period not unfrequently fell into the old method of allegorizing, and threw out typical explanations of a kind that cannot stand a careful scrutiny. It were quite easy to produce examples of this from the writings of those who lived at and immediately subsequent to the Reformation; but it would be of no service as regards our present object, since their attention was comparatively little drawn to the subject of types; and none of them attempted to construct any distinct typological system.

III. We pass on, therefore, to a later period—about the middle of the seventeenth century—when the science of theology began to be studied more in detail, and the types consequently received a more formal consideration. About that period arose

¹ On Gal. iv. 26.

² On Gal. iv. 22.

what is called the Cocceian school, which, though it did not revive the double sense of the Alexandrian (for Cocceius expressly disclaimed any other sense of Scripture than the literal and historical one), yet was chargeable in another respect with a participation in the caprice and irregularity of the ancient allegorists. Cocceius himself, less distinguished as a systematic writer in theology than as a Hebrew scholar and learned expositor of Scripture, left no formal enunciation of principles connected with typical or allegorical interpretations; and it is chiefly from his annotations on particular passages, and the more systematic works of his followers, that these are to be gathered. How freely, however, he was disposed to draw upon Old Testament history for types of Gospel things, may be understood from a single example—his viewing what is said of Asshur going out and building Nineveh, as a type of the Turk or Mussulman power, which at once sprang from the kingdom, and shook the dominion of Antichrist (cur. Prior in Gen. x. 11.) He evidently conceived that *every* event in Old Testament history, which in any way resembled something under the New, was to be regarded as typical. And that, even notwithstanding his avowed adherence to but one sense of Scripture, he could occasionally adopt a second, appears alone from his allegorical interpretation of the eighth Psalm; according to which the *sheep* there spoken of, as being put under man, are Christ's flock—the *oxen*, those who labour in Christ's service—the *beasts of the field*, such as are strangers to the city and kingdom of God, barbarians and savages—the *fowl of the air and fish of the sea*, persons at a still greater distance from godliness; so that, as he concludes, there is nothing so wild and intractable on earth but it shall be brought under the rule and dominion of Christ.

It does not appear, however, that the views of Cocceius differed materially from those which were held by some who preceded him; and it would seem rather to have been owing to his eminence generally as a commentator than to any distinctive peculiarity in his typological principles, that he came to be so prominently identified with the school, which from him derived the name of Cocceian. If we turn to one of the earlier editions of Glass's *Philologia Sacra*, published before Cocceius commenced his critical labours (the first was published before he was born), we shall find the principles of allegorical and typical interpretations laid

down with a latitude which Cocceius himself could scarcely have quarrelled with. Indeed, we shall find few examples in his writings that might not be justified on the principles stated by Glass ; and though the latter, in his section on allegories, has to throw himself back chiefly on the Fathers, he yet produces some quotations in support of his views, both on these and on types, from some writers of his own age. There seems to have been no essential difference between the typological principles of Glass, Cocceius, Witsius, and Vitringa ; and though the first wrote some time before, and the last about half a century later than Cocceius, no injustice can be done to any of them by classing them together, and referring indifferently to their several productions. Like the Fathers, they did not sufficiently distinguish between allegorical and typical interpretations, but regarded the one as only a particular form of the other, and both as equally warranted by New Testament Scripture. Hence, the rules they adopted were to a great extent applicable to what is allegorical in the proper sense, as well as typical, though for the present we must confine ourselves to the typical department. They held, then, that there was a twofold sort of types, the one *innate*, consisting of those which Scripture itself has expressly asserted to possess a typical character ; the other *inferred*, consisting of such as, though not specially noticed or explained in Scripture, were yet, on probable grounds, inferred by interpreters as conformable to the analogy of faith, and the practice of the inspired writers in regard to similar examples.¹ This latter class were considered not less proper and valid than the other ; and pains were taken to distinguish them from those which were sometimes forged by Papists, and which were at variance with the analogies just mentioned. Of course, from their very nature they could only be employed for the support and confirmation of truths already received, and not to prove what was in itself doubtful. But not on that account were they to be less carefully searched for, or less confidently used, because thus only, it was maintained, could Christ be found in all Scripture, which all testifies of him.

It is evident alone, from this general statement, that there was

¹ Philologia Sac. Lib. II. P. I. Tract. II. sect. 4. Vitringa Obs. Sac. Vol. II. Lib. VI. c. 20. Witsius De Econom. Lib. IV. c. 6.

something vague and loose in the Cocceian system, which left ample scope for the indulgence of a luxuriant fancy. Nor can we wonder that, in practice, a mere resemblance, however accidental or trifling, between an occurrence in Old, and another in New Testament times, was deemed sufficient to constitute the one a type of the other. Hence, in the writings of the very able and learned men above referred to, we find the name of Abel (emptiness) viewed as prefiguring our Lord's humiliation; the occupation of Abel, Christ's office as the Shepherd of Israel; the withdrawal of Isaac from his father's house to the land of Moriah, Christ's being led out of the temple to Calvary; Adam's awaking out of sleep, Christ's resurrection from the dead; Samson's meeting a young lion by the way, and the transactions that followed, Christ's meeting Saul on the road to Damascus, with the important train of events to which it led; David's gathering to himself a party of the distressed, the bankrupt, and discontented, Christ's receiving into his Church publicans and sinners. And many others of a like nature.

Multitudes of examples perfectly similar—that is, equally destitute of any proper foundation in principle—are to be found in writers of our own country, such as Mather,¹ Keach,² Worden,³ J. Taylor,⁴ Guild,⁵ who belonged to the same school of interpretation, and who nearly all lived toward the latter part of the seventeenth century. Excepting the two first, they make no attempt to connect their explanations with any principles of interpretation, and these two very sparingly. Their works were all intended for popular use, and rather exhibited by particular examples, than theoretically expounded the nature of their views. They, however, agreed in admitting *inferred* as well as *innate* types, but differed—more perhaps from constitutional temperament than on theoretical grounds—in the extent to which they severally carried the liberty they claimed to go beyond the explicit warrant of New Testament Scripture. Mather in particular, and Worden, usually confine themselves to such types as have obtained special notice of some kind from the writers of the New Testament; though

¹ The Figures and Types of the Old Testament.

² Key to open the Scripture Metaphors and Types.

³ The Types unveiled, or the Gospel picked out of the Legal Ceremonies.

⁴ Moses and Aaron.

⁵ Moses unveiled.

they held the principle, that "where the analogy was evident and manifest between things under the law and things under the gospel, the one were to be concluded (on the ground simply of that analogy) to be types of the other." How far this warrant from analogy was thought capable of leading, may be learned from Taylor and Guild, especially from the latter, who has no fewer than forty-nine typical resemblances between Joseph and Christ, and seventeen between Jacob and Christ, not scrupling to swell the number by occasionally taking in acts of sin, as well as circumstances of the most trifling nature. Thus, Jacob's being a supplanter of his brother, is made to represent Christ's supplanting death, sin, and Satan; his being obedient to his parents in all things, Christ's subjection to his heavenly Father and his earthly parents; his purchasing his birthright by red pottage, and obtaining the blessing by presenting savoury venison to his father, clothed in Esau's garment, Christ's purchasing the heavenly inheritance to us by his red blood, and obtaining the blessing by offering up the savoury meat of his obedience, in the borrowed garment of our nature, &c.

Now, we may affirm of these, and many similar examples occurring in writers of the same class, that the analogy they found upon was a merely *superficial* resemblance found between things in the Old and other things in the New Testament Scriptures. But with such a loose and shifting foundation, it was manifestly left open to any one to introduce the most frivolous conceits, and to caricature rather than vindicate its grand theme. Then, if such weight was fitly attached to mere resemblances between the Old and the New, even when they were altogether of a slight and superficial kind, why should not profane as well as sacred history be ransacked for them? What, for example, might prevent Romulus (seeing that God is in all history) assembling a band of desperadoes, and founding a world-wide empire on the banks of the Tiber, from serving, as well as David in the circumstances specified above, to typify the procedure of Christ in calling to him publicans and sinners at the commencement of his kingdom? As many points of resemblance might be found in the one case as in the other; and the two transactions in ancient history, as here contemplated, stood much on the same footing as regards the appointment of God; for both alike were

the offspring of human policy, struggling against outward difficulties, and endeavouring with such materials as were available to supply the want of better resources. And thus, by pushing the matter beyond its just limits, we reduce the sacred to a level with the profane, and, at the same time, throw an air of uncertainty over the whole aspect of its typical character.¹

That the Cocceian mode of handling the typical matter of ancient Scripture so readily admitted of the introduction of trifling, far-fetched, and even altogether false analogies, was one of its capital defects. It had no essential principles or fixed rules by which to guide its interpretations—set up no proper landmarks along the field of inquiry—left room on every hand for arbitrariness and caprice to enter. It was this, perhaps, more than anything else, which tended to bring typical interpretations into disrepute, and disposed men, in proportion as the exact and critical study of Scripture came to be cultivated, to regard the subject of its typology as hopelessly involved in conjecture and uncertainty. Yet this was not the only fault inherent in the typological system now under consideration. It failed, more fundamentally still, in the idea it had formed of the connection between the Old and the New in God's dispensations—between the type and the thing typified—which it made chiefly to consist in mere external resemblances, to the comparative neglect of the great fundamental principles which are common alike to all dispensations, and in which the more vital part of the connection must be sought. It was this more radical error, which in fact gave rise to the greater portion of the extravagances that disfigured the typical illustrations of our older divines; for it naturally led them to make account of resemblances that were sometimes trivial, and sometimes only apparent. And not only so; but it also led them to misapprehend the immediate object and design of the types in their relation to the Old Testament worshippers. While these

¹ In the reference made above to the beginnings of David's kingdom, it will be understood that the characters he associated with himself are simply viewed in the light contemplated by the writers we now contend against. My own conviction is, that 1 Sam. xxii. 2, if rightly interpreted, would present those who gathered themselves to David as spiritually the better sort in Israel—those who were partly made bankrupt by oppression, and partly were grieved and vexed in their minds at the existing state of things.

as *types* speak a language that can be distinctly and intelligently understood only by us, who are privileged to read their meaning in the light of gospel realities, they yet had, as *institutions in the existing worship, or events in the current providence of God*, a present purpose to accomplish, apart from the prospective reference to future times, and we might almost say, as much as if no such reference had belonged to them.

IV. These inherent errors and imperfections in the typological system of the Cocceian school, were not long in leading to its general abandonment. But theology had little reason to boast of the change. For the system that supplanted it, without entering *at all into* a more profound investigation of the subject, or attempting to explain more satisfactorily the grounds of a typical connection between the Old and the New, simply contented itself with admitting into the rank of types what had been expressly treated as such in the Scripture itself, to the exclusion of all besides. This seemed to be the only safeguard against error and extravagance.¹ And yet, we fear, other reasons of a less justifiable kind contributed not a little to produce the result. An unhappy current had begun to set in upon the Protestant Church, in some places, while Cocceius still lived, and in still more soon after his death, which disposed many of her more eminent teachers to slight the evangelical element of Christianity, and, if not utterly to lose sight of Christ himself, at least to disrelish and repudiate a system which delighted to find traces of Him in every

¹ The following critique of Buddeus, which belongs to the earlier part of last century, already points in this direction: "It cannot certainly be denied that the Cocceians, at least some of them, have carried this matter too far. For, besides that they *everywhere* seem to find images and types of future things, where other people can discern none, when they come to make the application to the antitype, they not unfrequently descend to minute and even trifling things, nay, advance what is utterly insignificant and ludicrous, exposing holy writ to the mockery of the profane. And here it may be proper to notice the fates of exegetical theology; since that intemperate rage for allegories which appeared in Origen and the Fathers, and which had been condemned by the schoolmen, was again, after an interval, though under a different form, produced anew upon the stage. For this typical interpretation differs from the allegorical only in the circumstance, that respect is had in it to the future things which are adumbrated by the types; and so, the typical may be regarded as a sort of allegorical interpretation. But in either way the amplest scope is afforded for the play of a luxurious fancy and a fertile invention."—I. F. Buddei *Isagogæ* II. hist. Theolog. 1830.

part of revelation. It was the redeeming point of the older typology, which should be allowed to go far in extenuating the occasional errors connected with it, that it kept the work and kingdom of Christ ever prominently in view, as the grand scope and end of all God's dispensations. It *felt*, if we may so speak, correctly, whatever it may have wanted in the requisite depth and precision of *thought*. But towards the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, a general coldness very commonly discovered itself, both in the writings and the lives of even the more orthodox sections of the Church. The living energy and zeal which had achieved such important results a century before, either inactively slumbered, or spent itself in doctrinal controversies; and the faith of the Church was first corrupted in its simplicity, and then weakened in its foundations by the pernicious influence of a widely cultivated, but essentially anti-Christian philosophy. In such circumstances Christ was not allowed to maintain his proper place in the New Testament, and it is not to be wondered at if he should have been nearly banished from the Old.

Vitringa, who lived when this degeneracy from better times had made considerable progress, attributed to it much of that distaste which was then beginning to prevail in regard to typical interpretations of Scripture. With special reference to the work of Spencer on the Laws of the Hebrews—a work not less remarkable for its low-toned, semi-heathen spirit, than for its varied and well-digested learning—he lamented the inclination that appeared to seek for the grounds and reasons of the Mosaic institutions in the mazes of Egyptian idolatry, instead of endeavouring to discover in them the mysteries of the Gospel. These, he believed, the Holy Spirit had plainly intimated to be couched there, and they shone, indeed, so manifestly through the institutions themselves, that it seemed impossible for any one to perceive the type, who recognised the antitype. Nor could he conceal his fear, that the talent, authority, and learning of such men as Spencer would gain extensive credit for their opinions, and soon bring the Typology of Scripture, as he understood it, into general contempt.¹ In this apprehension he was certainly not mistaken.

¹ Obs. Sac. Vol. II. p. 460, 461.

Another generation had scarcely passed away when Dathe published his edition of the Sacred Philology of Glass, in which the section on types, to which we have already referred, was quietly dropt out, as relating to a subject no longer thought worthy of a recognised place in the science of an enlightened theology. The rationalistic spirit, in the strength of its anti-Christian tendency, had now discarded the *innate*, as well as the *inferred* types of the older divines; and the convenient principle of *accommodation*, which was at the same time introduced, furnished an easy solution for those passages in New Testament Scripture, which seemed to indicate a typical relationship between the past and the future. It was only an adaptation, called forth by Jewish prejudice or conceit, of the facts and institutions of an earlier age to things essentially different under the Gospel; but now, since the state of feeling that gave rise to it no longer existed, deservedly suffered to fall into desuetude. And thus the bond was virtually broken by the hand of these rationalizing theologians between the Old and the New in Scripture, and the records of Christianity, when scientifically interpreted, were found to have marvellously little in common with those of Judaism.

In Britain various causes contributed to hold in check this downward tendency, and to prevent it from reaching the same excess of dishonour to Christ, which it soon attained on the Continent. Even persons of a cold and philosophical temperament, such as Clarke and Jortin, not only wrote in defence of types, as having a certain legitimate use in Revelation, but also admitted more within the circle of types than Scripture itself has expressly applied to Gospel times.¹ They urged, indeed, the necessity of exercising the greatest caution in travelling beyond the explicit warrant of Scripture; and in their general cast of thought they undoubtedly had more affinity with the Spencerian than the Cocceian school. Yet a feeling of the close and pervading connection between the Old and the New Testament dispensations restrained them from discarding the more important of the *inferred* types. Jortin especially falls so much into the current of the older writers, that he employs his ingenuity in reckoning up

¹ Clarke's Evidences, p. 420, sq. Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I. p. 138--152.

so many as forty particulars in which Moses typically prefigured Christ. A work composed about the same period as that to which the Remarks of Jortin belong, and one that has had more influence than any other in fashioning the typological views generally entertained in Scotland—the production of a young dissenting minister in Dundee (Mr M'Ewen)¹—is still more free in the admission of types not expressly sanctioned in the Scriptures of the New Testament. The work itself being posthumous, and intended for popular use, contains no investigation of the grounds on which typical interpretations rest, and harmonises much more with the school that had flourished in the previous century, than that to which Clarke and Jortin belonged. As indicative of a particular style of biblical interpretation, it may be classed with the older productions of Mather and Taylor, and partakes alike of their excellencies and defects.

There was, therefore, a considerable unwillingness in this country to abandon the Cocceian ground on the subject of types. The declension came in gradually, and its progress was rather marked by a tacit rejection in practice of much that was previously held to be typical, than by the introduction of views avowedly different. It became the practice of theologians to look more into the general nature of things for the reasons of Christianity, than into the pre-existing elements and characteristics of former dispensations, and to account for the peculiarities of Judaism by its partly antagonistic, partly homogeneous relation to Paganism, rather than by any concealed reference it might have to the coming realities of the Gospel. As an inevitable consequence, the typological department of theology fell into general neglect, from which the Old Testament Scriptures themselves did not altogether escape. Those portions of them especially which narrate the history, and prescribe the religious rites of the ancient Church, were but rarely treated in a manner that bespoke any confidence in their fitness to minister to the spiritual discernment and faith of Christians. It seems, partly at least, to have been owing to this growing distaste for Old Testament inquiries, and

¹ Grace and Truth, or the Glory and Fulness of the Redeemer displayed, in an attempt to explain the Types, Figures, and Allegories of the Old Testament, by the Rev. W. M'Ewen.

this general depreciation of its Scriptures, that what is called the Hutchinsonian school arose in England—which, by a sort of recoil from the prevailing spirit, ran into the opposite extreme of searching for the elements of all knowledge, human and divine, in the writings of the Old Testament. This school possesses too much the character of an episode in the history of biblical interpretation in this country, and was itself too strongly marked by a spirit of extravagance, to render any formal account of it necessary here. It was, besides, chiefly of a physico-theological character, combining the elements of a natural philosophy with the truths of revelation, both of which it sought to extract from the statements, and sometimes even from the words and letters of Scripture. The most profound meanings were consequently discovered in the text of Scripture, in respect alike to the doctrines of the Gospel and the truths of science. One of the maxims of its founder was, that “every passage of the Old Testament looks backward and forward, and every way, like light from the sun; not only to the state before and under the law, but under the Gospel, and nothing is hid from the light thereof.”¹ When such a depth and complexity of meaning was supposed to be involved in every passage, we need not be surprised to learn, respecting the exactness of Abraham’s knowledge of future events, that he knew from preceding types and promises, that “one of his own line was to be sacrificed, to be a blessing to all the race of Adam;” and not only so, but that when he received the command to offer Isaac, he proceeded to obey it, “not doubting that Isaac was to be that person who should redeem man.”²

The cabalistic and extravagant character of the Hutchinsonian system, if it had any definite influence on the study of types and other cognate subjects, could only tend to increase the suspicion with which they were already viewed, and foster a disposition to agree to whatever might keep investigation within the bounds of sobriety and discretion. Accordingly, while nothing more was done to unfold the essential and proper ground of a typical connection between Old and New Testament things, and to prevent abuse by making the subject more thoroughly understood in its fundamental principles, the more scientific students

¹ Hutchinsen’s Works, Vol. I. p. 292.

² Ibid. Vol. VII. p. 325.

of the Bible came, by a sort of common consent, to acquiesce in the opinion, that those only were to be reckoned types to which Scripture itself, by express warrant, or at least by obvious implication, had assigned that character. We may take Bishop Marsh as the ablest and most systematic expounder of this view of the subject. He says,—“ There is no other rule by which we can distinguish a real from a pretended type, than that of Scripture itself. There are no other possible means by which we can know that a previous design and a pre-ordained connection existed. Whatever persons or things therefore, recorded in the Old Testament, were expressly declared by Christ or by his apostles to have been designed as prefigurations of persons or things relating to the New Testament, such persons or things so recorded in the former, are types of the persons or things with which they are compared in the latter. But if we assert that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing, where no such prefiguration has been declared by divine authority, we make an assertion for which we neither have, nor can have, the slightest foundation.”¹ This is certainly a very authoritative and peremptory decision of the matter. But the principle involved in this statement, though seldom so oracularly announced, has long been practically received. It was substantially adopted by Macknight, in his Dissertation on the Interpretation of Scripture, at the end of his Commentary on the Epistles, before Bishop Marsh wrote, and it has been followed since by Vanmildert and Conybeare in their Bampton Lectures, by Nares in his Warburtonian Lectures, by Chevalier in his Hulsean Lectures, by Horne in his Introduction, and a host of other writers.

Judging from an article in the American Biblical Repository, which appeared in the number for January 1841, it would appear that the leading authorities on the other side of the Atlantic concur in the same general view. The reviewer himself advocates the opinion that “ no person, event, or institution, should be regarded as typical, but what may be proved to be such from the Scriptures,” meaning by that their explicit assertion in regard to the particular case. And in support of this opinion he quotes, besides English writers, the words of two of his own countrymen,

¹ Lectures, p. 373.

Professors Stowe and Moses Stuart, the latter of whom says,—
 “ That just so much of the Old Testament is to be accounted typical as the New Testament affirms to be so, and *no more*. The fact, that any thing or event under the Old Testament dispensation was designed to prefigure something under the New, can be known to us only by revelation ; and of course all that is not designated by divine authority as typical, can never be made so by any authority less than that which guided the writers of the New Testament.”¹

Now, the view embraced by this school of interpretation lies open to one objection, in common with the school that preceded it. While the field, as to its extent, was greatly circumscribed, and in its boundaries ruled as with square and compass, nothing was done in the way of investigating it internally, or of unfolding the grounds of connection between type and antitype. Fewer points of resemblance are usually presented to us between the one and the other by the writers of this school than are found in works of an older date ; but the resemblances themselves are quite as much of a superficial and outward kind. The real harmony and connection between the Old and the New in the divine dispensations, stood precisely where it was. But other defects adhere to this modern typological system. The leading excellence of the system that preceded it was the constant reference it supposed the Scriptures of the Old Testament to bear toward Christ and the Gospel dispensation ; and the practical disavowal of this may be said to constitute the great defect of the more exact and leaner system, which has now obtained the general suffrage of the learned. It drops a golden principle for the sake of avoiding a few lawless aberrations. With the narrow limits it sets to our inquiries, we cannot indeed wander far into the regions of extravagance. But in the very prescription of these limits, it wrongfully withholds from us the key of knowledge, and shuts us up to evils scarcely less to be deprecated than those it seeks to correct. For it destroys to a large extent the bond of connection between the Old and the New Testament Scriptures, and thus deprives the Christian Church of much of the instruction in divine things which they were designed to impart. Were men accustomed, as

¹ Stuart's *Ernesti*, p. 13.

they should be, to search for the germs of Christian truth in the earliest Scriptures, and to regard the inspired records of both covenants as having for their leading object "the testimony of Jesus," they would know how much they were losers by such an undue contraction of the typical element in Old Testament Scripture. And in proportion as a more profound and spiritual acquaintance with the divine Word is cultivated, will the feeling of dissatisfaction grow in respect to a style of interpretation, that so miserably dwarfs and cripples the relation which the preparatory bears to the final in God's revelations.

It is necessary, however, to take a closer view of the subject. The principle on which this typological system is based, is, that nothing less than inspired authority is sufficient to determine the reality and import of any thing that is typical. But we can see no solid ground for such a principle. No one holds the necessity of inspiration to explain each particular prophecy, and decide even with certainty on its fulfilment, and why should it be reckoned indispensable in the closely related subject of types? This question was long ago asked by Witsius, and yet waits for a satisfactory answer. A part only, it is universally allowed, of the prophecies which refer to Christ and his kingdom have been specially noticed and interpreted by the pen of inspiration. So little necessary, indeed, was inspiration for such a purpose, that even before the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, our Lord reproved his disciples as "fools and slow of heart to believe *all* that the prophets had spoken." And from the close analogy between the two subjects—for what is a type but a prophetic act or institution?—we might reasonably infer the same liberty to have been granted, and the same obligation to be imposed, in regard to the typical parts of ancient Scripture. But we have something more than a mere argument from analogy to guide us to this conclusion. For, the very same complaint is brought by an inspired writer against private Christians concerning their slowness in understanding the typical, which our Lord brought against his disciples in respect to the prophetic portions of ancient Scripture. In the epistle to the Hebrews a sharp reproof is administered for the imperfect acquaintance believers among them had with the typical character of Melchizedec, and subjects of a like nature—thus placing it beyond a doubt that it is both

the duty and the privilege of the Church, with that measure of the Spirit's grace which it is the part even of *private* Christians to possess, to search into the types of ancient Scripture, and come to a correct understanding of them. To deny this, is plainly to withhold an important privilege from the church of Christ; to dissuade from it, is to encourage the neglect of an incumbent duty.

But the unsoundness of the principle, which would thus limit the number of types to those which New Testament Scripture has expressly noticed and explained, becomes still more apparent when it is considered what these really are, and in what manner they are introduced. Leaving out of view the tabernacle, with its furniture and services, which, as a whole, is affirmed in the epistles to the Hebrews and the Colossians to have been of a typical nature, the following examples are what the writers now referred to usually regard as having something like an explicit sanction in Scripture:—1. Persons or characters; Adam (Rom. v. 11, 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22); Melchizedec (Heb. vii.); Sarah and Hagar, Ishmael and Isaac, and by implication Abraham (Gal. iv. 22—35); Moses (Gal. iii. 19, Acts iii. 22—26); Jonah (Matth. xii. 40); David (Ezek. xxxvii. 24, Luke i. 32., &c.); Solomon (2 Sam. vii.); Zerubbabel and Joshua (Zech. iii. iv. Hag. ii. 23). 2. Transactions or events; the preservation of Noah and his family in the ark (1 Pet. iii. 20); the redemption from Egypt and its passover-memorial (Luke xxii. 15, 16, 1 Cor. v. 7); the exodus (Matth. ii. 15); the passage through the Red sea, the giving of manna, Moses's veiling of his face while the law was read; the water flowing from the smitten rock; the serpent lifted up for healing in the wilderness, and some other things that befel the Israelites there (1 Cor. x. John iii. 14, v. 33, Rev. ii. 17).¹

¹ We don't vouch, of course, for the absolute completeness of the above list. Indeed, it is scarcely possible to know what would be regarded as a complete list—some feeling satisfied with an amount of recognition in Scripture which seems quite insufficient in the eyes of others. There have been those who, on the strength of Gen. xlix. 24, would insert Joseph among the specially mentioned types, and claim also Sampson, on account of what is written in Judges xiii. 5. But scriptural warrants of such a kind are out of date now—they can no longer be regarded as current coin. On the other hand, there are not a few who deem the scriptural warrant insufficient for some of those we have specified, and think the passages, where they are noticed, refer to them merely in the way of illustration. The list, however, comprises what are usually regarded as

Now, let any person of candour and intelligence take his Bible, and examine the passages to which reference is here made, and then say, whether the manner in which these typical characters and transactions are there introduced, is such as to indicate, that these alone were held by the inspired writers to be prefigurative of similar characters and transactions under the gospel? as if in naming them they meant to exhaust the typical bearing of Old Testament history? On the contrary, we deem it impossible for any one to avoid the conviction, that in whatever respect these particular examples may have been adduced, it is simply *as examples* adapted to the occasion, and taken from a vast store-house, where many more were to be found. They have so much at least the appearance of having been selected merely on account of their suitability to the immediate end in view, that they cannot fairly be regarded otherwise than as specimens of the class they belong to. And if so, they should rather have the effect of prompting farther inquiry than of repressing it; since, instead of themselves comprehending and bounding the whole field of typical matter, they only exhibit practically the principles on which others of a like description are to be discovered and explained.

Indeed, were it otherwise, nothing could be more arbitrary and inexplicable than the Typology of Scripture. For, what is there to distinguish the characters and events, which Scripture has thus particularized, from a multitude of others, to which the typical element might equally have been supposed to belong? Is there anything on the face of the inspired record to make us look on *them* in a singular light, and attribute to them a significance altogether peculiar respecting the future affairs of God's kingdom? So far from it, that we instinctively feel, if these really possessed a typical character, so also must others, which hold an equally, or perhaps even more prominent place in the history of God's dispensations. Can it be seriously believed, for example, that Sarah and Hagar stood in a typical relation to gospel times, while no such place was occupied by Rebekah, as the spouse of Isaac, and the mother of Jacob and Esau? What reason can we imagine for Melchizedec and Jonah having been

historical types, having the authority of Scripture, by writers belonging to the school of Marsh. The arguments of those who would discard them altogether, shall be considered under next division.

constituted types—persons to whom our attention is comparatively little drawn in Old Testament history—while such leading characters as Joseph, Sampson, Joshua, are omitted? Or, for selecting the passage through the Red sea, and the incidents in the wilderness, while no account should be made of the passage through Jordan, and the conquest of the land of Canaan?

We can scarcely conceive of a mode of interpretation which should deal more capriciously with the word of God, and make so anomalous a use of its historical matter. Instead of investing these with a homogeneous character, it arbitrarily selects a few out of the general mass, and sets them up in solitary grandeur, like mystic symbols in a temple, fictitiously elevated above the sacred materials around them. The exploded principle, which sought a type in *every* notice of Old Testament history, had at least the merit of uniformity to recommend it, and could not be said to deal partially, however often it might deal fancifully, with the facts of ancient Scripture. But according to the plan now under review, for which the authority of inspiration itself is claimed, we perceive nothing but arbitrary distinctions and groundless preferences. And though unquestionably it were wrong to expect in the word of God the precise method and order, which might naturally have been looked for in a merely human composition, yet as the product, amid all its variety, of one and the same Spirit, we *are* warranted to expect that there shall be a consistent agreement among its several parts, and that distinctions shall not be created in the one Testament, which in the other seem destitute of any just foundation or apparent reason.

But then, if a greater latitude is allowed, how shall we guard against error and extravagance? Without the express authority of Scripture, how shall we be able to distinguish between a happy illustration and a real type? In the words of Bishop Marsh: “By what means shall we determine, in any given instance, that what is *alleged* as a type, was really *designed* for a type? The only possible source of information on this subject is Scripture itself. The only possible means of knowing that two distant, though similar historical facts, were so connected in the general scheme of divine Providence, that the one was designed to prefigure the other is the authority of that book, in which the

scheme of divine Providence is unfolded.”¹ This is an objection, indeed, which strikes at the root of the whole matter, and its validity can only be ascertained by a thorough investigation into the fundamental principles of the subject. That Scripture is the sole rule, on the authority of which we are to distinguish what is properly typical from what is not, we readily grant—though not in the straitened sense contended for by Bishop Marsh and those who hold similar views, as if there were no way for Scripture to furnish a sufficient direction on the subject, except by specifying every particular case. It is possible, surely, that in this, as well as in other things, Scripture may unfold certain fundamental views or principles, of which it makes but a few individual applications, and for the rest leaves them in the hand of spiritually enlightened consciences. The more so, as it is one of the leading peculiarities of New Testament Scripture rather to develop great truths, than to dwell on minute and isolated facts. It is a presumption against, not in favour of, the system we now oppose, that it would shut up the Typology of Scripture, in so far as connected with the characters and events of sacred history, within the narrow circle of a few scattered and apparently random examples. And the attempt to rescue it from this position, if in any measure successful, will also serve to exhibit the unity of design which pervades the inspired records of both covenants, the traces they contain of the same divine hand, the subservience of the one to the other, and the mutual dependence alike of the Old upon the New, and of the New upon the Old.

V. We have still, however, another stage of our critical survey before us, and one calling in some respects for careful discrimination and inquiry. The style of interpretation which we have connected with the name of Marsh could not, in the nature of things, afford satisfaction to men of thoughtful minds, who must have something like equitable principles as well as external authority to guide them in their interpretations. Such persons could not avoid feeling that, if there was so much in the Old Testament bearing a typical relation to the New, as was admitted on scriptural authority by the school of Marsh, there must be

¹ Lectures, p. 372.

considerably more ; and also, that underneath that authority there must be a substratum of fundamental principles capable of bearing what Scripture itself has raised on it, and whatever besides may fitly be conjoined with it. But some, again, might possibly be of opinion that the authority of Scripture cannot warrantably carry us so far, and that both scriptural authority, and the fundamental principles involved in the nature of the subject, apply only in part to what the followers of Marsh regarded as typical. Accordingly, among more recent inquirers we have examples of each mode of divergence from the formal rules laid down by the preceding school of interpretation. The search for first principles has disposed some greatly to enlarge the typological field, and it has disposed others greatly to curtail it.

1. Of the former class the chief examples are to be found in Germany ; as it was there also that the new and more profound spirit of investigation began to develop itself. Near the commencement of the present century the religions of antiquity became there, as they had never been before, the subject of learned inquiry, and a depth of meaning was discovered in the myths and external symbols of these, which in the preceding century was not so much as dreamt of. Creuzer, in particular, by his great work (*Symbolik*) created quite a sensation in this department of learning, and opened up what seemed to be an entirely new field of research. He was followed by Baur (*Symbolik und Mythologie*), Görres (*Mythengeschichte*), Müller, and others of less note, each endeavouring to proceed farther than his predecessors into the explication of the religious views of the ancients, by weaving together, and interpreting what is known of their historical legends and ritual services. These inquiries were at first conducted merely in the way of antiquarian research and philosophical speculation ; and the religion of the Old Testament was deemed, in that point of view, too unimportant to be made the subject of special consideration. Creuzer only here and there throws out some passing allusions to it. Even Baur, though a theologian, enters into no regular investigation of the symbols of Judaism, while he expatiates at great length on all the varieties of Heathenism. By and bye, however, a better spirit appeared. Mosaism, as the religion of the Old Testament is called, had a distinct place allotted it by Görres among the ancient religions of

Asia. And at last it was itself treated at great length, and with consummate ability and learning, in a separate work—the *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* of Bähr (published in 1837-9.) This is still the great work in Germany on the meaning of the Mosaic symbols, although it is pervaded by fundamental errors of the gravest kind (on which we shall afterwards have occasion to remark), and not unfrequently falls into fanciful views on particular parts. Some of these have been corrected by Hengstenberg in the second volume of his *Authentic des Pentateuchus*, who has also furnished many good typical illustrations in his Christology and other exegetical works. Tholuck, in his Commentary on the Hebrews, has followed in the same tract, generally adopting the explanations of Hengstenberg, and still more recently (chiefly since the publication of our first edition), further contributions have been made by Kurtz, Baumgarten, Delitzsch. Even De Wette, in his old age, caught something of this new spirit; and after many an effort to depreciate apostolic Christianity by detecting in it symptoms of Judaical weakness and bigotry, he made at least one commendable effort in the nobler direction of elevating Judaism by pointing to the manifold germs it contained of a spiritual Christianity. In a passage quoted by Bähr (vol. i. p. 16, from an article of De Wette on the “*Charakteristik des Hebraismus*”), he says,—“Christianity sprang out of Judaism. Long before Christ appeared, the world was prepared for his appearance: *the entire Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of him who was to come, and has come.* Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent of Christ long before he came, and in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less clear, descried the new doctrine? The typological comparison, also, of the Old Testament with the New, was by no means a mere play of fancy; nor can it be regarded as altogether the result of accident, that the evangelical history, in the most important particulars, runs parallel with the Mosaic. Christianity lay in Judaism as leaves and fruits do in the seed, though certainly it needed the divine sun to bring them forth.”

Such language, and especially from such a quarter, indicates a decided change. Yet it must not be supposed, on reading so strong a testimony, as if every thing were already conceded; for

what by such writers as De Wette is granted in the general, is often denied or explained away in the particular. Nor has any systematic treatise (so far as we know) yet appeared on the Continent, unfolding the grounds of a typological connection between the things of the Old and those of the New Testament dispensations, and laying its foundations broad and deep in the great principles of God's administration. Bähr confines himself almost entirely to the mere interpretation of the symbols of the Mosaic dispensation, and, therefore, even when his views are correct, has only supplied some materials for the construction of a sound typological system. Tholuck and other learned men still note it as a defect in their literature, that they are without any work on the subject suited to the existing position and demands of theological science.

It is to be observed, however, that this new current opinion among the better part of theologians on the Continent, leads them to find the typical element widely diffused through the historical and prophetic, as well as the more strictly religious portions of the Old Testament. No one who is in any degree acquainted with the exegetical productions of Hengstenberg and Olshausen, now made accessible to English readers, can have failed to perceive this, from the tone of their occasional references and illustrations. Their unbiassed exegetical spirit rendered it impossible for them to do otherwise; for the same connection, they perceived, runs like a thread through the whole, and binds all together. Indeed, the only formal attempt made to work out a new system of typological interpretation—the small treatise of Olshausen (published in 1824, and consisting only of 124 widely printed pages), entitled, *Ein Wort über tiefern Schriftsinn*, has respect almost exclusively to the historical and prophetic parts of ancient Scripture. When he comes distinctly to unfold what he calls the deeper exposition of Scripture, he contents himself with a brief elucidation of the following points:—That Israel's relation to God is represented in Scripture as forming an image of all and each of mankind, in so far as the divine life is possessed by them—that Israel's relation to the surrounding heathen in like manner imaged the conflict of all spiritual men with the evil in the world—that a parallelism is drawn between Israel and Christ as the one who completely realized what Israel should

have been—and that all real children of God again image what, in the whole, is found imperfectly in Israel and perfectly in Christ, (p. 87-110.)

The positions, it must be confessed, indicate a considerable degree of vagueness and generality; and the treatise, as a whole, is defective in first principles and logical precision, as well as fullness of investigation. Klausen, in the following extract from his *Hermeneutik*, pp. 334-345, has given a fair outline of Olshausen's views: "We must distinguish between a false and a genuine allegorical exposition, which latter has the support of the highest authority, though it alone has it, being frequently employed by the inspired writers of the New Testament. The fundamental error in the common allegorizing, from which all its arbitrariness has sprung, bidding defiance to every sound principle of exposition, must be sought in this, that a double sense has been attributed to Scripture, and one of them consequently a sense entirely different from that which is indicated by the words. Accordingly, the characteristic of the genuine allegorical exposition must be, that it recognises no sense besides the literal one—none differing from this in nature, as from the historical reality of what is recorded; but only a *deeper-lying sense* (*ὑπόνοια*,) bound up with the literal meaning by an internal and essential connection—a sense given along with this and in it; so that it must present itself whenever the subject is considered from the higher point of view, and is capable of being ascertained by fixed rules. Hence, if the question be regarding the fundamental principles, according to which the connection must be made out between the deeper apprehension and the immediate sense conveyed by the words, these have their foundation in the law of general harmony, by which all individuals, in the natural as well as in the spiritual world, form *one* great organic system—the law by which all phenomena, whether belonging to a higher or a lower sphere, appear as copies of what essentially belongs to their respective ideas; so that the whole is represented in the individual, and the individual again in the whole. This mysterious relation comes most prominently out in the history of the Jewish people and their worship. But something analogous everywhere discovers itself; and in the manner in which the Old Testament is ex-

pounded in the New, we are furnished with the rules for all exposition of the Word, of nature, and of history."

The vague and unsatisfactory character of this mode of representation, is evident almost at first sight; the elements of truth contained in it are neither solidly grounded nor sufficiently guarded against abuse; so that, with some justice, Klausen remarks, in opposition to it,—“The allegorizing may perhaps be applied with greater moderation and better taste than formerly; but against the old principle, though revived as often as put down, viz. that every sense which can be found in the words has a right to be regarded as the sense of the words, the same exceptions will always be taken.” If the Typology of Scripture cannot be rescued from the domain of allegorizings, it will be impossible to secure for it a solid and permanent footing. We must have done with what can be fitly called allegorizings, or a nearer and deeper sense. We simply add, that Klausen himself has no place in his Hermeneutics for typical, as distinguished from allegorical interpretations. In common with Hermeneutical writers generally, he regards these as substantially the same in kind; and the one only as the excess of the other. *Some* application he would allow of Old Testament Scripture to the realities of the Gospel, in consideration of what is said by inspired writers of the relation subsisting between the two; but he conceives that relation to be of a kind which scarcely admits of being brought to the test of historical truth, and that the examples furnished of it in the New Testament arose from necessity rather than from choice. Dr Davidson (in his Hermeneutics), we are glad to see, proceeds farther, justifies and approves of typical interpretations; though he still also speaks of allegorical interpretations, not as essentially different from typical, but only as “an excessive use of the true spiritual interpretation contained in the New Testament.” (Pp. 68, 69).

2. But we must now refer more particularly to the sentiments of that class, whom the new turn of thought and inquiry has led greatly to curtail the typical matter of Scripture—to whom, undoubtedly, Klausen belongs. Here, however, we do not need to go to writers in a foreign tongue for our authorities; we have them in our own. Thus in the *Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Testament*, by Dr L. Alexander, 1841, while he fol-

lows Bähr in the mode of explaining some of the leading symbols of the Old Testament, and finds in them typical representations of the realities of the gospel, he declares himself opposed to any further extension of the typical matter of the Old Testament. Nothing in his view is typical which does not possess the character of a "divine institution;" or, as he more formally defines it, "symbolical institutes expressly appointed by God, to prefigure to those among whom they were set up certain great transactions in connection with that plan of redemption which, in the fulness of time, was to be unfolded to mankind." Hence all of what are called the historical types, even those which Marsh and his followers were wont to allow on account of the special explanations given of them in the New Testament, are entirely discarded; the use made of them in the New Testament is held to be "for illustration merely, and not for the purpose of building anything on them;" it does not properly constitute them types.

This view has recently been taken up, and at much greater length defended, in a periodical work, which, though a production of America, is not unknown in this country—the Ecclesiastical and Literary Journal of Mr Lord. The part to which we more particularly refer is an article that appeared in No. XV., containing an elaborate review of the first edition of the *Typology*, and endeavouring to overthrow the views maintained in it, as "a monstrous scheme," not only "without the sanction of the word of God," but "one of the boldest and most effective contrivances for its subversion." This certainly is strong language, yet it is only a fair specimen of the harsh and contemptuous phraseology which pervades the article, and which too commonly characterizes both the pen and the school of the writer. We have no intention of taking any particular notice either of these or of the palpable misrepresentations with which they are not unfrequently accompanied. We mean simply to examine the grounds on which the reviewer principally rests his opposition to our typological principles, and succeeds so entirely to his own satisfaction in cutting off much from the typical category in Scripture that we hold to belong to it.

The process, indeed, is a very brief and simple one. He first sets forth a delineation of the nature and characteristics of a type, so tightened and compressed as to admit of nothing but what

pertained to "the tabernacle worship, or the propitiation and homage of God;" this, in his judgment, embraces the entire sphere of the typical. And having thus oracularly settled the chief point (for he seems to think anything in the shape of proof quite unnecessary), it becomes an easy matter to discard whatever else may be called typical; for it is put to flight the moment he presents his exact definitions, and can only be considered typical by persons of dreamy intellect, who are utter strangers to clearness of thought and precision of language. In this way it is possible, we admit, and also not very difficult, to make out a scheme and establish a nomenclature of one's own; but the question is, does it accord with the representations of Scripture? and will it serve, in respect to these, as a guiding and harmonizing principle? We might, in a similar way, draw out a series of precise and definite characteristics of Messianic prophecy—such as, that it must avowedly bear the impress of a prediction of the future—that it must clearly and distinctly point to the person or times of Messiah—that it must be conveyed in language capable of no ambiguity or double reference—and then, with this sharp weapon in our hand, proceed summarily to lop off all supposed prophetic passages in which these characteristics are wanting—holding such, if applied to Messianic times, to be mere accommodations, originally intended for one thing, and afterwards loosely adapted to another. The rationalists of a former generation were great adepts in this mode of handling prophetic Scripture, and by the use of it dexterously got over nearly one-half of the passages which in the New Testament are represented as finding their fulfilment in Christ. But we have yet to learn, that by so doing they succeeded in throwing any satisfactory light on the interpretation of Scripture, or in placing on a Scriptural basis the connection between the Old and the New in God's dispensations.

How closely the principles of Mr Lord lead him to tread in the footsteps of these effete interpreters, will appear presently. But we must first lodge our protest against his account of the essential nature and characteristics of a type, as entirely arbitrary and unsupported by Scripture. The things really possessing this character, he maintains, must have had the following distinctive marks: They must have been specifically constituted types by God; must have been known to be so constituted, and contemplated as such

by those who had to do with them ; and must have been continued till the coming of Christ, when they were abrogated or superseded by something analogous in the Christian dispensation. These are his essential elements in the constitution of a type ; and an assertion of the want of these forms the perpetual refrain, with which he disposes of those characters and transactions, that in his esteem are falsely accounted typical. We demur to every one of them in the sense understood by our opponent, and challenge him, or any other person, to produce any scriptural proof of them, as applying to the strictly religious symbols of the Old Testament worship, and to them alone. These were not specifically constituted types, or formally set up in that character, no more than such transactions as the deliverance from Egypt, or the preservation of Noah in the deluge, which he denies to have been typical. In the manner of their appointment, viewed by itself, there is no more to indicate a reference to the Messianic future in the one than in the other. Neither were they for certain known to be types, and used as such by the Old Testament worshippers. They unquestionably were not in the time of our Lord ; and how far they may have been so at any previous period, is a matter only of doubtful speculation, and nowhere of express revelation. Nor, finally, was it by any means an invariable and indispensable characteristic, that they should have continued in use till they were superseded by something analogous in the Christian dispensation. They might have partly stood ; the redemption from Egypt, for example, did stand, in a transaction which was incapable of being so continued. It was a creative act, bringing Israel as a people of God into formal existence, and as such capable only of being commemorated, but not of being repeated, or rendered in itself perpetual. It *was* commemorated, however, in the passover-feast. In that feast the Israelites continually freshened the remembrance of it anew on their hearts. They in spirit re-enacted it as a thing that required to be ever renewing itself in their personal experience, precisely as Christians do now through the Supper in regard to the one great redemption-act of Christ upon the cross. This also, considered simply as an act in God's administration, is incapable of being repeated ; it can only be commemorated, and in its effects spiritually applied to the conscience. Yet so far from being thereby bereft of an antitypical character, it is the central antitype of the

gospel. Why should it be otherwise in respect to the type? The analogy of things favours it; and the testimony of Scripture not doubtfully requires it.

To say nothing of other passages of Scripture which bear less explicitly, though to our mind very materially upon the subject, our Lord himself, at the celebration of the last passover, declared to his disciples, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." (Luke xxii. 15, 16.) There is a prophecy (what else can the words mean?) as well as a memorial in this commemorative ordinance,—a prophecy, because it is the rehearsal of a typical transaction, which is now, and only now, going to meet with its full realisation. Such appears to me the plain and unsophisticated import of our Lord's words. And the Apostle Paul is, if possible, still more explicit: "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast," &c. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8.) What, we again ask, are we to understand by these words, if not that there is in the design and appointment of God an ordained connection between the sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the Passover, so that the one, as the means of redemption, takes the place of the other? In any other sense the language would be only fitted to mislead, by begetting apprehensions regarding a mutual correspondence and connection which had no existence. But what says our opponent? "Christ is indeed said to be our *passover*, but it is by a metaphor, and indicates only, that it is by his blood we are saved from everlasting death, as the first-born of the Hebrews were saved by the blood of the paschal lamb from death by the destroying angel." Why could not the apostle have so expressed himself if that was all he meant? If there was no real connection between the earlier and the later event, and the one stood as much apart from the other as the lintels of Goshen in themselves did from the cross of Calvary, why employ language that forces upon every unbiassed mind the reality of a proper connection? Simply, we believe, because it actually existed; and our "exegetical conscience" refuses to be satisfied with Mr Lord's mere metaphor. But when he states further, that the passover, having been "appointed with a reference to the exemption of the first-born of the Israelites from the death that was to be inflicted on the first-born

of the Egyptians, it cannot be a type of Christ's death for the sins of the world, as that would imply that Christ's death also was *commemorative* of the preservation from an analogous death,"—a child might tell him, that he confounds between the passover as an original redemptive transaction, and as a commemorative ordinance, pointing back to the original institution, and perpetually rehearsing it. It is as a *festal solemnity* alone that there can be anything commemorative belonging either to the Paschal sacrifice or to Christ's. Viewed, however, as redemptive acts, there *was* a sufficient analogy between them: the one redeemed the first-born of Israel (the élite of its families), and the other redeems "the Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven."

There is the same sort of trifling with the testimony of Scripture in most of the other instances examined by the reviewer. Christ, for example, calls himself, with pointed reference to the manna, "the bread of life;" and in Rev. ii. 17, an interest in his divine life is called "an eating of the hidden manna;" but it is only "by a metaphor," precisely as Christ elsewhere calls himself the vine, or is likened to a rock. As if there were no difference between an employment of these natural emblems and the identifying of Christ with the supernatural food given to support his people, after a typical redemption, and on the way to a typical inheritance. It is not the simple reference to a temporal good on which, in such a case, we rest the typical import, but this in connection with the whole of the relations and circumstances in which the temporal was given or employed. Jonah was not, it is alleged, a type of Christ; for he is not called such, but only "a sign;" neither was Melchizedec called by that name. Well, but Adam *is* called a type (τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, Rom. v. 14), and baptism *is* called the antitype to the deluge (ὁ καὶ ἡμας ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, 1 Pet. iii. 21). True, but then, we are told, the word in these passages only means a similitude; it does not mean type or antitype in the proper sense. What, then, *could* denote it? Is there any other term more properly fitted to express the idea? And if the precise term, when it *is* employed, still does not serve, why object in other cases to the want of it? Strange, surely, that its presence and its absence should be alike grounds of objection. But if the matter is to come to this mere stickling about words, shall we have any types at all? Are even the tabernacle and its

institutions of worship called by that name? Not once; but, inversely, the designation of *antitypes* is in one passage applied to them: "The holy places made with hands, the antitypes of the true," (*ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*, Heb. ix. 24.) So little does Scripture, in its teachings on this subject, encourage us to hang our theoretical explanations on a particular epithet! It varies the mode of expression with all the freedom of common discourse, and even, as in this last particular instance, inverts the current phraseology; but still, amid the variety, it indicates with sufficient plainness a real economical connection between the past and the present in God's dispensations,—such as is commonly understood by the terms type and antitype; and it is not for want of scriptural evidence if any fail to perceive it.

Our reviewer furnishes us still further with a specimen of his dialectical skill, in the remarks he makes on the passage in Galatians respecting Sarah and Isaac on the one side, and Hagar and Ishmael on the other. He begins, as usual, with telling us, that there is nothing typical expressed in the characters and relations there mentioned; for they are not any of them called types; nor, we may add, if they had been, would it have brought us a whit nearer the mark. "It is only said," he continues, "that that which is related of Hagar and Sarah is exhibited allegorically; that is, that there are other things that, used as allegorical representatives of Hagar and Sarah, exhibit the same facts and truths. The object of the allegory is to exemplify *them* by analogous things; not *by* them to exemplify something else, to which they present a resemblance. It is *they* that are said to be allegorized, that is, represented by something else; not something else that is allegorized by them. They are accordingly said to be the two covenants, that is, like the two covenants; and Mount Sinai is used to represent the covenant that genders to bondage; and Jerusalem from above, that is, the Jerusalem of Christ's kingdom, the covenant of freedom or grace. And they accordingly are employed [by the apostle] to set forth the character and condition of the bond and the free woman, and their offspring. He attempts to illustrate the lot of the two classes who are under law and under grace; first, by referring to the different relations to the covenant, and different lot of the children of the bond and the free woman; and then, by using Mount Sinai to exemplify the character and

condition of those under the Mosaic law, and the heavenly Jerusalem, to exemplify those who are under the gospel. The places from which the two covenants are proclaimed are thus used to represent those two classes ; not Hagar and Sarah to represent those places, or the covenants that are proclaimed from them." Now, this parade of petty criticism—professing to explain all, and yet leaving the main thing totally unexplained—is introduced, let it be observed, to expose an alleged "singular neglect of discrimination" in the use we had made of the passage. We had, it seems, been guilty of the extraordinary mistake of supposing Hagar and Sarah to be themselves the representatives in the apostle's allegorization, and not, as we should have done, the objects represented. Does any of our readers, with all the advantage of the reviewer's explanation, recognise the importance of this distinction? Or can he tell how it serves to explicate the apostle's argument? His mind must be differently constituted from ours if it has not well-nigh driven from his mind any distinct conception of the real subject of discourse. In itself it might have been of no moment, though it is of some for the apostle's argument, whether Hagar and Sarah be said to represent the two covenants of law and grace, or the two covenants be said to represent them ; as in Heb. ix. 24, it is of no moment whether the earthly sanctuary be called the antitype of the heavenly, or the heavenly of the earthly. There is in both cases alike a mutual representation, or relative correspondence ; and it is the *nature* of the correspondence, inferior and preparatory in the one case, spiritual and ultimate in the other, which is chiefly important. It is *that* (though entirely overlooked by the reviewer) which makes the apostle's appeal here to the historical transactions in the family of Abraham suitable and appropriate to the object he has in view.

We shall gather into a few sentences what, at different places in the former edition, we actually said respecting this passage in Galatians. We first stated, in a quotation from Bishop Marsh, that though the apostle here calls his reference to the historical transactions an allegorizing of them, he did not convert them into allegory in the ordinary sense. He did not treat them as fabulous ; he did nothing more, in fact, than represent one class of characters and relations as types, and the other as antitypes. As Tholuck also justly remarks in regard to it, that the allegorizing presented

is "nothing else than the typical meaning, and the typical exposition here also admits of a perfect justification."¹ Then, secondly, in opposition to Dr Alexander, we affirmed that the apostle's reference to the things connected with Hagar and Sarah could not have been for illustration merely, or with the design simply of presenting an apt similitude ; it must have proceeded on the ground of a real, valid, and divinely-appointed connection between the things compared. For how else could the apostle have introduced it with a call to the Galatians to hear the law? "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Could he have honestly made such an appeal in respect to a mere play of fancy, or anything not strictly binding on the conscience? It is a summons to hear the authoritative word of God ; which necessarily implies, that the transactions referred to in the case of Hagar and of Sarah were of the nature of a revelation, purposely ordered and arranged to teach on the narrower and lower sphere of domestic life, what was afterwards to take place nationally and spiritually in connection with the covenants of law and grace. But this, in our view, is all one with saying that the one was expressly designed to be to the spiritual eye a type and foreshadowing of the other. Lastly, as to the specific import of the passage, we had substantially said before, and we now repeat, that the tenor of the apostle's statement, and the place it holds in his train of argument, not only warrant, but even oblige us to regard the two mothers as the representatives of the two covenants, rather than inversely ; for it is by the mothers and their natural offspring he intends to throw light on the covenants and their respective tendencies and results. It was the earlier that exemplified and illustrated the later, not the later that exemplified and illustrated the earlier ; otherwise the reference of the apostle is misplaced, and the reasoning he founds on it manifestly inconclusive.

One specimen more of our reviewer's criticism, and we shall leave him. Among the passages of Scripture we had referred to, as indicating a typical relationship between the old and the new in God's dispensations, is Matth. ii. 15, where the Evangelist speaks of Christ being in Egypt till the death of Herod, "that it

¹ Das Alte Testament im Neuen, p. 38.

might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my Son." The allusion to this passage in our introductory chapter was never meant to convey the idea that it was the only Scriptural authority for concluding a typical relationship to have subsisted between Israel and Christ. And any one reading for information, and not for objection, might have found in other parts of the work a good deal of Scriptural authority besides this, bearing on the subject. It was, however, referred to as one of the passages most commonly employed by typological writers in proof of such a relationship, and in itself most obviously implying it. But what says our reviewer? "The language of Matthew does not imply that it (the passage in Hosea) was a prophecy of Christ; he simply states, that Jesus continued in Egypt till Herod's death, so that that occurred in respect to him which had been spoken by Jehovah by the prophet, Out of Egypt have I called my Son; or, in other words, so that that was accomplished in respect to Christ which had been related by the prophet of Israel." Had we not good reason for saying that our author's principles inevitably led him, as an interpreter of Scripture, to tread in the footsteps of the rationalists? One might suppose that it was a comment of Paulus or Kuinoel that we were here presented with, and we transfer the paraphrase of the latter to the bottom of the page, to shew how entirely they agree in spirit.¹ If the Evangelist simply meant what is ascribed to him, was he so unskilled in the ordinary use of language as not to be able plainly to express it? Or, if the words he employs distinctly indicate such a connection between Christ and Israel, as gave to the testimony in Hosea the force of a prophecy (which must be the impression of every unbiassed reader), what shall we say of the arbitrary and sophistical sense, which the reviewer thinks himself entitled to put even on the words of inspiration? And this, too, from one who hardly knows how to express his astonishment that such a work as the Typology should have appeared "at a period when the principles of language are more thoroughly investigated than in any former age, and the whole body of the learned hold, that the sacred volume, like other writings, is to be interpreted by the laws of

¹ Ut adeo hic recte possit laudari, quod dominus olim interprete propheta dixit, nempe: ex Ægypto vocavi filium meum.

philology!" "Physician, heal thyself!" It is no solitary example of rationalistic interpretation of which our reviewer has here been guilty. The antagonistic position he has taken up against all historical and prophetic types of necessity requires a similar mode of getting rid of a great many other applications of the Old Testament in the New. But as we mean to treat of this separately, and at some length, in a subsequent part of the work, we shall not further refer to it here. And, in conclusion, we trust we have said enough to shew that, while we hold the school of Marsh to have erred by way of defect in limiting the typical matter of ancient Scripture to what has been specially noticed as typical in Scripture itself, it was still fully justified in finding express warrant in Scripture for a good deal of such matter beyond the province of religious symbol and sacrificial worship. There are principles of interpretation authorised and sanctioned in New Testament Scripture, which furnish ample ground for maintaining the existence of a typical connection, to a considerable extent, between the old and the new, in respect also to the historical and prophetic portions of the old,—a typical connection substantially alike, though, we do not say in all respects perfectly agreeing, to that attaching to the institutions and services of religion. Even among these there were some shades of diversity as to the precise form and kind of correspondence between type and antitype; and other diversities naturally arose when the connection passed into the region of history and prophecy. This was implied in the first edition of the *Typology*. But, I admit, it was not with sufficient distinctness exhibited. And, among the improvements introduced into the present edition, will be found both a more clear and orderly enunciation of the fundamental principles of the subject, and a more discriminating exhibition of the differences between one portion of what is typical and another.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE NATURE, USE, AND DESIGN OF TYPES CONSIDERED WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO WHAT ARE COMMONLY DESIGNATED RITUAL TYPES, OR THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS OF OLD TESTAMENT WORSHIP.

IN entering on the formal investigation of this subject, we shall not attempt, what we have already found to prove so fruitless in the hands of another, to begin with a precise definition of a type. The points that would require to be embraced by it are of too complex and varied a character to admit of being distinctly expressed in a brief enunciation. But there are two principal ideas more or less clearly indicated in the definitions commonly adopted, which unfold what is of primary moment, and comprise all that is necessary as a foundation for farther inquiry. Understanding the word *type* in the theological sense—for as employed in Scripture the original word is undoubtedly used with greater latitude¹—it is admitted by general consent, first, that in the character, action, or institution, which is denominated the *type*, there must be a resemblance in form or spirit to what answers to it under the Gospel; and secondly, that it must not be *any* character, action, or institution, occurring in Old Testament Scripture, but such only as had their ordination of God, and were designed by Him to foreshadow and prepare for the better things of the Gospel. For, as Bishop Marsh has justly remarked, “to constitute one thing the type of another, something more is wanted than mere resemblance. The former must not

¹ Heb. viii. 5; Phil. iii. 17; 1 Thes. i. 7; 1 Pet. v. 3; Rom. vi. 17. In these passages *τύπος*, *type*, very nearly corresponds in meaning to our words *model*, *pattern*, or *exemplar* generally. And this is what is usually called the Scriptural, as opposed to the theological sense of the word. It might more properly, perhaps, be called the general as distinguished from the more specific theological meaning, which, if not actually expressed, is sometimes, at least in substance, indicated in Scripture, as at Rom. v. 14; Heb. ix. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 21.

only resemble the latter, but must have been *designed* to resemble the latter. It must have been so designed in its original institution. It must have been designed as something preparatory to the latter. The type as well as the antitype must have been pre-ordained; and they must have been pre-ordained as constituent parts of the same general scheme of divine Providence. It is this *previous design* and this *pre-ordained* connection [together, of course, with the resemblance], which constitute the relation of type and antitype".¹ We insert, *together with the resemblance*; for, while stress is justly laid on the previous design and pre-ordained connection, the resemblance also forms an indispensable element in this very connection, and is, in fact, the point that involves the more peculiar difficulties belonging to the subject, and calls for the closest investigation.

I. We begin, therefore, with the other point—the previous design and pre-ordained connection necessarily entering into the relation between type and antitype. A relation so formed, and subsisting to any extent between Old and New Testament things, evidently pre-supposes and implies two important *facts*. It implies, first, that the realities of the Gospel, which constitute the antitypes, are the ultimate objects which were contemplated by the mind of God, when planning the economy of his successive dispensations. And it implies, secondly, that to prepare the way for the introduction of these ultimate objects, he placed the Church under a course of training, which included instruction by types, or designed and fitting resemblances of what was to come. Both of these facts are so distinctly stated in Scripture, and, indeed, so generally admitted, that it will be unnecessary to do more than present a brief outline of the proof on which they rest.

1. In regard to the first of the two facts, we find the designation of "the ends of the world" applied in Scripture to the Gospel-age;² and that not so much in respect to its posteriority in point of time, as to its comparative maturity in regard to the things of salvation—the higher and better things having now come, which had hitherto appeared only in prospect or existed but

¹ Marsh's Lectures, p. 371.

² 1 Cor. x. 11; Heb. xi. 40.

in embryo. On the same account the Gospel dispensation is called "the dispensation of the fulness of times;"¹ indicating, that with it alone the great objects of faith and hope, which the Church was from the first destined to possess, were properly brought within her reach. Only with the entrance also of this dispensation does the great mystery of God, in connection with man's salvation, come to be disclosed, and the light of a new and more glorious era at last breaks upon the Church. "The day-spring from the height," in the expressive language of Zacharias, then appeared, and made manifest what had previously been wrapt in comparative obscurity, what had not even been distinctly conceived, far less satisfactorily enjoyed.² Here, therefore, in the sublime discoveries and abundant consolations of the Gospel, is the *reality*, in its depth and fulness, while, in the earlier endowments and institutions of the Church, there was no more than a shadowy exhibition and a partial experience;³ and as a necessary consequence, the most eminent in spiritual light and privilege before, were still decidedly inferior even to the less distinguished members of the Messiah's kingdom.⁴ In a word, the blessed Redeemer, whom the Gospel reveals, is Himself the beginning and the end of the scheme of God's dispensations; in Him is found alike the centre of Heaven's plan, and the one foundation of human confidence and hope. So that *before* his coming into the world, all things of necessity pointed toward him; types and prophecies bore testimony to the things that concerned his work and kingdom; the children of blessing were blessed in anticipation of his looked for redemption; and *with* his coming, the

¹ Eph. i. 10.

² Luke i. 78; 1 John ii. 8; Rom. xvi. 25, 26; Col. i. 27; 1 Cor. ii. 7, 10.

³ Col. ii. 17; Heb. viii. 5.

⁴ Matth. xi. 11, where it is said respecting John the Baptist, "notwithstanding he that is least (*ὁ μικρότερος*) in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he." The older English versions retained the comparative, and rendered "he that is *less*," in the kingdom of heaven"—(Wickliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer, the Geneva); and so also Winer Greek Gr. § 36, 3, "he who occupies some lower place in the kingdom of heaven." Lightfoot, Hengstenberg, and many others approve of this *milder* sense, as it may be called; but Alford in his recent commentary adheres still to the stronger, "the *least*;" and so does Stier in his *Reden Jesu*, who, in illustrating the thought, goes so far as to say, "a mere child that knows the catechism, and can say the Lord's prayer, both knows and has more than the Old Testament can give, and so far stands higher and nearer to God than John the Baptist." One cannot but feel that this is putting something like a strain on our Lord's declaration.

grand reality itself came, and the higher purposes of Heaven entered on their fulfilment.¹

2. The other fact pre-supposed and implied in the relation between type and antitype, namely, that God subjected the Church to a course of preparatory training, including instruction by types, before he introduced the realities of his final dispensation, is written with equal distinctness in the page of inspiration. It is scarcely possible, indeed, to dissociate even in idea the one fact from the other ; for, without such a course of preparation being perpetually in progress, the long delay which took place in the introduction of the Messiah's kingdom would be quite inexplicable. Accordingly, the Church of the Old Testament is constantly represented as having been in a state of comparative childhood, supplied only with such means of instruction, and subjected to such methods of discipline as were suited to so imperfect and provisional a period of her being. Her law, in its higher aim and object, was a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ (Gal. iii. 24) ; and every thing in her condition—what it wanted, as well as what it possessed, what was done for her, and also what remained undone—concurrent in pointing the way to Him, who was to come with the better promises and the perfected salvation (Heb. vii. viii. ix.) Such is the plain import of a great many Scriptures bearing on the subject.

It is to be noted, however, in regard to this course of preparation, continued through so many ages, that every thing in the mode of instruction and discipline employed ought not to be regarded as employed simply for the sake of those who lived during its continuance. It was, no doubt, primarily introduced on their account, and must have been wisely adapted to their circumstances, as under preparation for better things to come. But, at the same time, it must also, like the early training of a well educated youth, have been fitted to tell with beneficial effect on the spiritual life of the Church in her more advanced state of existence, after she had actually attained to those better things themselves. The man of mature age, when pursuing his way amid the perplexing cares and busy avocations of life, finds himself continually indebted to the lessons he was taught and the

¹ Rev. i. 8 ; Luke ii. 25 ; Acts x. 43, iv. 12 ; Rom. iii. 25 ; 1 Pet. i. 10-12, 20.

skill he has acquired during the period of his early culture. And, in like manner, it was undoubtedly God's intention that his method of procedure toward the Church in her state of minority, not only should minister what was needed for her immediate instruction and improvement, but should also furnish materials of edification and comfort for believers to the end of time. If the earlier could not be made perfect without the things belonging to the later Church (Heb. xi. 40), so neither, on the other hand, can the later profitably or even safely dispense with the advantage she may derive from the more simple and rudimentary things that belonged to the earlier. The Church, considered as God's nursery for training souls to a meetness for immortal life and blessedness, is substantially the same through all periods of her existence; and the things which were appointed for the behoof of her members in one age, had in them also something of lasting benefit for those on whom the ends of the world are come (1 Cor. x. 6, 11.)

It is farther to be noted, that in this work of preparation for the more perfect future, arrangements of a typical kind, being of a somewhat recondite nature, necessarily occupied a relative and subsidiary, rather than the primary and most essential place. The church enjoyed from the first the benefit of direct and explicit instruction, imparted either immediately by the hand of God, or through the instrumentality of his accredited messengers, From this source she always derived her knowledge of the more fundamental truths of religion, and also her more definite expectations of the better things to come. The fact is of importance, both as determining the proper place of typical acts and institutions, and as indicating a kind of extraneous and qualifying element, that must not be overlooked in judging of the condition of believers under them. Yet they were not, on that account, rendered less valuable or necessary as constituent parts of a preparatory dispensation. For, it was through them, as temporary expedients, and by virtue of the resemblances they possessed to the higher things in prospect, that the realities of Christ's kingdom obtained a kind of present realization to the eye of faith. What, then, was the nature of these resemblances? Wherein precisely did the similarity which formed more especially the

preparatory element in the Old, as compared with the New, really lie? This is the point that mainly calls for elucidation.

II. It is the second point we were to investigate, as being that which would necessarily require the most lengthened and careful examination. And the general statement we submit respecting it is, that two things were here essentially necessary: *there must have been in the Old the same great elements of truth as in the things they represented under the New; and then, in the Old, these must have been exhibited in a form more level to the comprehension, more easily and distinctly cognizable by the minds of men.*

1. There must have been, first, the same great elements of truth—for the mind of God, and the circumstances of the fallen creature, are substantially the same at all times. What the spiritual necessities of men now are, they have been from the time that sin entered into the world. Hence the truth revealed by God to meet these necessities, however varying from time to time in the precise amount of its communications, and however differing also in the external form under which it might be presented, must have been, so far as disclosed, essentially one in every age. For, otherwise, what anomalous results would follow? If the principles unfolded in God's communications to men, and on which he regulates his dealings toward them, were materially different at one period from what they are at another, then either the wants and necessities of men's natural condition must have undergone a change, or—these being the same, as they undoubtedly are—the character of God must have altered—he cannot be the immutable Jehovah. Besides, the very idea of a course of preparatory dispensations were, on the supposition in question, manifestly excluded; since that could have no proper ground to rest on, unless there was a deep-rooted and fundamental agreement between what was temporary and what was final and ultimate in the matter. The primary and essential elements of truth, therefore, which are embodied in the facts of the Gospel, and on which its economy of grace is based, cannot, in the nature of things, be of recent origin—as if they were altogether peculiar to the New Testament dispensation, and had

only begun with the entrance of it to obtain a place in the government of God. On the contrary, their existence must have formed the ground-work, and their varied manifestation the progress of any preparatory dispensations that might be appointed. And whatever ulterior respect the typical characters, actions, or institutions of those earlier dispensations might carry to the coming realities of the Gospel, their more immediate intention and use must have consisted in the exhibition they gave of the vital and fundamental truths, common alike to all dispensations.

2. If a clear and conclusive certainty attaches to this part of our statement, it does so in even an increased ratio to the other. Holding that the same great elements of truth must of necessity pervade both type and antitype, we must unquestionably hold, that in the former they were more simply and palpably exhibited—presented in some shape in which the human mind could more easily and distinctly apprehend them—than in the latter. It would manifestly have been absurd to admit into a course of preparation for the realities of the Gospel, certain temporary exhibitions of the same great elements of truth that were to pervade these, unless the preparatory had been of more obvious meaning, and of more easy comprehension, than the ultimate and final. The transition from the one to the other must clearly have involved a rise in the mode of exhibiting the truth from a lower to a higher territory—from a form of developement more easily grasped, to a form which should put the faculties of the mind to a greater stretch. For thus only could it be wise or proper to set up preparatory dispensations at all. These, manifestly, had been better spared, if the realities themselves lay more, or even so much within the reach and comprehension of the mind, as their temporary and imperfect representations.

Standing, then, on the foundation of these two principles, as necessarily forming the essential elements of the resemblance that subsisted between the Old and the New in God's dispensations, we may now proceed to consider how far they can legitimately carry us in explaining the subject in hand; or, in other words, to answer the question, how on such a basis the typical things of the past could properly serve as preparatory arrangements for the higher and better things of the future? We shall endeavour to answer this question, in the first instance, by mak-

ing application of our principles to the symbolical institutions of the Mosaic dispensation, which are usually denominated the *ritual* or *legal* types. For, in respect to these we have the advantage of the most explicit assertion in Scripture of their typical character; and we are also furnished with certain general descriptions of their nature as typical, which may partly serve as lights to direct our inquiries, and partly provide a test by which to try the correctness of our results.

Viewing the institutions of the dispensation brought in by Moses as typical, we look at them in what may be called their *secondary* aspect; we consider them as *prophetic symbols of the better things to come in the Gospel*. But this evidently implies that in another and more immediate respect they were merely symbols, that is, outward and sensible representations of Divine truth, in connection with an existing dispensation and a religious worship. It was only from their being this, in the one respect, that they could, in the other, be prophetic symbols, or types, of what was afterwards to appear under the Gospel; on the ground already stated, that the preparatory dispensation to which they belonged was necessarily inwrought with the same great elements of truth, which were afterwards, in another form, to pervade the Christian. Had there not been the identity of the truths here supposed, assimilating the two dispensations to each other amid all their outward diversities, the earlier would rather have blocked up than prepared and opened the way for the latter. A partial exhibition of a *truth*, or an embodiment of it in things comparatively little, easily grasped by the understanding, and but imperfectly satisfying the mind, may certainly make way for its exhibition in some more complete and perfect manner:—The mind thus familiarized to it in the little, may both have the desire created, and the capacity formed for beholding its development in things of a far higher and nobler kind. But a partial or defective representation of an *object*, apart from any principles common to both, must rather tend to pre-occupy the mind, and either entirely prevent it from anticipating, or fill it with mistaken and prejudiced notions of, the reality. If such a representation of the mere objects of the Gospel had been all that was aimed at in the symbolical institutions of the Old Testament—if their direct, immediate, and only use had been to serve, as pictures, to pre-

figure and presentiate to the soul the future realities of the divine kingdom—then, who could wonder if these realities should have been wholly lost sight of before, or misbelieved and repudiated when they came? For, in that case, the preparatory dispensation must have been far more difficult for the worshipper than the ultimate one. The child must have had a much harder lesson to read, and a much higher task to accomplish, than the man of full-grown and ripened intellect. And divine wisdom must have employed its resources, not to smooth the Church's path to an enlightened view, and a believing reception of the realities of the Gospel, but to shroud them in the most profound and perplexing obscurities.

Every serious and intelligent believer will shrink from this conclusion. But if he does so, he will soon find, that there is only one way of effectually escaping from it; and that is, by regarding the symbolical institutions of the Old Covenant as not simply or directly representations of the realities of the Gospel, but in the first instance as parts of an existing dispensation, and, as such, expressive of certain great and fundamental truths, which could even then be distinctly understood and embraced. This was what might be called their more *immediate and ostensible* design. Their *further and prospective* reference to the higher objects of the Gospel, was of a more indirect and occult nature; and stood in the same essential truths being exhibited by means of present and visible, but inferior and comparatively inadequate objects. So that in tracing out the connection from the one to the other, we must always begin with inquiring, What, *per se*, was the native import of each symbol? What truths did it symbolize merely as part of an existing religion? and from this proceed to unfold how it was fitted to serve as a guide and a stepping-stone to the glorious events and issues of Messiah's kingdom. This—which it was the practice of the older typological writers in great measure to overlook—is really the foundation of the whole matter; and without it every typological system must either contract itself within very narrow bounds, or be in danger of running out into superficial or fanciful analogies. The Mosaic ritual had at once a shell and a kernel,—its shell, the outward rites and observances it enjoined; its kernel, the spiritual relations which these indicated and the spirit-

ual truths which they embodied and expressed. Substantially, these truths and relations were, and must have been, the same for the Old that they are for the New Testament worshippers ; for the spiritual wants and necessities of both are the same, and so also is the character of God, with whom they have to do. *There*, therefore, in that fundamental agreement, that internal and pre-established harmony of principle, we are to find the bond of union between the symbolical institutions of Judaism and the permanent realities of Messiah's kingdom. One truth in both—but that truth existing first in a lower, then in a higher stage of developement ; in the one case, as a precious bud embosomed and but partially seen amid the imperfect relations of flesh and time ; in the other expanded under the bright sunshine of heaven into all the beauty and fruitfulness of which it is susceptible.

To make our meaning perfectly understood, however, we must descend from the general to the particular, and apply what has been stated to a special case. In doing so, we shall go at once to what may justly be termed the very core of the religion of the Old Covenant—the right of expiatory sacrifice. That this was typical, or prophetically symbolical of the death of Christ, is testified with much plainness and frequency in New Testament Scripture. Yet, independently of this connection with Christ's death, it had a meaning of its own, which it was possible for the ancient worshipper to understand, and, so understanding, to present through it an acceptable service to God, whether he might perceive or not the further respect it bore to a dying Saviour. It was in its own nature a symbolical transaction, embodying a threefold idea ; first, that the worshipper having been guilty of sin, had forfeited his life to God ; then, that the life so forfeited must be surrendered to divine justice ; and finally, that being surrendered in the way appointed, it was given back to him again by God, or he became re-established, as a justified person, in the divine favour and fellowship. How far a transaction of this kind, done symbolically and not really—by means of an irrational creature substituted in the sinner's room, and unconsciously devoted to lose its animal, in lieu of his intelligent and rational life—might commend itself as altogether satisfactory to his view ; or how far he might see reason to regard it as but a provisional arrangement, proceeding on the contemplation of something more perfect yet

to come—these are points which might justly be raised, and will indeed call for future discussion, but they are somewhat extraneous to the subject itself now under consideration. We are viewing the right of expiatory sacrifice simply as a constituent part of ancient worship—a religious service, which formally, and without notification from itself of anything farther being required, presented the sinner with the divinely appointed means of reconciliation and restored fellowship with God. In this respect it symbolically represented, as we have said, a threefold idea, which if properly understood and realized by the worshipper, he performed, in offering it, an acceptable service. And when we rise from the symbolical to the typical view of the transaction—when we proceed to consider the right of expiation as bearing a prospective reference to the redemption of Christ, we are not to be understood as ascribing to it some new sense or meaning ; we merely express our belief that the complex capital idea which it so impressively symbolized, finds its only true, as from the first, its destined realization, in the work of salvation by Jesus Christ. For, in him alone was there a real transference of man's guilt to one able and willing to bear it—in his death alone, the surrender of a life to God, such as could fitly stand in the room of that forfeited by the sinner—and in faith alone on his death, a full and conscious appropriation of the life of peace and blessing obtained by him for the justified. So that here only it is we perceive the idea of a true, sufficient, and perfect sacrifice converted into a living reality—such as the holy eye of God, and the troubled conscience of man, can alike rest on with perfect satisfaction. And while there appear precisely the same elements of truth in the ever-recurring sacrifices of the Old Testament, and in the one perfect sacrifice of the New, it is seen, at the same time, that what the one symbolically represented, the other actually possessed ; what the one could only exhibit as a kind of acted lesson for the present relief of guilty consciences, the other makes known to us, as a work finally and for ever accomplished for all who believe in the propitiation of the cross.

The view now given of the symbolical institutions of the Old Testament, as prophetic symbols of the realities of the Gospel, is in perfect accordance with the general descriptions we have of their nature in Scripture itself. These are of two classes. In the

one they are declared to have been *shadows* of the better things of the Gospel ; as in Heb. x. 1, where the law is said to have had “ a shadow, and not the very image of good things to come ;” in ch. viii. 5, where the priests are described as “ serving unto the example (copy) and shadow of heavenly things ;” and again in Col. ii. 16, where the fleshly ordinances in one mass are denominated “ shadows of good things to come,” while it is added, “ the body is of Christ.” Now, that the tabernacle, with the ordinances of every kind belonging to it, were shadows of Christ and the blessings of his kingdom, can only mean that they were obscure and imperfect resemblances of these ; or that they embodied the same elements of divine truth, but wanted what was necessary to give them proper form and consistence as parts of a final and abiding dispensation of God. And when we go to inquire, wherein did the obscurity and imperfection consist, we are always referred to the carnal and earthly nature of the Old as compared with the New. The tabernacle itself was a material fabric, constructed of such things as this present world could supply, and hence called “ a worldly sanctuary ;” while its counterpart under the Gospel is the eternal region of God’s presence and glory, neither discernible by fleshly eye, nor made by mortal hands. In like manner, the ordinances of worship connected with the tabernacle were all ostensibly directed to the preservation of men’s present existence, or the advancement of their well-being as related to an outward sanctuary and a terrestrial commonwealth ; while in the Gospel it is the soul’s relation to the sanctuary above, and its possession of an immortal life of blessedness and glory, which all is directly intended to provide for. In these differences between the Old and the New, which bespeak so much of inferiority on the part of the former, we perceive the darkness and imperfection which hung around the things of the ancient dispensation, and rendered them shadows only of those which were to come. But still shadows are resemblances. Though unlike in one respect, they must be like in another. And as the unlikeness stood in the dissimilar nature of the things immediately handled and perceived—in the different *materiel*, so to speak, of the two dispensations, wherein should the resemblance be found but in the common truths and relations alike pervading both ? By means of an earthly tabernacle, with its appropriate

services, God manifested toward his people the same principles of government, and required from them substantially the same disposition and character that he does now under the higher dispensation of the Gospel. For, look beyond the mere outward diversities, and what do you see? You see in both alike a pure and holy God, enshrined in the recesses of a glorious sanctuary—unapproachable by sinful flesh but through a medium of powerful intercession and cleansing efficacy—yet when so approached, ever ready to receive and bless with the richest tokens of his favour and lovingkindness as many as come in the exercise of genuine contrition for sin, and longing for restored fellowship with the God they have offended. The same description applies equally to the service of both dispensations; for in both the same impressions are conveyed of God's character respecting sin and holiness, and the same gracious feelings necessarily awakened in the bosom of sincere worshippers in regard to them. But then, as to the means of accomplishing this, there was only, in the one case, a shadowy exhibition of spiritual things through earthly materials and temporary expedients, while, in the other, the naked realities appear in the one perfect sacrifice of Christ, the rich endowments of grace, and the glories of an everlasting kingdom.

The other general description given in New Testament Scripture of the prophetic symbols or types of the old dispensation does not materially differ from the one now considered, and, when rightly understood, leads to the same result. According to it the religious institutions of earlier times contained the *rudiments* or elementary principles of the world's religious truth and life. Thus in Col. ii. 20, the now antiquated ordinances of Judaism are called "the rudiments of the world;" and in Gal. iv. 3, the church, while under these ordinances, is said to have been "in bondage under the elements or rudiments of the world." The expression also, which is found in ch. iii. 24 of this Epistle to the Galatians, "the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," conveys much the same idea; since it is the special business of a schoolmaster to communicate to those under his charge the rudiments of learning, by which their minds may in due time be prepared for the higher walks of science and literature. The law certainly did this,

to a considerable extent, by direct instruction in the great principles of truth and duty. But it did so not less by means of its symbolical institutions and ordinances, which were in themselves inherently defective, and yet in their spirit and design entirely analogous to the higher things of the Gospel. The animal, the fleshly, the material, the temporal, was what alone appeared in them, when viewed in respect merely to their ostensible character and object ; all, however, moulded and arranged, so as to exhibit ideas and relations that reached far beyond these, and could only, indeed, find their suitable development in things spiritual, heavenly, and eternal. The church had then to be dealt with after the manner of a child. But the child must have instruction administered to him in a form adapted to his juvenile capacities. If he is to be prepared for apprehending the outlines and proportions of the globe, these must be presented to his view on diagrams of a few spans long. Or, if he is to be made acquainted with the laws and principles which bear sway throughout the material universe, he must again see them exemplified in miniature among the small and familiar objects of every day life. In like manner, the church of the Old Testament, while in bondage to fleshly institutions and services, yet received through these the rudiments of all divine truth and wisdom. In a form which the eye of a spiritual babe could scan, and its hand, in a manner, grasp, she had constantly exhibited before her the essential truths and principles of God's everlasting kingdom. And nothing more was needed than that the instruction thus imparted should have been impartially received and properly cultivated, in order to fit the disciple of Moses for passing with intelligence and delight from his rudimental tutelage, under the *shadows* of good things, into the free use and enjoyment of the things themselves.

The general descriptions, then, given of the symbolical institutions and services of the Old Testament, in their relation to the Gospel, perfectly accord with the principles we have advanced. And viewed in the light now presented, we at once see the essential unity that subsists between the Old and the New dispensations, and the nature of that progression in the divine plan, which rendered the one a fitting preparation and stepping-stone to the other. In its fundamental elements the religion of both covenants is thus

found to be identical. Only it appears under the old covenant as on a lower platform, disclosing its ideas, and imparting its blessings through the imperfect instrumentalities of fleshly relations and temporal concerns ; while under the new every thing rises heavenwards, and eternal realities come distinctly and prominently into view. But as ideas and relations are more palpable to the mind, and lie more within the grasp of its comprehension, when exhibited on a small scale, in corporeal forms, amid familiar and present objects, than on a scale of large dimensions, which stretches into the unseen, and embraces alike the divine and human, time and eternity ; so the economy of outward symbolical institutions was in itself simpler than the Gospel, and, as a lower exhibition of divine truth, prepared the way for a higher. But they did this, let it be observed, in their character merely *as symbolical institutions*, or parts of a dispensation then existing, not as typically foreshadowing the things belonging to a higher and more spiritual dispensation yet to come. It was comparatively an easy thing for the Jewish worshipper to understand how, from time to time, he stood related to a visible sanctuary and an earthly inheritance, or to go through the process of an appointed purification by means of water and the blood of slain victims applied externally to his body:—much more easy than for the Christian to apprehend distinctly his relation to an heavenly sanctuary, and realize the cleansing of his conscience from all guilt by the inward application of the sacrifice of Christ and the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. But for the Jewish worshipper to do both his own and the Christian's part—both to read the meaning of the symbol as expressive of what was already laid open to his view, and to descry its concealed reference to the yet undiscovered realities of a better dispensation, would have required a reach of discernment and a strength of faith far beyond what is now needed in the Christian. For this had been, not like him to discern the heavenly, when the heavenly had come, but to do it amid the obscurities and imperfections of the earthly ; not simply to look with open eye into the deeper mysteries of God's kingdom, when these mysteries are fully disclosed, but to do so while they were still buried amid the thick folds of a cumbrous and overshadowing drapery.

Yet let us not be mistaken. We speak merely of what was strictly required, and what might ordinarily be expected of the ancient worshipper, in connection with the institutions and services of his symbolical religion, taken simply by themselves. We do not say that there *never was*, much less that there *could not be*, any proper insight obtained by the children of the old covenant into the future mysteries of the Gospel. There were special gifts of grace then, as well as now, occasionally imparted to the more spiritual members of the covenant, which enabled them to rise to unusual degrees of knowledge ; and it is a distinctive property of the spiritual mind generally to be dissatisfied with the imperfect, to seek and long for the perfect. Even now, when the comparatively perfect has come, what spiritual mind is not often conscious to itself of a feeling akin to melancholy, when it thinks of the yet abiding darkness and disorders of the present, or does not fondly cling to every hopeful indication of a brighter future ? But even the *best* things of the old covenant bore on them the stamp of imperfection. The temple itself, which was the peculiar glory and ornament of Israel, still in a very partial and defective manner realised its own grand idea of a people dwelling with God, and God dwelling with them ; and hence, because of that inherent imperfection (it was plainly declared), a higher and better mode of accomplishing the object should one day take its place (Jer. iii. 16, 17). So, too, the palpable disproportion already noticed in the rite of expiatory sacrifice between the rational life forfeited through sin, and the merely animal life substituted in its room, seemed to proclaim the necessity of a more adequate atonement for human guilt, and could not but dispose intelligent worshippers to give more earnest heed to the announcements of prophecy regarding the coming purposes of heaven. But yet, when we have admitted all this, it by no means follows that the people of God generally, under the old covenant, could attain to very definite views of the realities of the Gospel ; nor does it furnish us with any reason for asserting that such views must ever of necessity have mingled with the service of an acceptable worshipper. For, his was the worship of a preparatory dispensation. It must, therefore, have been simpler and easier than what was ultimately to supplant it. And this, we again repeat, it could

only be by being viewed in its more obvious and formal aspect, as the worship of an existing religion, which provided for the time then present a fitting medium of access to God, and hallowed intercourse with heaven. The man who humbly availed himself of what was thus provided to meet his soul's necessities, stood in faith, and served God with acceptance—though still with such imperfections in the present, and such promises for the future, that the more always he reflected, he would become the more a child of desire and hope.¹

We have spoken as yet only of the symbolical institutions and services of the Old Testament; and of these quite generally, as one great whole. For it is carefully to be noted, that the Scriptural designations of rudiments and shadows, which we have shewn to be the same as typical, when properly understood, are applied to the entire mass of the ancient ordinances in their prospective reference to Gospel realities. And yet, while New Testament Scripture speaks thus of the whole, it deals very sparingly in particular examples; and if it furnishes, in its language and allusions, many valuable hints to direct inquiry, it still contains remarkably few detailed illustrations. It nowhere tells us, for example, what was either immediately symbolized, or prophetically shadowed forth, by the Holy Place in the tabernacle, or the shew-bread, or the golden candlestick, or the ark of the cove-

¹ If any one will take the trouble to look into the older writers, who formally examined the typical character of the ancient symbolical institutions, he will find them entirely silent in regard to the points chiefly dwelt upon in the above discussion. Lowman, for example, on the Rational of the Hebrew Worship, and Outram de Sac. Lib. i. c. 18, where he comes to consider the nature and force of a type, give no proper or satisfactory explanation of the questions, wherein precisely did the resemblance stand between the type and the antitype, or how should the one have prepared the way for the other. We are told frequently enough, that the "Hebrew ritual contained a plan, or sketch, or pattern, or shadow of Gospel things:" that "the type adumbrated the antitype by something of the same sort with that which is found in the antitype," or "by a symbol of it," or "by a slender and shadowy image of it," or "by something that may somehow be compared with it," &c. But we look in vain for anything more specific. Townley, in his Reasons of the Laws of Moses, still advances no farther in the Dissertation he devotes to the Typical Character of the Mosaic Institutions. Even Olshausen, in the treatise formerly noticed (*Ein Wort über tiefen Schriftsinn*), when he comes to unfold what he calls his deeper exposition, confines himself to a brief illustration of the few general statements formerly mentioned. See p. 44.

nant, or, indeed, by anything connected with the tabernacle, excepting its more prominent offices and ministrations. Even the Epistle to the Hebrews, which enters with such comparative fullness into the connection between the Old and the New, and which is most express in ascribing a typical value to all that belonged to the tabernacle, can yet scarcely be said to give any detailed explanation of its furniture and services beyond the rite of expiatory sacrifice, and the action of the high priest in presenting it, more particularly on the great day of atonement. So that those who insist on an explicit warrant and direction from Scripture in regard to each particular type, will find their principle conducts them but a short way even through that department, which, they are obliged to admit, possesses throughout a typical character. A general admission of this sort can be of little use, if one is restrained on principle from touching most of the particulars ; one might as well maintain that these did not in any degree partake of the typical element. So, indeed, Bishop Marsh has substantially done ; for, "that such explanations," he says, referring to particular types, "are in various instances given in the New Testament, no one can deny. And if it was deemed necessary to explain one type, wherè could be the expediency or moral fitness of withholding the explanation of others? Must not, therefore, the *silence* of the New Testament in the case of any *supposed* type, be an argument against the existence of that type?"¹ Undoubtedly, we reply, if the Scriptures of the New Testament professed to illustrate the whole field of typical matter in God's ancient dispensations ; but by no means, if, as is really the case, they only take it up in detached portions, by way of occasional example ; and still less if the effect would be practically to exclude from the character of types many of the very institutions and services which are declared to have been all "shadows of good things to come, whereof the body is Christ." How we ought to proceed in applying the general views that have been unfolded to the interpretation of such parts of the Old Testament symbols as have not been explained in New Testament Scripture, will no doubt require careful consideration. But that we are both warranted and bound to give them a Christian interpretation, is manifest from the

¹ Lectures, p. 392.

general character that is ascribed to them. And the fact that so much of what was given to Moses as “ a testimony (or evidence) of those things which were to be spoken after” in Christ, remains without any particular explanation in Scripture, sufficiently justifies us in expecting that there may also be much typical, though unexplained matter, in the other, the historical department of the subject, which we now proceed to investigate.

CHAPTER THIRD.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED, BUT WITH A VIEW MORE ESPECIALLY TO THE SOLUTION OF THE QUESTION, WHETHER OR HOW FAR THE HISTORICAL CHARACTERS AND TRANSACTIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT MAY BE REGARDED AS TYPICAL?—HISTORICAL TYPES.

IN the preceding chapter we have seen in what sense the religious institutions and services of the old covenant were typical. They were constructed and arranged so as to express symbolically the great truths and principles of a spiritual religion—truths and principles which were common alike to Old and New Testament times, but which, from the nature of things, could only find in the New their proper development and full realisation. On the limited scale of the earthly and perishable—in the construction of a material tabernacle, and the suitable adjustment of bodily ministrations and sacrificial offerings,—there was presented a palpable exhibition of those great truths respecting sin and salvation, the purification of the heart, and the dedication of the person and the life to God, which in the fulness of time were openly revealed and manifested on the grand scale of a world's redemption, by the mediation and work of Jesus Christ. In that pre-arranged and harmonious, but still inherently defective and imperfect exhibition of the fundamental ideas and spiritual relations of the Gospel, stood the real nature of its typical character.

Nor, we may add, was there anything arbitrary in so employing the things of flesh and time to shadow forth, under a preparatory dispensation, the higher realities of God's everlasting kingdom. It has its ground and reason in the organic arrangements or appearances of the material world. For these are so framed as to be ever giving forth representations of divine truth, and are a kind of ceaseless regeneration, in which, through successive stages, new and higher forms of being are continually springing out of the

lower. It is on this constitution of nature that the figurative language of Scripture is based. And it was only building on a foundation that already existed, and which stretches far and wide through the visible territory of creation, when the outward relations and fleshly services of a symbolical religion were made to image and prepare for the more spiritual and divine mysteries of Messiah's kingdom. Hence, also, some of the more important symbolical institutions were expressly linked (as we shall see) to appropriate seasons and aspects of nature.

But was symbol alone thus employed? Might there not also have been a similar employment of many circumstances and transactions in the province of sacred history? Might not God have, in many respects, disposed the events of his providence, and appointed the external relations of his people, as well as framed the institutions of his worship, so as to give, by means of them, like exhibitions of the better things of the Gospel? If the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ, with the blessings of his great salvation, was the object mainly contemplated by God from the beginning of the world, and with which the Church was ever travelling in birth—if, consequently, the previous dispensations were chiefly designed to lead to, and terminate upon, Christ and the things of his salvation:—what can be more natural than to suppose that the evolutions of providence throughout the period during which the salvation was preparing, should have concurred with the symbols of worship in imaging and preparing for what was to come? It is possible, indeed, that the connection here, between the past and the future, might be somewhat more varied and fluctuating, and in several respects less close and exact, than in the case of a compact system of religious symbols of worship, appointed to last till they were superseded by the better things of the New dispensation. This is only what might be expected from the respective natures of the two departments referred to. But that a connection, similar in kind, had a place in the one as well as in the other, we think not only in itself probable, but capable of being satisfactorily established. And in support of it we advance the following considerations:—First, That the historical relations and circumstances recorded in the Old Testament, and typically interpreted in the New, had very much the same resemblances and the same defects in respect to the realities of the Gospel,

which we have found to belong to the ancient symbolical institutions of worship ; Secondly, That such historical types were absolutely necessary, in considerable number and variety, to render the earlier dispensations thoroughly preparative in respect to the coming dispensation of the Gospel : And, thirdly, that Old Testament Scripture itself contains undoubted indications, that much of its historical matter stood related to some higher ideal, in which the truths and relations exemplified in them were again to meet and receive a new but more perfect development.

I. The first consideration is, that the historical relations and circumstances recorded in the Old Testament, and typically interpreted in the New, had very much the same resemblances and defects, in respect to the Gospel, which we have found to belong to the ancient symbolical institutions of worship. Thus—to refer to one of the earliest events in the world's history so interpreted—the general deluge, that destroyed the old world, and preserved Noah and his family alive, is represented as standing in a typical relation to Christian baptism (1 Pet. iii. 21). It did so, as will be explained more at large hereafter, from its having destroyed those who, by their corruptions, destroyed the earth, and saved for a new world the germ of a better race. Doing this in the outward and lower territory of the world's history, it served substantially the same purpose that Christian baptism does in a higher ; since this is designed to bring the individual that receives it under those vital influences that purge away the corruption of a fleshly nature, and cause the seed of a divine life to take root and grow for the occupation of a better inheritance. In like manner, Sarah, with her child of promise, the special and peculiar gift of heaven, and Hagar, with her merely natural and fleshly offspring, are explained as typically foreshadowing, the one a spiritual church, bringing forth real children to God, in spirit and destiny as well as in calling, the heirs of his everlasting kingdom ; the other, a worldly and corrupt church, whose members are in bondage to the flesh, having but a name to live, while they are dead. (Gal. iv. 22, 31.) In such cases, it is clear that the same kind of resemblances, coupled also with the same kind of differences, appear between the preparatory and the final, as in the case of the symbolical types. For here also the ideas and relations are substantially one

in the two associated transactions ; only in the earlier they appear ostensibly connected with the theatre alone of an earthly existence, and with respect to seen and temporal results ; while in the later it is the higher field of grace and the interests of a spiritual and immortal existence that come directly into view.

Or, look again to the use made of the events that befel the Israelites on their way to the land of Canaan, as regards the state and prospects of the Church of the New Testament on its way to Heaven. Look at this, for example, as unfolded in the third and fourth chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the essential features of a typical connection will at once be seen. For, the exclusion of those carnal and unbelieving Israelites, who fell in the wilderness, is there exhibited, not only as affording a reasonable presumption, but as providing a valid ground for asserting, that persons similarly affected now toward the kingdom of glory cannot attain to Heaven. Indeed, so complete in point of principle is the identity of the two cases, that the same expressions are applied to both alike, without intimation of any differences existing between them : “ the Gospel is preached ” to the one class as well as to the other ; God gives to each alike “ a promise of rest,” while they equally “ fall through unbelief,” having hardened their hearts against the word of God. Yet there were the same differences in kind as we have noted between the type and the antitype in the symbolical institutions of worship—the visible and earthly being employed in the one to exhibit such relations and principles as in the other appear in immediate connection with what is spiritual and heavenly. In the type we have the prospect of Canaan, the Gospel of an *earthly* promise of rest, and, because not believed, issuing in the loss of a *present* life of honour and blessing ; in the antitype, the prospect of a *heavenly* inheritance, the Gospel promise of an *everlasting* rest, bringing along with it, in the experience of such as reject it, the fearful loss of *eternal* blessedness and glory.

Again, and with reference to the same period in the Church’s history, it is said in John iii. 14-15, “ As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” The language here certainly does not necessarily betoken by any means so close a connection between the

Old and the New, as in the cases previously referred to ; nor are we disposed to assert that the same connection in all respects really existed. The historical transaction in this case had at first sight the aspect of something occasional and isolated, rather than of an integral and essential part of a great plan. And yet the reference in John, viewed in connection with other passages of Scripture bearing on the subject, sufficiently vindicates for it a place among the earlier exhibitions of divine truth, planned by the foreseeing eye of God with special respect to the coming realities of the Gospel. As such it entirely accords in nature with the typical prefigurations already noticed. In the two related transactions there is a fitting correspondence as to the relations maintained : in both alike a wounded and dying condition in the first instance, then the elevation of an object apparently inadequate, yet really effectual, to accomplish the cure, and this through no other medium on the part of the affected, than their simply looking to the object so presented to their view. But with this pervading correspondence, what marked and distinctive characteristics ! In the one case a dying body, in the other a perishing soul. There an uplifted serpent, of all instruments of healing from a serpent's bite the most unpromising ; here the exhibition of one condemned and crucified as a malefactor, of all conceivable persons apparently the most impotent to save. There, once more, the fleshly eye of nature deriving from the outward object visibly presented to it the healing virtue it was ordained to impart ; and here the spiritual eye of the soul, looking in steadfast faith to the exalted Redeemer, and getting the needed supplies of his life-giving and regenerating grace. In both the same elements of truth, the same modes of dealing, but in the one developing themselves on a lower, in the other on a higher territory ; in the former having immediate respect only to things seen and temporal, and in the latter to what is unseen, spiritual, and eternal. And when it is considered how the divine procedure, in the case of the Israelites, was in itself so extraordinary and peculiar, so unlike God's usual methods of dealing in providence, and yet directly bore only on their inferior and perishable interests, it seems to be, without any adequate reason, to want, in a sense, its due explanation, until it is viewed as a dispensation specially designed to prepare the way for the higher and better things of the Gospel.

Similar explanations might be given of the other historical facts recorded in Old Testament Scripture, and invested with a typical reference in the New. But enough has been said to shew the essential similarity in the respect borne by them to the better things of the Gospel, and of that borne by the ritual types of the law. The ground of the connection in the one class, precisely as in the other, stands in the substantial oneness of the ideas and relations pervading the earlier and the later transactions, as corresponding parts of related dispensations ; or in the identity of truth and principle appearing in both, as different, yet mutually dependent parts of one great providential scheme. In that internal agreement and relationship, rather than in any mere outward resemblances, we are to seek the real bond of connection between the Old and the New.

At first sight, perhaps, a connection of this nature may appear to want something of what is required to satisfy the conditions of a proper typical relationship. And there are two respects more especially, in which this deficiency may seem to exist.

1. It has been so much the practice to look at the connection between the Old and the New in an external aspect, that one naturally fancies the necessity of some more palpable and arbitrary bond of union to link together type and antitype. The one is apt to be thought of as a kind of pre-ordained pantomime of the other—like those pre-figurative actions which the prophets were sometimes instructed, whether in reality or in vision, to perform (as Isaiah in ch. xx, or Ezekiel in ch. xii.), meaningless in themselves, yet very significant as foreshadowing intimations of coming events in providence. Such prophecies in action, certainly, had something in common with the typical transactions now under consideration. They both alike had respect to other actions or events yet to come, without which, pre-ordained and foreseen, they would not have taken place. They both also stood in a similar relation of littleness to the corresponding circumstances they foreshadowed—exhibiting on a comparatively small scale what was afterwards to realize itself on a large one, and thereby enabling the mind more readily to anticipate the approaching future, or more distinctly to grasp it after it had come. But they differed in this, that the typical actions of the prophets had respect *solely* to the coming transactions they prefigured,

and but for these would have been foolish and absurd ; while the typical actions of God's providence, as well as the symbolical institutions of his worship, had a moral meaning of their own, independently of the reference they bore to the future revelations of the Gospel. To overlook this independent moral element, is to leave out of account what should be held to constitute the very basis of the connection between the past and the future. But if, on the other hand, we make due account of it, we establish a connection, which, in reality, is of a much more close and vital nature, and one, too, of far higher importance, than if it consisted alone in points of outward resemblance. For it implies not only that the entire plan of salvation was all along in the eye of God, but that, with a view to it, he was ever directing his government, so as to bring out in successive stages and operations the very truths and principles, which were to find in the realities of the Gospel their more complete manifestation. He shewed, that he saw the end from the beginning by interweaving with his providential arrangements the elements of the more perfect, the terminal plan. And, therefore, to lay the ground-work of the connection between the preparatory and the final in the elements of truth and principle common alike to both, instead of placing it in merely formal resemblances, is but to withdraw it from a less to a more vital and important part of the transactions—from the outer shell and appearance, to the inner truth and substance of the history ; so that we can discern, not only some perceptible coincidences between the type and the antitype, but the same fundamental character, the same spirit of life, the same moral import and practical design.

To render this more manifest, as it is a point of considerable moment in our inquiry, let us compare an alleged example of historical type, where the resemblance between it and the supposed antitype is of an ostensible, but still only of an outward kind, with one of those referred to above—the brazen serpent, for example, or the deluge. In this latter example there was scarcely *any* outward resemblance presented to the Christian ordinance of baptism ; as in no proper sense could Noah and his family be said to have been literally baptized in the waters. But both this and the other historical transaction presented strong lines of resemblance, of a more inward and substantial kind, to the things

connected with them in the Gospel—such as enable us to recognize without difficulty the impress of one divine hand in the two related series of transactions, and to contemplate them as corresponding parts of one grand economy, rising gradually from its lower to its higher stages of development. Take, however, as an example of the other class, the occupation of Abel as a shepherd, which by many, among others by Witsius, has been regarded as a prefiguration of Christ in his character as the great Shepherd of Israel. A superficial likeness, we admit; but what is to be found of real unity and agreement? What light does the one throw upon the other? What expectation beforehand could the earlier beget of the later, or what confirmation afterwards can it supply? Admitting that the death of Abel somehow foreshadowed the infinitely more precious blood to be shed on Calvary, what distinctive value could the sacrifice of life in his case derive from the previous occupation of the martyr? Christ, certainly, died as the spiritual shepherd of souls, but Abel was not murdered on account of having been a keeper of sheep; nor had his death any necessary connection with his having followed such an employment. For what purpose, then, press points of resemblance so utterly disconnected, and dignify them with the name of typical prefigurations? resemblances, worthless even if real, and from their nature incapable of affording any insight into the mind and purposes of God? But when, on the contrary, we look into the past records of God's providence, and find there in the dealings of his hand and the institutions of his worship a coincidence of principle and economical design with what appears in the dispensation of the Gospel, we cannot but feel that we have something of real weight and importance to grapple with. And if, farther, we have reason to conclude, not only that agreements of this kind existed, but that they were all skilfully planned and arranged—the earlier with a view to the later, the earthly and temporal for the spiritual and heavenly—we find ourselves possessed of the essential elements of a typical connection. But we *have* reason so to conclude, as has partly been shewn already, and will still farther be shewn in the sequel.

2. Granting, however, what has now been stated—granting that the connection between type and antitype is more of an internal than of an external kind, it may still be objected, in regard to the

historical types, that they wanted for the most part something of the necessary correspondence with the antitypes ; the one did not occupy under the Old the same relative place that the other did under the New—existing for a time as a shadow until it was superseded and displaced by the substance. Perhaps not ; but is such a close and minute correspondence absolutely necessary ? Or is it to be found even in the case of all the symbolical types ? With them also considerable differences appear ; and we look in vain for anything like a fixed and absolute uniformity. The correspondence assumed the most exact form in the sacrificial rites of the tabernacle worship. *There*, certainly, part may be said to have answered to part ; there was priest for priest, offering for offering, death for death, and blessing for blessing—throughout, an inferior and temporary substitute in the room of the proper reality, and continuing till it was superseded and displaced by the latter. We find a relaxation, however, in this closely adjusted relationship, whenever we leave the immediate province of sacrifice ; and in many of the things expressly denominated shadows of the Gospel, it can hardly be said to have existed. In regard, for example, to the ancient festivals, the new moons, the use or disuse of leaven, the defilement of leprosy and its purification, there was no such precise and definite superseding of the Old by something corresponding under the New—nothing like office for office, action for action, part for part. The symbolical rites and institutions referred to were typical—not, however, as representing things that were to hold specifically and palpably the same place in Gospel times—but rather as embodying in set forms and ever-recurring bodily services the truths and principles, that in naked simplicity and by direct teaching, were to pervade the dispensation of the Gospel.

There is quite a similar diversity in the case of the historical types. In some of them the correspondence was very close and exact ; in others more loose and general. Of the former class was the calling of Israel as an elect people, their relation to the land of Canaan, as their covenant-portion, their redemption from the yoke of Egypt, and their temporary sojourn in the wilderness as they travelled to inherit it—all of which continued (the two latter by means of commemorative ordinances) till they were superseded by corresponding but higher objects under the Gospel.

In respect to these we can say, the new dispensation presents people for people, redemption for redemption, inheritance for inheritance, and one kind of wilderness-training for another ; objects precisely corresponding in the relations they severally occupied, and the one preserving their existence or transmitting their efficacy, till they were supplanted by the other. But we do not pretend to see the same close connection and the same exact correspondence between the Old and the New in all, or even the greater part of the historical transactions of the past, which we hold to have been typical ; nor are we warranted to look for it. The analogy of the symbolical types would lead us to expect, along with the more direct typical arrangements, many acts and institutions of a somewhat incidental and subordinate kind, in which a typical representation should be given of ideas and relations, that could only find in the realities of the Gospel their full and proper manifestation. If they were not appointed as temporary substitutes for these realities, and kept in operation or perpetually commemorated, till the better things took their place, they were still moulded after the form and pattern of the better. They were designed by God, not, it may be, to present to men's minds the events and objects of the Gospel, but at least to acquaint them with its elements of truth, and to familiarize them with its spiritual ideas, its modes of procedure and principles of working. And in this they plainly possessed the more essential part of a typical connection.

II. Enough, however, for the first point. We proceed to the second ; which is, that such historical types as those under consideration, were absolutely necessary, in considerable number and variety, to render the earlier dispensations thoroughly preparative in respect to the coming dispensation of the Gospel. This was necessary, first of all, from the typical character of the position and worship of the members of the old covenant. The main things respecting them being, as we have seen, typical, it was inevitable but that many others of a subordinate and collateral nature should be the same ; for otherwise they would not have been suitably adapted to the dispensation to which they belonged.

But we have something more than this general correspondence or analogy to appeal to. For, the nature of the historical types themselves, as already explained, implies their existence in considerable number and variety. The representation they were designed to give of the fundamental truths and principles of the Gospel, with the view of preparing the church for the new dispensation, would necessarily have been incomplete and inadequate, unless it had embraced a pretty extensive field. The object of their appointment would have been but partially reached, if they had consisted only of the few straggling examples which have been particularly mentioned in New Testament Scripture. Nor, unless the history in general of Old Testament times, in so far as its recorded transactions bore on them the stamp of God's mind and will, had been pervaded by the typical element, could it have in any competent measure fulfilled the design of a preparatory economy. So that whatever distinctions it may be necessary to draw between one part of the transactions and another, as to their being in themselves sometimes of a more essential, sometimes of a more incidental character, or in their typical bearing being more or less closely related to the realities of the Gospel, their very place and object in a shadowy dispensation required them to be extensively typical. To be spread over a large field, and branched out in many directions, was as necessary to their typical, as to their more immediate and temporary design.

Thus the one point grows by a sort of natural necessity out of the other. But the argument admits of being considerably strengthened by the manner in which the historical types that *are* specially mentioned in New Testament Scripture are there referred to. So far from being represented as singular in their typical reference to Gospel times, they have uniformly the appearance of being only selected for the occasion. Nay, the obligation on the part of believers generally to seek for them throughout the Old Testament Scriptures, and apply them to all the purposes of Christian instruction and improvement, is distinctly asserted in the epistle to the Hebrews ; and the capacity to do so is represented as a proof of full-grown spiritual discernment (Heb. v. 11-14). There is, therefore, a sense in which the saying of Augustine,—“ The Old Testament, when rightly understood, is

one great prophecy of the New,"¹ is strictly true even in regard to those parts of ancient Scripture, which, in their direct and immediate bearing, partake least of the prophetic. Its records of the past are, at the same time, pregnant with the germs of a corresponding but more exalted future. The relations sustained by its more public characters, the parts they were appointed to act in their day and generation, the deliverances that were wrought for them and by them, and the chastisements they were from time to time given to experience, did not begin and terminate with themselves. They were parts of an unfinished and progressive plan, which finds its destined completion in the person and kingdom of Christ; and only when seen in this prospective reference do they appear in their proper magnitude and their full significance.

Christ, then, is the end of the history as well as of the law, of the Old Testament. It had been strange, indeed, if it were otherwise; strange if its historical transactions had not been ordained by God, in another manner than the common events of history, to bear a prospective reference to the Gospel scheme. For what is this scheme itself, in its fundamental character, but a grand historical development? What are the doctrines it teaches, the blessings it imparts, and the promises it unfolds of everlasting glory, but the reflection and fruit of its recorded facts—the facts, namely, of the incarnation and life, the death and resurrection, of the Lord Jesus Christ? These are the foundation on which all rests, the root from which everything springs in Christianity. And shall it, then, be imagined, that the earlier facts in the history of related and preparatory dispensations did not point, like so many heralds and forerunners, to these unspeakably greater ones to come? If a prophecy lay concealed in their symbolical rites, could it fail to be found also in the historical transactions, that were often so closely allied to these, and always coincident with them in purpose and design? Assuredly not. In so far as God spake in the transactions, and gave discoveries by them of his truth and character, they typically bore respect to the one "pattern-man," and the terminal kingdom of righteousness and blessing,

¹ *Vetus Testamentum recte intelligentibus prophetia est Novi Testamenti (Contra Faust. l. xv. 2.) And again, Ille apparatus veteris Testamenti in generationibus, factis etc. parturiebat esse venturum (Ib. l. xix. 31.)*

of which he was to be the head and centre. Here only the history of God's earlier dispensations attained its proper end, as in this also the history of the world finds its grand turning-point.¹

III. The thought, however, may very naturally occur, that if the historical matter of the Old Testament possess as much as we represent of a typical character, some plain indications of its being so should be found in Old Testament Scripture itself. We should scarcely need to draw our proof of the existence and nature of the historical types entirely from the writings of the New Testament. It was with the view of meeting this thought that we advanced our third statement; which is, that Old Testament Scripture does contain undoubted marks and indications of its historical personages and events being related to some higher ideal, in which the truths and relations exhibited in them were again to meet, and obtain a more adequate developement. The proof of this is to be sought chiefly in the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, in which the more select instruments of God gave expression to the Church's faith respecting both the past and the

¹ Some notice was taken toward the close of the Introduction of the change that has for some time been in progress on the Continent regarding the Typology of Scripture generally. In connection with the particular branch of it considered above, the following quotation (given by Hartmann in his *Verbinnung des Alten Test. mit den Newen*, p. 6, from a German periodical) may serve both as a specimen of the improved tone of thinking on the subject of Old Testament history, and its connection with the Gospel. "Must not Judaism be of great moment to Christianity, since both stand in brotherly and sisterly relations to each other? The historical books of the Hebrews are also religious books; the religious import is involved in the historical. The history of the people, as a divine leading and management in respect to them, was at the same time a training for religion, precisely as the Old Testament is a preparation for the New." To the same effect also Jacobi, as quoted by Sack, *Apologetik*, p. 356, on the words of Christ, that "as the serpent was lifted up, so *must* the Son of Man be lifted up," (*ὁ υἱὸς ἀρρῆναι δεῖ*): "History is also prophecy. The past contains within itself the future as an embryo, and at certain points, discernible by the spiritual eye, the greater, as in an image, is seen represented in the smaller, the internal in the external, the present or future in the past. Here there is nothing whatever arbitrary; throughout there is a divine *must*, connection, and arrangement, pregnant with mutual relations." More recently still Hofmann, in his *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, has given peculiar prominence to this view of Old Testament history; though he has nearly neutralized the benefit by the false views with which he has mixed it up. To these we shall probably refer afterwards. It is well, however, to hear him speaking of "the whole Old Testament history being a *vaticinium reale* respecting the New," and of history and prophecy being the two great component-factors in a preparatory economy.

future in his dispensations. And in looking there we find, not only that an exalted personage, with his work of perfect righteousness, and his kingdom of consummate bliss and glory, was seen to be in prospect, but also that the expectations cherished of what was to be, took very commonly the form of a new and higher exhibition of what had been. In giving promise of the better things to come, prophecy to a large extent availed itself of the characters and events of history. But it could only do so on the twofold ground, that it perceived in these essentially the same elements of truth and principle which were to appear in the future; and in that future anticipated a nobler exhibition of them than had been given in the past. And what was this but, in other words, to declare their typical meaning and design? The truth of what we say will more fully appear when we come to treat of the combination of type with prophecy—which, on account of its importance, we reserve for the subject of a separate chapter. Meanwhile, it will be remembered how even Moses speaks before his death of “the prophet which the Lord their God should raise up from among his brethren like to himself” (Deut. xviii. 18)—one that should hold a like position and do a similar work, but each in its kind more perfect and complete—else, why look out for another? In like manner David connects the historical appearance of Melchizedec with the future head of God’s Church and kingdom, when he announces him as a priest after the order of Melchizedec (Ps. cx. 4); he foresaw that the relations of Melchizedec’s time should be again revived in this divine character, and the same part fulfilled anew, but raised, as the connection intimates, to a higher sphere, invested with a heavenly greatness and a world-wide significance and power. So again we are told (Mal. iii., 1, iv. 5) another Elias should arise in the brighter future, to be succeeded by a more glorious manifestation of the Lord, to do what had never but very imperfectly been done before; namely, to provide for himself a true spiritual priesthood, a regenerated people, and an offering of righteousness. But the richest proofs are furnished by the latter portion of Isaiah’s writings. For, there we find the prophet intermingling so closely together the past and the future, that it is often difficult to tell of which he actually speaks. He passes from Israel to the Messiah, and again from the Messiah to Israel, as if the one were but a new, a higher and perfect development of what belonged to the

other. And the Church of the future is constantly represented under the relations of the past, only freed from the imperfections that attached to these, and rendered in every respect blessed and glorious.

Such are a few specimens of the way in which the more spiritual and divinely enlightened members of the old covenant saw the future imaged in the past or present. They discerned the essential oneness in truth and principle between the two ; but, at the same time, were conscious of such inherent imperfections and defects attaching to the past, that they felt it required a more perfect future to render it properly worthy of God, and fully adequate to the wants and necessities of his people. And there is one entire book of the Old Testament which owes in a manner its existence, as it now stands, to this likeness in one respect, but diversity in another, between the past and the future things in God's administration. We refer to the Book of Psalms. The pieces of which this book consists are in their leading character devotional summaries, expressing the pious thoughts and feelings which the consideration of God's ways, and the knowledge of his revelations, were fitted to raise in reflecting and spiritual bosoms. But the singular thing is, that they are this for the New, as well as for the Old Testament worshipper. They are still incomparably the most perfect expression of the religious sentiment, and the best directory to the soul in its thoughts and communings about divine things, which is anywhere to be found. There is not a feature in the divine character, not a spiritual principle or desire in the mind of an enlightened Christian, or an aspect of the life of faith, to which expression, more or less distinct, is not given in this invaluable portion of ancient Scripture. How could such a book have come into existence, centuries before the Christian era, but for the fact, that the Old and the New dispensations—however they may have differed in outward form, and however the ostensible transactions in the one case may have been inferior to what they were to be in the other—were founded on the same relations, and pervaded by the same essential truths and principles? No otherwise could the Book of Psalms have served as the great hand-book of devotion to the members of both covenants. *There* the disciples of Moses and Christ meet as on common ground—the one still readily and gratefully using the fervid and deep-toned utterances which the other had breathed forth ages before, and

bequeathed as a legacy to succeeding generations. And though it was comparatively carnal institutions under which the holy men lived and worshipped, who indited those divine songs ; though it was transactions which directly bore only on their earthly and temporal condition, that formed the immediate ground and occasion of the sentiments they uttered ; yet, where in all Scripture can the believer, who now “ worships in spirit and in truth,” more readily find for himself the words that shall fitly express his loftiest conceptions of God, embody his most spiritual and enlarged views of the divine government, or tell forth the feelings and desires of his soul even in many of its most lively and elevated moods ?

But with this fitting adaptation in the Psalms to the thoughts and feelings of the Christian, what a difference still exists between the Psalms and the epistles of the New Testament ! With all that discovers itself in the Psalms of a vivid apprehension of God, and of a habitual confidence in his faithfulness and love, there still is apparent something of awe and restraint upon the soul ; it never rises into the filial cry of the Gospel, Abba, Father. There is a fitfulness also in its movements, as of one dwelling in a dusky and changeful atmosphere. Continually, indeed, do we see the Psalmist flying, in distress and trouble, under the shelter of the Almighty, and trusting in his mercy for deliverance from the guilt of sin. Even in the worst times he still prays and looks for redemption. But *the* redemption which dispels all fear, and satisfies the soul with the highest good, he knew not, excepting as a bright day-star glistening in the far-distant horizon. He knew it as a thing that should assuredly be brought in for the Church of God ; and could tell somewhat of the mighty and glorious personage destined in the divine counsels to accomplish it—of his unparalleled struggles in the cause of righteousness, and of his final triumphs, resulting in the extension of his kingdom to the farthest bounds of the earth. But no more—the veil still hangs ; expectation still waits and longs ; and it is only for the believer of other times to say, “ Mine eyes have seen thy salvation ;” “ I have a desire to depart, and to be with Christ ;” or again, “ Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God ; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know, that when he appears, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.”

Such is the agreement, and such also the difference between the Old and the New. “*There* we see the promise and prelude of the blessings of salvation ; *here*, these blessings themselves, far surpassing all the previous foreshadowings of them. There, a fiducial resting in Jehovah ; here, an unspeakable fulness of spiritual and heavenly blessings from the opened fountain of his mercy. There, a confidence that the Lord would not abandon his people ; here, the Lord himself assuming their nature, the God-man, connecting himself in organic union with humanity, and sending forth streams of life through its members. There, in the back-ground, night, only relieved by the stars of the word of promise and operations of grace in suitable accordance with it ; here, in the back-ground, day, still clouded, indeed, by our human nature, which is not yet completely penetrated by the Spirit, and is ever anew manifesting its sinfulness, but yet such a day as gives assurance of the cloudless sunshine of eternity, of which God himself is the light.”¹

The whole of the argument maintained in this and the preceding chapters, respecting the typical character of God’s earlier dispensations, admits of confirmation and support from the existence of typical forms in nature, which present in this respect a striking analogy between the natural and the religious departments of God’s working. A brief outline of the kind of illustration that might be obtained here, is given in another place, as it has only a collateral bearing on the main subject.² But let us not close this elementary discussion without reflecting for a moment on the skilful adjustment which appears in the earlier dispensations of God, as regards the progressive character of his divine plan. The plan so considered certainly presents something strange and mysterious to our view, especially in the extreme slowness of its progression ; since it required the postponement of the work of redemption for so many ages, and kept the church during these in a state of comparative ignorance in respect to the great objects of her faith and hope. Yet what is it but an application to the world’s history of what is constantly proceeding before our eyes in each man’s personal history, whose term of probation upon earth

¹ Delitzsch, *Biblich-prophetische Theologie*, p. 232.

² See Appendix A.

is, in many cases half, in nearly all a third part consumed, before the individual attains to a capacity for the objects and employments of manhood? Constituted as we personally are, and as the world also is, progression of some kind is indispensable to happiness and well-being; and the majestic slowness that appears in the plan of God's administration of the world, is but a reflection of the nature of its divine author, with whom a thousand years are as one day. Starting, then, with the assumption, that the divine plan behoved to be of a progressive character, the nature of the connection we have found to exist between its earlier and later parts, discovers the perfect wisdom and foresight of God. The terminating point in the plan was what is called emphatically "the mystery of godliness,"—God manifest in the flesh for the redemption of a fallen world, and the establishment through all its borders of a kingdom of righteousness, that should not pass away. It was necessary that some intimation of this ulterior design should be given from the first, that the church might know whither to direct her expectations. Accordingly, the prophetic Word began to utter its predictions with the very entrance of sin. The first promise was given on the spot that witnessed the fall; and that a promise which contained, within its brief but pregnant meaning, the whole burden of redemption. As time rolled on, prophecy continued to add to its communications, having still for its grand scope and aim "the testimony of Jesus." And at length so express had its tidings become, and so plentiful its revelations, that when the purpose of the Father drew near to its accomplishment, the remnant of sincere worshippers were like men standing on their watch-towers, waiting and looking for the long-expected consolation of Israel; nor was there anything of moment in the personal history or work of the Son, of which it could not be written, It was so done, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled.

It is plain, however, on a little consideration, that something more was needed than the simple announcements of prophecy. The church required training as well as teaching, and training of a very peculiar kind; for she had to be formed for receiving things "which men had not heard, nor had the ear perceived, neither had the eye seen—the things which God had prepared for those that waited for him." (Isa. lxiv. 4.) "The new dispensation was to be wholly made up of things strange and wonderful;

all that is seen and heard of it is contrary to carnal wisdom. The appearance of the Son of God in a humble condition—the discharge by him in person of a Gospel ministry, with its attendant circumstances—his shame and sufferings—his resurrection and ascension into heaven—the nature of the kingdom instituted by him, which is spiritual—the blessings of his kingdom, which are also spiritual—the instruments employed for advancing the kingdom, men devoid of worldly learning, and destitute of outward authority—the gift of the Holy Spirit, the calling of the Gentiles, the rejection of so many among the Jewish people :—these, among other things, were indeed such as the carnal eye had never seen, and the carnal ear had never heard ; nor could they without express revelation, by any thought or natural ingenuity on the part of man, have been foreseen or understood.”¹ But lying thus so far beyond the ken of man’s natural apprehensions, and so different from what they were disposed of themselves to expect, if all that was done beforehand respecting them had consisted in the necessarily partial and obscure intimations of prophecy, there could neither have been any just anticipation of the things to be revealed, nor any suitable training for them ; the change from the past to the future must have come as an irruption, and men could only have been brought by a sort of violence to submit to it.

To provide against this, there was required, as a proper accompaniment to the intimations of prophecy, the training of preparatory dispensations, that the past history and established experience of the church might run, though on a lower level, yet in the same direction with her future prospects. And what her circumstances in this respect required, the wisdom and foresight of God provided. He so skilfully modelled for her the institutions of worship, and so wisely arranged the dealings of his providence, that there was constantly presented to her view in the outward and earthly things with which she was there conversant, the cardinal truths and principles of the coming dispensation. In every thing she saw and handled, there was something to mould her spirit into accordance with the realities of the Gospel ; so that if she could not be said to live *directly* under “the powers of the world to come,” she yet shared their *secondary* influence, being placed amid the signs and shadows of the true, and conducted

¹ Vitringa on Isa. lxiv. 4.

through earthly transactions that bore on them the image of the heavenly.

It is to this preparatory training, as being on the part of God sufficiently protracted and complete, that we are to regard the apostle as chiefly referring, when he speaks of Christ having appeared, "when the fulness of the time was come" (Gal. iv. 4). Chiefly, though not by any means exclusively. For there is a manifold wisdom in all God's arrangements. In the moral as well as in the physical world he is ever making numerous operations conspire to the production of one result, and one result to serve many important ends. It is, therefore, a most fit and proper object of inquiry to search and consider how many lines there were in the world's condition, that opportunely met at the time of Christ's appearing, and together rendered it above all others the best suited for the institution of his kingdom, and most advantageous for the diffusion of its truths and blessings among the nations of the earth. But whatever light may be gathered from these external researches, it should never be forgotten that God's own record must furnish the main grounds for determining the special fitness of the selected time, and the position of his church the paramount reason. In everything that essentially affects the interests of the church, therefore pre-eminently in what concerns the manifestation of Christ, which is the centre-point of all that touches her interests, the state and condition of the church herself is ever the first thing contemplated by the eye of God; the rest of the world holds but a secondary and subordinate place. And so, when we are told that Christ appeared in the fulness of time, the fact, of which we are mainly assured, is, that all was done which was fit and necessary to be done for bringing the church into a state of preparedness for the time of his appearing. Not only had the period anticipated by prophecy arrived, and believing expectation, mounting on the ladder of prophecy, reached its proper height, but also the long series of preliminary arrangements and dealings was now complete, which were designed to make the church familiar with the fundamental truths and principles of Messiah's kingdom, and prepare her for the erection of this kingdom with its divine realities and eternal prospects. Nor do we need to make any exception to this in behalf of the long period that reached from the Babylonish exile to the advent of

Christ ; for however this may seem at first sight to have been a period chiefly of disaster and inaction, it is found on more careful consideration to have been, in other respects, one of active and powerful influence—one peculiarly fitted to complete the training of the covenant-people, and dispose aright both their minds and their persons for the new era that awaited them.

It is true that we search in vain for the general and widespread success, which we might justly expect to have arisen from the plan of God, and to have made conspicuously manifest its infinite wisdom. With the exception of a comparatively small number, the professing church was found so completely unprepared for the doctrine of Christ's kingdom, as to reject it with disdain, and oppose it with unrelenting violence. But this neither proves the absence of the design, nor the unfitness of the means for carrying it into effect. It only proves how insufficient the best means are of themselves to enlighten and sanctify the human mind, when it becomes set upon objects that fall in with its own carnal views and prejudices—proves how the heart may remain essentially untaught, even after undergoing the most perfect course of instruction, and may remain wedded to error and corruption. But while we cannot overlook the fatal ignorance and perversity that pervaded the mass of the Jewish people, we are not to forget that there still was among them a pious remnant, “the election according to grace,” who, as the church in the world, so they in the church ever occupy the foremost place in the mind and purposes of God. In the bosom of the Jewish church, as is justly remarked by Thiersch, there lay a domestic life so pure, noble, and tender, that it could yield such a person as the holy Virgin, and could furnish an atmosphere in which the Son of God might grow up sinless from childhood to manhood. There was Simeon and Anna, Zacharias and Elizabeth, Mary and Joseph, the company of apostles, the converts, no small number after all, who flocked to the standard of Jesus, as soon as the truths of his salvation came to be fully known and understood, and the believing Jews and proselytes scattered abroad, who, in almost every city, were ready to form the nucleus of a Christian church, and greatly facilitated its extension in the world. Did not the course of God's preparatory dispensations reach its end in regard to these ? We have only to look for the answer to the style of ar-

gument and address used by the apostles. How much do both their language and their ideas savour of the sanctuary! How constantly do they throw themselves back for illustration and support, not only on the prophecies, but also on the sacred annals and institutions of the Old Testament! They spake and reasoned on the assumption, that the revelations of the Gospel were but a new and higher exhibition of the principles, which appeared alike in the events of their past history and the services of their religious worship. An appropriate language was already furnished by means of these to their hand, through which they could discourse aright of spiritual and divine things. But more than that, as they had no new language to invent, so they had no new ideas to discover, or unheard-of principles to promulgate. The scheme of truth, which they were called to expound and propagate, had its foundations already laid in the whole history and constitution of the Jewish commonwealth. In labouring to establish it, they felt that they were treading in the footsteps, and, on a higher vantage-ground, maintaining the faith of their illustrious fathers. In short, they appear as the heralds and advocates of a cause, which, in its essential principles, had its representation in all history, and gathered as into one glorious orb of truth the scattered rays of light and consolation, which had been emanating from the ways of God since the world began. Thus wisely were the different parts of the divine plan adjusted to each other; and, for the accomplishment of what was required, the training by means of types could no more have been dispensed with, than the glimpse-like visions and hopeful intimations of prophecy.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

PROPHETICAL TYPES, OR THE COMBINATION OF TYPE WITH PROPHECY—
ALLEGED DOUBLE SENSE OF PROPHECY.

A TYPE necessarily possesses something of a prophetic character, and differs in degree rather than in kind from what is usually designated prophecy. The one images or prefigures, while the other foretels, coming realities. In the one case representative acts or symbols, in the other verbal delineations, serve the purpose of indicating beforehand what God was designed to accomplish for his people in the approaching future. The difference is not such as to affect the essential nature of the two subjects, as alike connecting together the Old and the New in God's dispensations. In distinctness and precision, however, simple prophecy has greatly the advantage over informations conveyed by type. For prophecy, however it may differ in its general characteristics from history, as it naturally possesses something of the directness, so it may also attain to something of the exactness of historical description. But types having a significance or moral import of their own, apart from anything prospective, must, in their prophetic aspect, be somewhat less transparent, and possess more of a complicated character. Still the relation between type and anti-type, when pursued through all its ramifications, may produce as deep a conviction of design and pre-ordained connection, as can be derived from simple prophecy and its fulfilment, though, from the nature of things, the evidence in the latter case must always be more obvious and palpable than in the former.

But the possession of the same common character is not the only link of connection between type and prophecy. Not only do they agree in having both a prospective reference to the future, but they are often also combined into one prospective exhibition

of the future. Prophecy, though it sometimes is of a quite simple, and direct nature, is far from being always so ; and can scarcely ever be said to delineate the future with the precision and exactness that history employs in recording the past. In many portions of it there is a certain degree of complexity, if not dubiety, and that mainly arising from the circumstances and transactions of the past being in some way interwoven with its anticipations of things to come. Here, however, we approach the confines of a controversy on which some of the greatest minds have expended their talents and learning, and with such doubtful success on either side, that the question is still perpetually brought up anew for discussion, whether there is or is not a double sense in prophecy ? That some portion of debateable ground will always remain connected with the subject appears to us more than probable. But, at the same time, we are fully persuaded that the portion admits of being greatly narrowed in extent, and even reduced to such small dimensions, as not materially to affect the settlement of the main question, if only the typical element in prophecy is allowed its due place and weight. This we shall endeavour, first of all, to exhibit in the several aspects in which it actually presents itself ; and shall then subjoin a few remarks on the views of those who espouse either side of the question, as it is usually stated.

From the general resemblance between type and prophecy, we are prepared to expect that they may sometimes run into each other ; and especially, that the typical in action may in various ways form the ground-work and the materials, by means of which the prophetic in word gave forth its intimations of the coming future. And this, it is quite conceivable, may have been done under any of the following modifications. 1. A typical action might, in some portion of the prophetic word, be historically mentioned, and hence the mention being that of a prophetic circumstance or event, would come to possess a prophetic character. 2. Or something typical in the past or the present might be represented in a distinct prophetic announcement, as going to appear again in the future ; thus combining together the typical in act, and the prophetic in word. 3. Or, the typical, not expressly and formally, but in its essential relations and principles, might be embodied in an accompanying prediction, which

foretold things corresponding in nature, but far higher and greater in importance. 4. Or, finally, the typical might itself be still future, and in a prophetic word might be partly described, partly pre-supposed, as a typical ground for the delineation of other things still more distant, to which, when it occurred, it was to stand in the relation of type to antitype. We could manifestly have no difficulty in conceiving such combinations of type with prophecy, without any violence done to their distinctive properties, or any invasion made on their respective provinces—nothing, indeed, happening but what might have been expected from their mutual relations, and their fitness for being employed in concert to the production of common ends. And we shall now shew how each of the suppositions has found its verification in the prophetic Scriptures.¹

I. The first supposition is that of a typical action being historically mentioned in the prophetic word, and the mention, being that of a prophetic circumstance or event, thence coming to possess a prophetic character. There are two classes of Scriptures which may be said to verify this supposition; one of which is of a somewhat general and comprehensive nature, so that the fulfilment is not necessarily confined to any single person or period, though it could not fail, in an especial manner, to appear in the personal history of Christ. To this class belonged such recorded experiences as the following—"The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up" (Ps. lxi. 9, comp. with John ii. 17); "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me" (Ps. xli. 9, comp. with John xiii. 18); "They hated me without a cause" (Ps. lxi. 4, comp. with John xv. 25); "The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner" (Ps. cxviii. 22, comp. with Matth. xxi. 42, 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7.) These passages are all distinctly referred to Christ in the Gospels, and the things that befel him are expressly said, or plainly indicated to have happened, that such scriptures might be fulfilled. Yet

¹ It is proper to state, however, that we cannot present here anything like a full and complete elucidation of the subject; and we therefore mean to supplement this chapter by an appendix on the Old Testament in the New, in which the subject will both be considered from a different point of view, and followed out more into detail. See Appendix B.

as originally penned they assume the form of historical statements, rather than of prophetic announcements—recorded experiences on the part of those who indited them, and experiences of a kind, that in one form or another, could scarcely fail to be often recurring in the history of God's church and people. As such it might have seemed enough to say, that they contained general truths which were exemplified also in Jesus, when travailing in the work of man's redemption. But the convictions of Jesus himself and the inspired writers of the New Testament go beyond this; they perceive a closer connection—a prophetic element in the passages, which must find its due fulfilment in the personal experience of Christ. And this the passages contained, simply from their being in their immediate and historical reference, descriptive of what belonged to characters—David and Israel—that bore typical relations to Christ; so that their being descriptive in the one respect necessarily implied their being prophetic in the other. What had formerly taken place in the experience of the type, must substantially renew itself again in the experience of the great antitype—whatever other and inferior renewals it may find besides.

To the same class also may be referred the passage in Ps. lxxviii. 2, "I will open my mouth in a parable (lit. similitude); I will utter dark sayings (lit. riddles) of old," which in Matth. xiii. 35 is spoken of as a prediction that found, and required to find, its fulfilment in our Lord's using the parabolic mode of discourse. As an utterance in the seventy-eighth Psalm the word simply records a fact, but a fact essentially connected with the discharge of the prophetic office, and, therefore, substantially indicating what must be met with in Him, in whom all prophetic endowments were to have their highest manifestation. Every prophet may be said to speak in similitudes or parables in the sense here indicated, which is comprehensive of all discourses upon divine things, delivered in figurative terms or an elevated style, and requiring more than common discernment to understand it aright. The parables of our Lord formed one species of it, but not by any means the only one. It was the common prophetic-poetical diction, which was characterized, not only by the use of measured sentences, but also by the predominant employment of external forms and natural similitudes. But, marking as it did,

the possession of a prophetic gift, the record of its employment by Christ's prophetic types and forerunners was a virtual prediction, that it should be ultimately used in some appropriate form by himself.

The other class of passages which comes within the terms of *the first supposition, is of a more specific and formal character.* It coincides with the class already considered, in so far as it consists of words originally descriptive of some transaction or circumstance in the past, but afterwards regarded as prophetically indicative of something similar under the Gospel. Such is the word in Hos. xi. 1, "I called my son out of Egypt," which, as uttered by the prophet, was unquestionably meant to refer historically to the fact of the Lord's goodness in delivering Israel from that land of bondage and oppression. But the Evangelist Matthew expressly points to it as a prophecy, and tells us, that the infant Jesus was for a time sent into Egypt, and again brought out of it, that the word might be fulfilled. This arose from the typical connection between Christ and Israel. The Scripture fulfilled was prophetic, simply because the circumstance it recorded was typical. But in so considering it, the Evangelist puts no new strain upon its terms, nor introduces any sort of double sense into its import. He merely points to the prophetic element involved in the transaction it relates, and thereby discovers to us a bond of connection between the Old and the New in God's dispensations, necessary to be kept in view for a correct apprehension of both.

The same explanation in substance may be given of another example of the same class—the word in Exod. xii. 46, "A bone of him shall not be broken," which in John xix. 36 is represented as finding its fulfilment in the remarkable preservation of our Lord's body on the cross from the common fate of malefactors. The Scripture in itself was a historical testimony regarding the treatment the Israelites were to give to the paschal lamb, which, instead of being broken into fragments, was to be preserved entire, and eaten as one whole. It could only be esteemed a prophecy from being the record of a typical or prophetic action. But, when viewed in that light, the Scripture itself stands precisely as it did, without any recondite depth or subtle ambiguity being thrown into its meaning. For the prophecy in it is found, not by extracting from its words some new and hidden sense, but

merely by noting the typical import of the circumstances, of which the words in their natural and obvious sense are descriptive.

How either Israel or the paschal lamb should have been in such a sense typical of Christ, that what is recorded of the one could be justly regarded as a prophecy of what was to take place in the other, will be matter for future inquiry, and, in connection with some other prophecies, will be partly explained in the appendix already referred to in this chapter. It is the *principle*, on which the explanation must proceed, to which alone for the present we desire to draw attention, and which, in the cases now under consideration, simply recognises the prophetic element involved in the recorded circumstance or transaction of the past. Neither is the Old Testament Scripture, taken by itself, prophetic, nor does the New Testament Scripture invest it with a force and meaning foreign to its original purport and design. The Old merely records the typical fact, which properly constitutes the whole there is of prediction in the matter, while the New reads forth its import as such, by announcing the co-relative events or circumstances in which the fulfilment should be discovered. And nothing more is needed for perfectly harmonising the two together, than that we should so far identify the typical transaction recorded with the record that embodies it, as to perceive, that when the Gospel speaks of a Scripture fulfilled, it speaks of that Scripture in connection with the prophetic character of the subject it relates to.

There is nothing, surely, strange or anomalous in this. It is but the employment of a metonymy of a very common kind, according to which what embodies or contains any thing is viewed as in a manner one with the thing itself—as when the earth is made to stand for the inhabitants of the earth, a house for its inmates, a cup for its contents, a word descriptive of events past or to come, as if it actually produced them.¹ Of course, the validity of such a mode of explanation depends entirely upon the reality of the connection between the alleged type and antitype—between the

¹ So, for example, in Hos. vi. 5, "I have hewed them by the prophets;" Gen. xxvii. 37, "Behold I have made him thy lord;" xlviii. 22, "I have given thee one portion above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite"—each ascribing to the word spoken the actual doing of that which it only declared to have been done.

earlier circumstance or object described, and the later one to which the description is prophetically applied. On any other ground such references as those in Matthew to Hosea, and in John to Exodus, can only be viewed as fanciful or strained accommodations. But the matter assumes another aspect if the one was originally ordained in anticipation of the other, and so ordained, that the earlier should not have been brought into existence if the later had not been before in contemplation. Seen from this point of view, which we hold to be the one taken by the inspired writers, the past appears to run into the future, and to have existed mainly for it. And the record or delineation of the past is naturally and justly, not by a mere fiction of the imagination, seen to possess the essential character of a prediction. Embodying a prophetic circumstance or action, it is itself named by one of the commonest figures of speech, a prophecy.

II. Our second supposition was that of something typical in the past or present being represented in a distinct prophetic announcement as going to appear again in the future—the prophetic in word being thus combined with the typical in act into a prospective delineation of things to come. This supposition also includes several varieties, and in one form or another has its exemplifications in many parts of the prophetic word. For it is in a manner the native tendency of the mind, when either of itself forecasting, or under the guidance of a divine impulse anticipating and disclosing the future, to see this future imaged in the past, to make use of the known in giving shape and form to the unknown; so that the things which *have* been, are then usually contemplated as in some respect types of what *shall* be, even though in the reality there may be considerable differences of a formal kind between them.

How much it is the native tendency of the mind to work in this manner, when itself endeavouring to descry the events of the future, is evident from the examples, transmitted to us by the most cultivated minds, of human divination. Thus the Pythoness in Virgil, when disclosing to Æneas what he and his posterity might expect in Latium, speaks of it merely as a repetition of the scenes and experiences of former times. “You shall not want Simois, Xanthus, or the Grecian camp. Another Achilles, also of

divine offspring, is already provided for Latium."¹ In like manner Juno, in the vaticination put into her mouth by Horace, respecting the possible destinies of Rome, declares, that in the circumstances supposed, "the fortune of Troy again reviving, should again also be visited with terrible disaster, and that even if a wall of brass were thrice raised around it, it should be thrice destroyed by the Greeks."² In such examples of pretended divination, no one, of course, imagines it to have been meant that the historical persons and circumstances mentioned were to be actually reproduced in the approaching or contemplated future. All we are to understand is, that others of a like kind—holding similar relations to the parties interested, and occupying much the same position—were announced beforehand to appear; and so, would render the future a sort of repetition of the past; or the past a kind of typical foreshadowing of the future.

As an example of divine predictions precisely similar in form, we may point to Hos. viii. 13, where the prophet, speaking of the Lord's purpose to visit the sins of Israel with chastisement, says, "They shall return to Egypt." The old state of bondage and oppression should come back upon them; or the things going to befall them of evil should be after the type of what their forefathers had experienced under the yoke of Pharaoh. Yet that the new should not be by any means the exact-repetition of the old, as it might have been conjectured from the altered circumstances of the time, so it is expressly intimated by the prophet himself a few verses afterwards, when he says, "Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean things in Assyria" (chap ix. 3); and again in ch. xi. 5, "He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king." He shall return to Egypt and still not return; in other words, the Egypt-state shall come back on him, though the precise locality and external circumstances shall differ. In like manner Ezekiel in ch. iv. foretels, in his own peculiar and mystical way, the return of the Egypt-state; and in

¹ Non Simois tibi, nec Xanthus, nec Dorica castra
Defuerint. Alius Latio jam partus Achilles,
Natus et ipse dea.—Æn. vi. 88-90.

² Trojæ renascens alite lugubri
Fortuna tristi clade iterabitur etc.—Carm. L. III. 3, 61-68.
See also Seneca Medea, 374, etc.

ch. xx. speaks of the Lord as going to bring the people again into the wilderness ; but calls it " the wilderness of the peoples," to indicate that the dealing should be the same only in character with what Israel of old had been subjected to in the wilderness, not a bald and formal repetition of the story.

Indeed, God's providence knows nothing in the sacred any more than in the profane territory of the world's history, of a literal reproduction of the past. And when prophecy threw its delineations of the future into the form of the past, and spake of the things yet to be as a recurrence of those that had already been, it simply meant that the one should be after the type of the other, or should in spirit and character resemble it. By type, however, in such examples as those just referred to, is not to be understood type in the more special or theological sense in which the term is commonly used in the present discussions, as if there was anything in the past that of itself gave prophetic intimation of the coming future. It is to be understood only in the general sense of a pattern-form, in accordance with which the events in prospect were to bear the image of the past. The prophetic element, therefore, did not properly reside in the historical transaction referred to in the prophecy, but in the prophetic word itself, which derived its peculiar form from the past, and through that a certain degree of light to illustrate its import. There were, however, other cases in which the typical in circumstance or action—the typical in the proper sense—was similarly combined with a prophecy in word ; and in them we have a twofold prophetic element—one more concealed in the type, and another more express and definite in the word, but the two made to coalesce in one prediction.

Of this kind is the prophecy in Zech. vi. 12, 13, where the prophet takes occasion, from the building of the literal temple in Jerusalem under the presidency of Joshua, to foretel a similar, but higher and more glorious work in the future : " Behold the man, whose name is the Branch ; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord ; even he shall build the temple of the Lord," &c. The building of the temple was itself typical of the incarnation of God in the person of Christ, and of the raising up in him of a spiritual house that should be " an habitation of God through the Spirit." (John ii. 19 ; Matth. xvi. 18 ; Eph. ii. 20, 22.) But the prophecy thus involved in the

action is expressly uttered in the prediction, which at once explained the type, and sent forward the expectations of believers toward the contemplated result. Similar, also, is the prediction of Ezekiel, in chap. xxxiv. 23, in which the good promised in the future to a truly penitent and believing people, is connected with a return of the person and times of David: "And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd." And the closing prediction of Malachi, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." David's kingdom and reign in Israel were from the first intended to foreshadow those of Christ; and the work also of Elias, as preparatory to the Lord's final reckoning with the apostate commonwealth of Israel, bore a typical respect to the work of preparation that was to go before the Lord's personal appearance in the last crisis of the Jewish state. Such might have been probably conjectured or dimly apprehended from the things themselves; but it became comparatively clear, when it was announced in explicit predictions, that a new David and a new Elias were to appear. The prophetic element was there before in the type; but the prophetic word brought it distinctly and prominently out; yet so as in no respect to materially change or complicate the meaning. The specific designation of "David my servant," and "Elijah the prophet," are in each case alike intended to indicate, not the literal reproduction of the past, but the full realization of all that the past typically foretokened of good. It virtually told the people of God, that in their anticipations of the coming reality, they might not fear to heighten to the uttermost the idea which those honoured names were fitted to suggest; their anticipations would be amply borne out by the event, in which still higher prophecy than Elijah's, and unspeakably nobler service than David's, was to be found in reserve for the church.¹

¹ Those who contend for the actual re-appearance of Elijah, because the epithet of "the prophet," they think, fixes down the meaning to the personal Elijah, may as well contend for the re-appearance of David as the future king; for "David my servant" is as distinctive an appellation of the one, as "Elijah the prophet" of the other. But in reality they are thus specified as both exhibiting the highest known ideal—the one of king-like service, the other of prophetic work as preparatory to a divine manifestation. And in thinking of *them* the people could get the most correct view they were capable of entertaining of the predicted future.

III. We pass on to our third supposition, which may seem to be nearly identical with the last, yet belongs to a stage further in advance. It is that the typical, not expressly and formally, but in its essential relations and principles, might be embodied in an accompanying prediction, which foretold things corresponding in nature, but of higher moment and wider import. So far this supposed case coincides with the last, that in that also the things predicted might be, and, if referring to gospel times, actually were higher and greater than those of the type. But it differs, in that this superiority did not there, as it does here, appear in the terms of the prediction, which simply announced the recurrence of the type. And it differs still farther, in that there the type was expressly and formally introduced into the prophecy, while here it is tacitly assumed, and only its essential relations and principles are applied to the delineation of some things analogous and related, but conspicuously loftier and greater. In this case, then, the typical transactions furnishing the materials for the prophetic delineation, must necessarily form the back-ground, and the explanatory prediction the foreground of the picture. The words of the prophet must describe not the typical past, but the corresponding and grander future,—describe it, however, under the form of the past, and in connection with the same fundamental views of the divine character and government. So that there must here also be but one sense, though a twofold prediction—one more vague and indefinite, standing in the type or prophetic action, the other more precise and definite, furnished by the prophetic word, and directly pointing to the greater things to come.

The supposition now made is actually verified in a considerable number of prophetic Scriptures. Connected with them, and giving rise to them, there were certain circumstances and events so ordered by God as to be in a greater or less degree typical of others under the Gospel. And there was a prophecy connecting the two together, by taking up the truths and relations embodied in the type, and expanding them so as to embrace the higher and still future things of God's kingdom,—thus at once indicating the typical design of the past, and announcing in appropriate terms the coming events of the future.

Let us point, in the first instance, to an illustrative example, in which the typical element, indeed, was comparatively vague

and general, but which has the advantage of being the first, if we mistake not, of this species of prophecy, and in some measure gave the tone to those that followed. The example we refer to is the song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1-10) indited by that pious woman under the inspiration of God, on the occasion of the birth of Samuel. The history leaves no room to doubt that this was its immediate occasion ; yet, if viewed in reference to that occasion alone, how comparatively trifling is the theme ! How strained and magniloquent the expressions ! Hannah speaks of her " mouth being enlarged over her enemies," of " the bows of the mighty men being broken," of the " barren bearing seven," of the " full hiring themselves out for bread," and other things of a like nature—all how far exceeding, how completely caricaturing the occasion, if it has respect merely to the fact of a woman, hitherto reputed barren, becoming at length the joyful mother of a child ! Were the song a mere inflation in the style of common eastern poetry, we might not be greatly startled at such grotesque exaggerations ; but being a portion of that word, which is all given by inspiration of God, and is as silver tried in a furnace, we must disband from our mind any idea of extravagance or conceit. Indeed, from the whole strain and character of the song, it is evident, that though occasioned by the birth of Samuel, it was so far from having exclusive reference to that event, that the things concerning it formed one only of a numerous and important class pervading the providence of God, and closely connected with his highest purposes. In a spiritual respect it was a time of mournful barrenness and desolation in Israel ; " the word of the Lord was precious, there was no open vision ;" and iniquity was so rampant as even to be lifting up its insolent front, and practising its foul abominations in the very precincts of the Sanctuary. How natural, then, for Hannah, when she had got that child of desire and hope, which she had devoted from his birth as a Nazarite to the Lord's service, and feeling her soul moved by a prophetic impulse, to regard herself as specially raised up to be " a sign and a wonder" to Israel, and to do so particularly in respect to that principle in the divine government, which had so strikingly developed itself in her experience, but which was destined to receive its grandest manifestation in the work and kingdom, which were to be more peculiarly the Lord's ! Hence,

instead of looking simply to her individual case, and marking the operation of the Lord's hand in what merely concerned her personal history, she wings her flight aloft, and surveys the wide field of God's providential dealings; noting especially, as she proceeds, the workings of that pure and gracious sovereignty which delights to exalt an humble piety, while it brings down the proud and rebellious. And as every exercise of this principle is but part of a grand series, which culminates in the dispensation of Christ, her song runs out at the close into a sublime and glowing delineation of the final results to be achieved by it in connection with his righteous administration. "The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall he thunder upon them; the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his anointed."¹

This song of Hannah, then, plainly consists of two parts, in the one of which only—the concluding portion—it is properly prophetic. The preceding stanzas are taken up with unfolding, from past and current events, the grand spiritual idea; the closing ones carry it forward in beautiful and striking application to the affairs of Messiah's kingdom. In the earlier part it presents to us the germ of sacred principle unfolded in the type; in the latter, it exhibits this rising to its ripened growth and perfection in the final exaltation and triumph of the king of Zion. The two differ in respect to the line of things immediately contemplated—the facts of history in the one case, in the other the anticipations of prophecy; but they agree in being alike pervaded by one and the same great principle, which, after floating down the

¹ The last clause might as well, and indeed better, have been rendered, "Exalt the horn of his Messiah." Even the Jewish interpreter, Kimchi, understands it as spoken directly of the Messiah, and the Targum paraphrases, "He shall multiply the kingdom of Messiah." It is the first passage of Scripture where the word occurs in its more distinctive sense, and is used as a synonyme for the consecrated or divine king. It may seem strange that Hannah should have been the first to introduce this epithet, and to point so directly to the destined head of the divine kingdom: it will even be inexplicable, unless we understand her to have been raised up for a "sign and a wonder" to Israel, and to have spoken as she was moved by the Holy Ghost. But the other expressions, especially "the adversaries of the Lord shall be destroyed, and the ends of the earth shall be judged," shew that it really was of the kingdom with such a head that she spoke. And the idea of Grotius and the Rationalists, that she referred in the first instance to Saul, is entirely groundless.

stream of earthly providences, is represented as ultimately settling and developing itself with resistless energy in the affairs of Messiah's kingdom. And as if to remove every shadow of doubt as to this being the purport and design of Hannah's song, when we open the record of that better era, which she only saw glistening as a distant star in the horizon, we find the Virgin Mary, in her song of praise at the announcement of Messiah's birth, re-echoing the sentiments, and sometimes even repeating the very words of the mother of Samuel—"My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden. He hath shewed strength with his arm: he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich he hath sent empty away. He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham and to his seed for ever." Why should the Spirit, breathing at such a time on the soul of Mary, have turned her thoughts so nearly into the channel that had been struck out ages before by the pious Hannah? Or why should the circumstances connected with the birth of Hannah's Nazarite offspring have proved the occasion of strains, which so distinctly pointed to the manifestation of the King of Glory, and so closely harmonized with those actually sung in celebration of the event? Doubtless to mark the connection really subsisting between the two. It is the Spirit's own intimation of his ulterior design in transactions long since past, and testimonies delivered centuries before—namely, to herald the coming of Messiah, and make the church familiar with the form and character of his spiritual dispensation. ¹

¹ The view now given of Hannah's song presents it in a much higher, as we conceive it does also in a truer light, than that exhibited by Bishop Jebb, who speaks of it in a style that seems scarcely compatible with any proper belief in its inspiration. The song appears, in his estimation, to have been the mere effusion of Hannah's private, and, in great part, unsanctified feelings. "We cannot but feel," he says, "that her exultation partook largely of a spirit far beneath that which enjoins the love of our enemies, and which forbids personal exultation over a fallen foe." He regards it as "unquestionable, that previous sufferings had not thoroughly subdued her temper—that she could not suppress the workings of a retaliative spirit,—and was thus led to dwell, not on the peaceful glories of his (Samuel's) priestly and prophetic rule, but on his

Hannah's song was the first specimen of that combination of prophecy with type, which is now under consideration ; but it was soon followed by others, in which both the prophecy was more extended, and the typical element in the transactions that gave rise to it, was more marked and specific. The examples we refer to are to be found in the Messianic psalms, which also resemble the song of Hannah in being of a lyrical character, and thence admitting of a freer play of feeling on the part of the individual writer than could fitly be introduced into simple prophecy. But this again principally arose from the close connection typically between the present and the future, whereby the feelings originated by the one naturally incorporated themselves with the delineation of the other. And as it was the institution of the temporal kingdom in the person and house of David which here formed the ground and the occasion of the prophetic delineation, there was no part of the typical arrangements under the ancient dispensation which more fully admitted, or, to prevent misapprehension, more obviously required the accompaniment of a series of lyrical prophecies, such as that contained in the Messianic psalms.

For, the institution of a temporal kingdom in the hands of an Israelitish family involved a very material change in the external framework of the theocracy ; and a change that of itself was fitted to rivet the minds of the people more to the earthly and visible, and take them off from the invisible and divine. The constitution under which they were placed before the appointment of a king—though it did not absolutely preclude such an appointment—yet seemed as if it would rather suffer than be improved by so broad and palpable an introduction of the merely human element. It was till then a theocracy in the strictest sense ; a commonwealth, that had no recognized head but God, and placed every thing essentially connected with life and wellbeing under his immediate presidency and direction. The

future triumphs over the Philistine armies" (Sacred Literature, p. 397). If such were indeed the character of Hannah's song, we may be assured it would not have been so closely imitated by the blessed Virgin. But it is manifestly wrong to regard Hannah as speaking of her merely personal enemies—her language would otherwise be chargeable with vicious extravagance, as well as unsanctified feeling. She identifies herself throughout with the Lord's cause and people ; and it is simply her zeal for righteousness which expresses itself in a spirit of exultation over prostrate enemies.

land of the covenant was emphatically God's land¹—the people that dwelt in it were *his* peculiar property and heritage²—the laws which they were bound to obey were his statutes and judgments³—and the persons appointed to interpret and administer them were *his* representatives, and on this account even sometimes bore his name.⁴ It was the peculiar and distinguishing glory of Israel as a nation, that they stood in this near relationship to God, and that which more especially called forth the rapturous eulogy of Moses,⁵ “Happy art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee! The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.” It was a glory, however, which the people themselves were too carnal for the most part to estimate aright, and of which they never appeared more insensible, than when they sought to be like the Gentiles, by having a king appointed over them. For, what was it but in effect to seek, that they might lose their peculiar distinction among the nations? that God might retire to a greater distance from them, and might no longer be their immediate guardian and sovereign?

Nor was this the only evil likely to arise out of the proposed change. Every thing under the old covenant bore reference to the future and more perfect dispensation of the Gospel; and the ultimate reason of any important feature or material change in respect to the former, can never be understood without taking into account the bearing it might have on the future state and issues of things under the Gospel. But how could any change in the constitution of ancient Israel, and especially such a change as the people contemplated, when they desired a king after the manner of the Gentiles, be adopted without altering matters in this respect to the worse? The dispensation of the Gospel was to be, in a peculiar sense, the “kingdom of heaven, or of God,” having for its high end and aim the establishment of a near and blessed intercourse between God and men. It realizes its consummation, when the vision seen by John, and described

¹ Lev. xxv. 23; Ps. x. 16; Isa. xiv. 25; Jer. ii. 7, &c.

² Ex. xix. 5; Ps. xciv. 5; Jer. ii. 7; Joel iii. 2.

³ Ex. xv. 26; xviii. 16; etc.

⁴ Ex. xxii. 28; Ps. lxxxii. 6.

⁵ Deut. xxxiii. 26, 29.

after the precise pattern of the constitution set up in the wilderness, comes into fulfilment—when “the tabernacle of God is with men, and he dwells with them.” Of this consummation it was a striking and impressive image that was presented in the original structure of the Israelitish commonwealth, wherein God himself sustained the office of king, and had his peculiar residence and appropriate manifestations of glory in the midst of his people. And when they, in their carnal affection for a worldly institute, clamoured for an earthly sovereign, they not only discovered a lamentable indifference towards what constituted their highest honour, but betrayed also a want of discernment and faith in regard to God’s prospective and ultimate design in connection with their provisional economy. They gave conclusive proof that “they did not see to the end of that which was to be abolished,” and preferred a request, which, if granted according to their expectation, would in a most important respect have defeated the object of their theocratic constitution.

We need not, therefore, be surprised that God should have expressed his dissatisfaction with the proposal made by the people for the appointment of a king to them, and should have regarded it as a substantial rejection of himself, that he should not reign over them. (1 Sam. viii. 7). But why then did he afterwards accede to it? And why did he make choice of the things connected with it, as an historical occasion and a typical ground for shadowing forth the nature and glories of Messiah’s kingdom? The divine procedure in this, though apparently capricious, was in reality marked by the highest wisdom, and affords one of the finest examples to be found in Old Testament history of that overruling providence, by which God often averted the evil which men’s devices tended to produce, and rendered them subservient to the greatest good.

The appointment of a king, as the earthly head of the commonwealth, we have said, was not absolutely precluded by the theocratic constitution. It was from the first contemplated by Moses as a thing which the people would probably desire, and in which they were not to be gainsayed, but were only to be directed into the proper method of accomplishing it (Deut. xvii. 14–20). It was even possible—if the matter was rightly gone about, and the divine sanction obtained respecting it—to turn it to profitable

account, in familiarising the minds of men with what was destined to form the central idea of the Messiah's kingdom—the personal indwelling of the divine in the human nature—and so, to acquire for it the character of an important step in the preparatory arrangements for the kingdom. This is what was actually done. After the people had been solemnly admonished of their guilt in requesting the appointment of a king on *their* worldly principles, they were allowed to raise one of their number to the throne—not, however, as absolute and independent sovereign, but only as the deputy of Jehovah ; that he might simply rule in the name, and in subordination to the will, of God.¹ For this reason his throne was called “the throne of the Lord ;”² on which, as the queen of Sheba expressed it to Solomon, he was “set to be king for the Lord his God ;”³ and the kingly government itself was afterwards designated “the kingdom of the Lord.”⁴ For the same reason, no doubt, it was that Samuel “wrote in a book the manner of the kingdom, and laid it up before the Lord ;”⁵ that the protest concerning its derived and vicegerent nature might be perpetuated. And to render the divine purpose in this respect manifest to all who had eyes to see and ears to hear, the Lord allowed the choice first to fall on one who—as the representative of the people's carnal wisdom and prowess—was little disposed to rule in humble subordination to the will and authority of Heaven, and was therefore supplanted by another who should act as God's representative, and bear distinctively the name of *his servant*.⁶

It was, therefore, in this second person, David, that the kingly administration in Israel properly began ; he was the root and founder of the kingdom—as a kingdom, in which the divine and human stood first in an official, as they were ultimately to stand in a personal union. And to make the preparatory and the final in this respect properly harmonise and adapt themselves to each other, the Lord, in the first instance, ordered matters connected with the institution of the kingly government, so as to render the beginning an image of the end—typical throughout of Mes-

¹ See Warburton's Legation of Moses, B. V. sect. 3.

² 1 Chron. xxix. 23.

³ 2 Chron. ix. 8.

⁴ 2 Chron. xiii. 8.

⁵ 1 Sam. x. 2.

⁶ This appellation is used of David far more frequently than of any other person. Upwards of thirty times it is expressly coupled with David ; and in the Psalms he is ever speaking of himself as the Lord's servant.

siah's work and kingdom. And then, lest the typical bearing of things should be lost sight of in consequence of their present interest or importance, he gave in connection with them the word of prophecy, which, proceeding on the ground of their typical import, pointed the expectations of the Church to corresponding, but far higher and greater things still to come. In this way, what must otherwise have tended to veil the purpose of God, and obstruct the main design of his preparatory dispensation, was turned into one of the most effective means of revealing and promoting it. The earthly head, that now under God stood over the members of the commonwealth, instead of overshadowing his authority, only presented this more distinctly to their view, and served as a stepping-stone to faith, in enabling it to rise nearer to the apprehension of that personal indwelling of Godhead—the real Immanuel—which was to constitute the foundation and the glory of the Gospel dispensation. Not only was the work of God's preparatory arrangements not arrested, and the prospective anticipation of the future not marred, but occasion was taken to unfold this future in its more essential features with an air of individuality and distinctness, with a variety of detail and vividness of colouring not to be met with in any other portions of prophetic Scripture.

We refer for illustration to a single example of this combination of prophecy with type (others will be noticed, and in a somewhat different connection, in the Appendix)—the second Psalm. The production as to form is a kind of inaugural hymn, intended to celebrate the appointment and final triumph of Jehovah's king. The heathen nations are represented as foolishly opposing it (v. 1, 2); they agree among themselves, if the appointment should be made, practically to disown and resist it (v. 3); the Almighty however, perseveres in his purpose, scorning the rebellious opposition of such impotent adversaries (v. 4); the eternal decree goes forth, that the anointed king is enthroned on Zion; that being Jehovah's son, he is made the heir of all things, even to the uttermost bounds of the habitable globe (v. 5–9). And in consideration of what has thus been decreed and ratified in Heaven, the Psalm concludes with a word of friendly counsel and admonition to earthly potentates and rulers, exhorting them to submit in time to the sway of this glorious king, and forewarning them

of the inevitable ruin of resistance. That in all this we can trace the lines of Messiah's history, is obvious at a glance. Even the older Jewish doctors, as we learn by the quotation from Solomon Jarchi, given by Venema, agreed that "it should be expounded of King Messiah;" but he adds, "in accordance with the literal sense, and that it may be used against the heretics (*i. e.* Christians), it is proper to explain it as relating to David himself." Strange, that this idea, the offspring of Rabbinical artifice, seeking to withdraw an argument from the cause of Christianity, should have so generally commended itself to Christian interpreters! But if by *literal sense* is to be understood the plain and natural import of the words employed, what ground is there for such an interpretation? David was not opposed in his appointment to the throne of Israel by heathen nations or rulers, who knew and cared comparatively little about it; nor was his being anointed king coincident with his being set on the holy hill of Zion; nor, after being established in the kingdom, did he ever dream of pressing any claims of dominion on the kings and rulers of the earth: his wars were uniformly wars of defence, and not of conquest. So palpable, indeed, is the discordance between the lines of David's history, and the lofty terms of the psalm, that the opinion which ascribes it in the literal sense to David, may now be regarded as comparatively antiquated; and some even of those who formerly espoused it (such as Rosenmüller), have at length owned, that "it cannot well be understood as applying either to David or to Solomon, much less to any of the later Hebrew kings, and that the judgment of the more ancient Hebrews is to be followed, who considered it as a celebration of the mighty king that they expected under the name of the Messiah."

But has the Psalm, then, no connection with the life and kingdom of David? Unquestionably it has; and a connection so close, that what took place in him was at once the beginning and the image of what, amid higher relations, and on a more extended scale, was to be accomplished by the subject of the Psalm. While the terms in which the king and the kingdom there celebrated are spoken of, stretch far above the line of things that belonged to David, they yet bear throughout the mark and impress of these. In both alike we see a sovereign choice and fixed appointment, on

the part of God, to the office of king among men—an opposition of the most violent and heathenish nature to withstand and nullify the appointment—the gradual and successive overthrow of all the obstacles raised against the purpose of Heaven, and the extension of the sphere of empire (still partly future in the case of Messiah) till it reached the limits of the divine grant. The lines of history in the two cases are entirely parallel ; there is all the correspondence we expect between type and antitype ; but the prophecy which marks the connection between them, while it was occasioned by the purpose of God respecting David, and derived from his history the particular mould in which it was cast, was applicable only to Him, who, to the properties of a human nature and an earthly throne, was to add those also of the heavenly and divine.

We shall not here go further into detail respecting this class of prophecies, which belong chiefly to the Psalms ; but we must remark, that as it was their object to explain the typical character of David's calling and kingdom, and to connect this with the higher things to come, we may reasonably expect there will be some portions in the Messianic psalms, which are alike applicable to type and antitype ; and also entire psalms, in which there may be room for doubting to which of the two they may most fitly be referred. In some the distinctive, the superhuman and divine properties of the Messiah's person and kingdom are so broadly and characteristically delineated, (as in Ps. ii. xxii. xlv. lxxii. cx), that it is impossible by any fair interpretation of the language to understand the description of another than Christ. But there are others, in which the merely human elements are so strongly depicted (such as Ps. xl. lxix. cix.), that not a few of the traits might doubtless be found in the bearer also of the earthly kingdom ; while still the excessive darkness of the picture, as a whole, on the one side, and the magnitude of the results and interests connected with it, on the other, shut us up to the conclusion that Christ, in his work of humiliation and his kingdom of blessing and glory, is the real subject of the prophecy. Viewed as an entire and prospective delineation, the theme is still one, and the sense not manifold but simple. There are again others, however, of which Ps. xli. may be taken as a specimen, in which the delineation throughout is as applicable to the bearer of the earthly, as to

that of the heavenly kingdom ; so that if regarded as a prophecy at all, it can only be in the way explained under our first supposition, as an historical description of things that happened under typical relations, which imparted to them a prophetic element.

Such varieties are no more than what might have been expected in the class of sacred lyrics now under consideration ; and the rather so, as they were composed for the devotional use of the church at a time when she required as well to be refreshed and strengthened by the faith of the typical past, as to be cheered and animated by the hope of the still grander antitypical future. It was necessary that she should be taught so to look for the one as not to lose sight of the other ; but rather, in what had already occurred, to find the root and promise of what was to be hereafter. The word of Nathan to David (2 Sam. vii. 4-16), which properly began the series, and laid the foundation for further developments, presented the matter in this light. David is there associated with his filial successor, as alike connected with the institution of the kingdom in its primary and inferior aspect ; and the high honour was conceded to his house of furnishing the royal dynasty that was destined to preside for ever in God's name over the affairs of men. But this *for ever*, emphatically used in the promise, evidently pointed to a time when the relations of the kingdom in its then provisional and circumscribed form, should give way to others immensely greater and higher. It pointed to a commingling of the divine and human, the heavenly and the earthly, in another manner than could possibly be realised in the case either of David himself, or of any ordinary descendant from his loins. And it became one of the leading objects of David's prophetic calling, and of those who were his immediate successors in the prophetic function, to unfold, after the manner already described, something of that ulterior purpose of heaven, which, though included, was still but obscurely indicated in the fundamental prophecy of Nathan.¹

¹ According to the view now given, there is no need for that alternating process which is so commonly resorted to in the explanation of Nathan's prophecy, by which this one part is made to refer to Solomon and his immediate successors, and that other to Christ. There is no need for formally splitting it up into such portions, each pointing to different quarters, nor can the understanding satisfactorily rest in them. The prophecy is to be taken as an organic whole, as the kingdom also is, of which it speaks. David reigned in

IV. But we have still to notice another possible combination of type with prophecy. It is possible, we said, that the typical transactions might themselves be still future ; and might, in a prophetic word, be partly described, partly presupposed, as a ground for the delineation of other things still more distant, in respect to which they were to hold a typical relation. The difference between this and the last supposition is quite immaterial in so far as any principle is involved. It makes no essential change in the nature of the relation, that the typical transactions forming the groundwork of the prophetic delineation should have been contemplated as future, and not as past or present. It is true that the prophet was God's messenger, in an especial sense, to the men of his own age, and as such usually delivered messages, which were called forth by what had actually occurred, and bore its peculiar impress. But he was not necessarily tied to that. As from the present he could anticipate the still undeveloped future, so there was nothing to hinder—if the circumstances of the Church might require it—that he should also at times realise as present a nearer future, and from that anticipate another more remote. In doing so he would naturally transport himself into the position of those who were to witness that nearer future, which would then be contemplated as holding much the same relation typically to the higher things in prospect, as in the case last considered : that is, the matter-of-fact prophecy involved in the typical transactions viewed as already present, would furnish to the prophet's eye the form and aspect under which he would exhibit the corresponding events yet to be expected.

The only addition which the view now suggested makes to the one generally held, is, that we suppose the prophet, while he spake as from the midst of circumstances future, though not dis-

the Lord's name, and the Lord, in the fulness of time, was born to occupy David's throne—a mutual interconnection. The kingdom throughout is God's, only existing in an embryo state, while presided over by David and his merely human descendants ; and rising to its ripened form, as soon as it passes into the hands of one who, by virtue of his divine properties, was fitted to bear the glory. The prophecy, therefore, is to be regarded as a general promise of the connection of the kingdom with David's person and line, including Christ as belonging to that line, after the flesh ; but in respect to the element of eternity, the absolute perpetuity, guaranteed in the promise, not only admitting, but requiring the possession of a nature in Christ, higher unspeakably than he could derive from David.

tant, recognised in these something of a typical nature ; and on the basis of that as the type unfolded the greater and more distant antitype. There is plainly nothing incredible or even improbable in such a supposition, especially if the nearer future already lay within the vision of the Church. The circumstances, however, giving rise to prophecies of this description could not be expected to be of very frequent occurrence. They could only be expected in those more peculiar emergencies when it became needful for the Church's warning or consolation to overshoot, as it were, the things more immediately in prospect, and fix the eye on others more remote in point of time, though in nature most closely connected with them.

Now, at one remarkable period of her history, the Old Testament Church was certainly in such circumstances—the period preceding and during the Babylonish exile. From the time that this calamity had become inevitable, the prophets, as already noticed, had spoken of it as a second Egypt—a new bondage to the power of the world, from which the Church required to be delivered by a new manifestation of redemptive grace. But a second redemption after the manner of the first would obviously no longer suffice to restore the heart of faith to assured confidence, or fill it with satisfying expectations of coming good. The redemption from Egypt, with all its marvellous accompaniments and happy results, had still failed to provide an effectual security against sweeping desolation. And if the redemption from Babylon might have brought, in the fullest sense, a restoration to the land of Canaan, and the re-establishment of the temple-service ; yet if this were all the spirit of prophecy could descry of coming good, there must still have been room for fear to enter ; there could scarcely fail even to be sad forebodings of new desolations likely to rise and undo the work of the new redemption. At such a period, therefore, the prophet had a double part to perform, when charged with the commission to comfort the people of God. He had, in the first instance, to declare the fixed purpose of God to visit Babylon for her sins, and thereby afford a door of escape for the captive children of the covenant, that as a people saved anew they might return to their ancient heritages. But he had to do more than this. He had to take his station, as it were, on the floor of that nearer redemption, and from thence direct the eye of

hope to another and higher, of which it was but the imperfect shadow—a redemption which should lay the foundation of the Church's wellbeing so broad and deep, that the former troubles could no longer return, and heights of prosperity and blessing should be reached entirely unknown in the past. Thus alone could a ground of consolation be provided for the people of God, really adequate to the emergencies of that dismal time, when all that was of God seemed ready to perish, under the combined force of internal corruption and outward violence.

It was precisely in this way that the Prophet Isaiah sought to comfort the church of God by inditing the latter portion of his writings (ch. xl.-lxvi.), in which we have the most important example of the class of prophecies now under consideration. The central object in the whole of this magnificent chain of prophecy, is the appearance, work, and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ—his spirit and character, his sufferings and triumphs, the completeness of his redemption, the safety and blessedness of his people, the certain overthrow of his enemies, and the final glory of his kingdom. The manner in which this prophetic discourse is entered on, might alone satisfy us that such is in reality its main theme. For, the voice which there meets us, of one crying in the wilderness, is that to which, according to all the evangelists, John the Baptist appealed, as announcing beforehand his office and mission to the church of God. And if the forerunner is found at the threshold, who should chiefly occupy the interior of the building but He, whom John was specially sent to make known to Israel? The substance of the message also, as there briefly indicated, entirely corresponds; for, it speaks not, as is often loosely represented, of the people's return to Jerusalem, but of the Lord's return to the people; it announces a coming revelation of his glory, which all flesh should see; and proclaims to the cities of Judah the tidings, Behold your God! We are not to be understood as meaning, that the Lord might not in a sense be said to come to his people, when in their behalf he brought down the pride of Babylon, and laid open for them a way of return to their native land. A reference to this more secret and preparatory revelation of himself may certainly be understood, both here and in several kindred representations that follow; yet not as their direct and immediate object, but rather as something pre-

supposed, similar in kind, though immensely inferior in degree to the proper reality. There are passages, indeed, so general in the truths and principles they enunciate, that they cannot with propriety be limited to one period of the church's history any more than to another. And again, there are others, especially the portion reaching from ch. xlv. 24 to xlviii. 22, as also ch. li., lii., which refer more immediately to the events connected with the deliverance from Babylon, as things in themselves perfectly certain, and fitted to awaken confidence in regard to the greater things that were yet destined to be accomplished. He who could speak of Babylon as already prostrate in the dust, though no shade had yet come over the lustre of her glory—who, at the very moment she was the scourge and terror of the nations, could picture to himself the time when she should be seen as a spoiled and forlorn captive—who could behold the once weeping exiles of Judea, escaped from her grasp, and sent back with honour to revive the glories of Jerusalem, while the proud destroyer was left to sink and moulder into irrecoverable ruin—He, who could foresee all this as in a manner present, and commit to his Church the prophetic announcement generations before it had been fulfilled, might well claim from his people an implicit faith, when giving intimation of a work still to be done, the greatness of which should surpass all thought, as its blessings should extend to all lands (ch. xlv. 17, 22, xlix. 18-26). Thus, the deliverance accomplished from the yoke of Babylon formed a fitting prelude and stepping-stone to the main subject of the prophecy—the revelation of God in the person and work of his Son. The certainty of the one—a certainty soon to be realized—was a pledge of the ultimate certainty of the other; and the character also of the former, as a singular and unexpected manifestation of the Lord's power to deliver his people and lay their enemies in the dust, was a prefiguration of what was to be accomplished once for all in the salvation to be wrought out by Jesus Christ.¹

¹ The same view substantially of this portion of Isaiah's writings was given by Vitringa, who thus sums up the leading topics of discourse:—"The great mystery of the manifestation of the kingdom of God and his righteousness in the world through the Messiah, his forerunner, and apostles, with the revival of an elect church, then reduced to a very small number, with its more remarkable preceding signs, and the means that should be subservient to the whole work of grace,—among which preceding signs the

There are few portions of Old Testament prophecy, which altogether resemble the one we have been considering. Perhaps that which approaches nearest to it, in the mode of combining type with prophecy, is the thirty-fourth chapter of Isaiah, which is not a direct and simple delineation of the judgments that were destined to alight upon Idumea, but rather an ideal representation of the judgments preparing to alight on the enemies generally of God's people, founded upon the approaching desolations of Edom, which it contemplates as the type of the destruction that awaits all the adversaries. Still more similar, however, is our Lord's prophecy regarding the destruction of Jerusalem and his own final advent to judge the world in the twenty-fourth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel; in which, undoubtedly, the nearer future is regarded as the type of the higher and more remote. It would almost seem as if the two events were, to a certain extent, thrown together in the prophetic delineation; for the efforts that have been made to separate the portions strictly applicable to each, have never wholly succeeded; and more, perhaps, than any other part of prophetic Scripture is there the appearance here of something like a double sense. What reasons may have existed for this we can still but imperfectly apprehend. One principal reason, we may certainly conclude, was, that it did not accord with our Lord's design, as it would not have consisted with his people's good, to have exhibited very precise and definite prognostics of his second coming. The exact period behoved to be shrouded almost to the very last in mystery, and it seemed to divine wisdom the fittest course to order the circumstances connected with the final act of judgment on the typical people and territory, so as to serve, at the same time, for signs and tokens of the last great act of judgment on the world at large. As the acts themselves corresponded, so there should also be a correspondence in the manner of their accomplishment; and to contemplate the one as imaged in the other, without being able in

deliverance from Babylon by Cyrus, in connection with the destruction of Babylon itself, as typical of the overthrow of all idolatrous and Satanic power, are chiefly dwelt upon, in like manner, as the conviction both of Jews and Gentiles concerning the vanity of idols and the truth of God and his spiritual worship, hold the most prominent place among the concurrent means."

all respects to draw the line very accurately between them, was the whole that could safely be permitted to believers.

The result, then, of the preceding investigation is, that there is in Scripture a fourfold combination of type with prophecy. In the first of these the prophetic import lies in the type, and in the word only as descriptive of the type. In the others there was not a double sense, but a double prophecy—a typical prophecy in action, coupled with a verbal prophecy in word; not uniformly combined, however, but variously modified; in one class a distinct typical action having associated with it an express prophetic announcement; in another, the typical lying only as the background on which the spirit of prophecy raised the prediction of a corresponding but much grander future; and in still another, the typical belonging to a nearer future, which was realised as present, and taken as the occasion and groundwork of a prophecy respecting a future greater, and also more distant. It is in this last department alone that there is anything like a mixing up of two subjects together, and a consequent difficulty in determining when precisely the language refers to the nearer, and when to the more remote transactions. Even then, however, only in rare cases; and with this slight exception, there is nothing that carries the appearance of confusion or ambiguity. Each part holds its appropriate place, and the connection subsisting between them, in its various shapes and forms, is such as might have been expected in a system so complex and many-sided as that to which they belonged.

II. We proceed now to offer some remarks on the views generally held on the subject of the prophecies which have passed under our consideration. They fall into two opposite sections. Overlooking the real connection in such cases between type and prophecy, and often misapprehending the proper import of the language, the opinion contended for, on the one side, has been, that the predictions contain a double sense—the one primary and the other secondary, or the one literal and the other mystical; while, on the contrary side, it has been maintained that the predictions have but one meaning, and when applied in New Testament Scripture, in a way not accordant with that meaning, it is

held to be a simple accommodation of the words. A brief examination of the two opposing views will be sufficient for our purpose.

1. And, first, in regard to the view which advocates the theory of the double sense. Here it has been laid down as a settled canon of interpretation, that "the same prophecies frequently refer to different events, the one near and the other remote—the one temporal the other spiritual, and, perhaps, eternal; that the expressions are partly applicable to one and partly to another; and that what has not been fulfilled in the first, we must apply to the second." If so, the conclusion seems inevitable, that there must be a painful degree of uncertainty and confusion resting on such portions of prophetic Scripture. And the ambiguity thus necessarily pervading them, must, one would think, have rendered them of comparatively little value, whether originally as a ground of hope to the Old Testament church, or now as an evidence of faith to the New.

Great ingenuity was certainly shewn by Warburton in labouring to establish the grounds of this double sense, without materially impairing in any respect the validity of the prophecy. The view advocated by him, however, lies open to two serious objections, which have been powerfully urged against it, especially by Bishop Marsh, and which have demonstrated its arbitrariness.

1. In the first place, while it proceeds upon the supposition, that the double sense of prophecy is quite analogous to the double sense of allegory, there is in reality an essential difference between them. "When we interpret a prophecy, to which a double meaning is ascribed, the one relating to the Jewish, the other to the Christian dispensation, we are in either case concerned with an interpretation of *words*. For the same words which, according to one interpretation, are applied to one event, are, according to another interpretation, applied to another event. But in the interpretation of an allegory, we are concerned only in the *first* instance with an interpretation of words; the *second* sense, which is usually called the allegorical, being an interpretation of *things*. The interpretation of the words gives nothing more than the plain and simple narratives themselves (the allegory generally assuming the form of a narrative); whereas the *moral* of the allegory is learnt by an application of the things signified by those

words to other things which resemble them, and which the former were intended to suggest. There is a fundamental difference, therefore, between the interpretation of an allegory, and the interpretation of a prophecy with a double sense.”¹ 2. The view of Warburton is, besides, liable to the objection, that it not only affixes a necessary darkness and obscurity to the prophecies having the double sense, but also precludes the existence of any other prophecies more plain, direct, and explicit—until at least the dispensation, under which the prophecies were given, and for which the double sense specially adapted them, was approaching its termination. He contends that the veiled meaning of the prophecies was necessary, in order at once to awaken some general expectations among the Jews of better things to come, and, at the same time, to prevent these from being so distinctly understood as to weaken their regard to existing institutions. It is fatal to this view of the matter, that in reality many of the most direct and perspicacious prophecies concerning the Messiah were contemporaneous with those, which are alleged to possess the double meaning and the veiled reference to the Messiah. If, therefore, the divine method were such as to admit only of the one class, it must have been defeated by the other. And it must also have been, not so properly a ground of blame as a matter of necessity, arising from the very circumstances of their position, that the Jews “could not stedfastly look to the end of that which was to be abolished” (2 Cor. iii. 13). The reverse, however, was actually the case; for the more clearly they perceived the meaning of the prophecies, and the end of their symbolical institutions, the more heartily did they enter into the design of God, and the more nearly attain the condition which it became them to occupy.

These objections, however, apply chiefly to that vindication of the double sense which came from the hand of Warburton, and was interwoven with his peculiar theory. The opinion has since been advocated in a manner that guards it against both objections, and is put, perhaps, in its most approved form by Davison. “What,” he asks, “is the double sense? Not the convenient latitude of two unconnected senses, wide of each other, and giving room to a fallacious ambiguity, but the combination of two

¹ Marsh's Lectures, p. 441.

related, analogous, and harmonizing, though disparate subjects, each clear and definite in itself ; implying a twofold truth in the prescience, and creating an aggravated difficulty, and thereby an accumulated proof in the completion. For a case in point : to justify the predictions concerning the kingdom of David in their double force, it must be shewn of them, that they hold in each of their relations, and in each were fulfilled. So that the double sense of prophecy, in its true idea, is a check upon the pretences of a vague and unappropriated prediction, rather than a door to admit them. But this is not all. For if the prediction distribute its sense into two remote branches or systems of the divine economy ; if it shew not only what is to take place in distant times, but describe also different modes of God's appointment, though holding a certain and intelligent resemblance to each other ; such prediction becomes not only more convincing in the argument, but more instructive in the doctrine, because it expresses the correspondence of God's dispensations in their points of agreement, as well as his foreknowledge."¹

This representation so far coincides with the one given in the preceding pages, that it virtually recognises a combination of type with prophecy ; but differs, in that it supposes both to have been included in the prediction, the one constituting the primary, the other the secondary sense of its terms. And, undoubtedly, according to this scheme, as well as our own, the correspondence between God's dispensations might be sufficiently exhibited, both in regard to doctrine and general harmony of arrangement. But when it is contended further, that prophecy with such a double sense, instead of rendering the evidence it furnishes of divine foresight more vague and unsatisfactory, only supplies an accumulated proof of it by creating an aggravated difficulty in the fulfilment, it seems to be forgotten that the terms of the prediction, to admit of such a duplicate fulfilment, must have been made so much more general and vague. But it is the precision and definiteness of the terms in a prediction, which, when compared with the facts in providence that verify them, chiefly produce in our minds a conviction of divine foresight and direction. And in so far as prophecies might have been constructed to comprehend

¹ Davison on Prophecy, p. 196.

two series of disparate events, holding in each of the relations, and in each fulfilled, it could only be by dispensing with the more exact criteria, which we cannot help regarding in such cases as the most conclusive evidence of prophetic inspiration.

But as it was by no means the sole object of prophecy to provide this evidence, so predictions without such exact criteria are certainly not wanting in the word of God. There are prophecies which were not so much designed to foretel definite events, as to unfold great prospects and results, in respect to the manifestation of God's purposes of grace and truth toward men. Such prophecies were of necessity general and comprehensive in their terms, and admitted of manifold fulfilments. It is of them that we would understand the singularly pregnant and beautiful remark of Lord Bacon in the Second Book of the Advancement of Learning, that "divine prophecies, being of the nature of their Author, with whom a thousand years are but as one day, are therefore not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishment; though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age." The very first prophecy ever uttered to fallen man—the promise given of a seed through the woman that should bruise the head of the serpent; and that afterwards given to Abraham of a seed of blessing, may be referred to as illustrative of the principle; since in either case—though not by virtue of a double sense, but of a wide and comprehensive import—a fulfilment from the first was constantly proceeding, while "the height and fulness" of the predicted good could only be reached in the redemption of Christ and the glories of his kingdom.

To return, however, to the matter at issue, we have yet to press our main objection to the theory of the double sense of prophecy; we dispute the fact on which it is founded, that there really *are* prophecies (with the partial exceptions already noticed) predictive of similar, though disparate series of events, strictly applicable to each, and in each finding their fulfilment. This necessarily forms the main position of the advocates of the double sense; and when brought to particulars, they constantly fail to establish it. The terms of the several predictions are sure to be put to the torture in order to get one of the two senses extracted from them. And the violent interpretations resorted to

for the purpose of effecting this, afford one of the most striking proofs of the blinding influence which a theoretical bias may exert over the mind. Such Psalms, for example, as the second and forty-fifth, which are so distinctly characteristic of the Messiah, that some learned commentators have abandoned their early predilections to interpret them wholly of him, are yet ascribed by the advocates of the double sense as well to David as to Christ. Nay, by a singular inversion of the usual meaning of words, they call the former the literal, and the latter their figurative or secondary sense,—although this last is the only one the words can strictly bear.

There is no greater success in most other cases ; we shall confine ourselves to one. “Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption : thou wilt make known to me the path of life ; in thy presence is fulness of joy ; and at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.” These words in the sixteenth Psalm were applied by the apostle Peter to Christ, as finding in the events of his history their only proper fulfilment. David, he contends, could not have been speaking directly of himself, since he had seen corruption ; and instead of regaining the path of life, and ascending into the presence of God (namely, in glorified humanity), had suffered, as all knew, the common lot of nature. And so, the apostle infers, the words should be understood more immediately of Christ, in whose history alone they could properly be said to be accomplished. Warburton, however, inverts this order. Of the deliverance from hell, the freedom from corruption, and the return to the paths of life, he says, “Though it literally signifies security from the curse of the law upon transgressors, viz. immature death, yet it may very reasonably be understood in a spiritual sense of the resurrection of Christ from the dead ; in which case the words or terms translated *soul* and *hell* are left in the meaning they bear in the Hebrew tongue of *body* and *grave* !” He does not, of course, deny that Peter claimed the passage as a prophecy of Christ’s resurrection ; but maintains that he does so, “no otherwise than by giving it a secondary or spiritual sense.” In such a style of interpretation, one cannot but feel as if the terms *primary* and *secondary*, *literal* and *spiritual*, had somehow come to exchange places ; since the plain import of the words carries us directly to

Christ, while only by a strained and inadequate meaning can they be adapted to David.

Such, indeed, is usually the case in the instances referred to by the advocates of this theory. The double sense they contend for does not strictly hold in both of the relations; and very commonly what is contended for as the immediate and primary, is the sense that is least accordant with the grammatical import of the words. We, therefore, reject it as a satisfactory explanation of a numerous class of prophecies, and on three several grounds: First, because it so ravel and complicates the meaning of the prophecies to which it is applied, as to involve us in painful doubt and uncertainty regarding their proper application. Secondly, should this be avoided, it can only arise from the prophecies being of so general and comprehensive a nature, as to be incapable of a very close and specific fulfilment. And, finally, when applied to particular examples, the theory practically gives way, as the terms employed in all the more important predictions are too definite and precise to admit of more than one proper fulfilment.

2. We turn now, in the last place, to the mode of prophetic interpretation which has commonly prevailed with those who have ranged themselves in opposition to the theory of the double sense. The chief defect in this class of interpreters consists in their having failed to take sufficiently into account the connection subsisting between the Old and the New Testament dispensations. They have hence generally given only a partial view of the relations involved in particular prophecies, and not unfrequently have confined the application of these to circumstances which only supplied the occasion of their delivery, and the form of their delineations. The single sense contended for has thus too often differed materially from the real sense. And many portions of the Psalms and other prophetic Scriptures, which in New Testament Scripture itself are applied to gospel-times, have been stripped of their evangelical import, on the ground that the writer of the prophecy must have had in view some events immediately affecting himself or his country, and that no further use, except by way of accommodation, can legitimately be made of the words he uttered.

Such, for example, has been the way that the remarkable prophecy in Isaiah, respecting the son to be born of a virgin (ch. vii. 14-16), has often been treated. The words of the prophecy are, "Behold the virgin conceiveth and beareth a son, and she shall call his name Immanuel. Butter [rather milk] and honey shall he eat, when he shall know (or that he may know) to refuse what is evil and choose what is good ; for before this child shall know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good, the land shall become desolate, by whose two kings thou art distressed." We may be said to have two inspired commentaries on this prediction, one in the Old, and another in the New Testament. The prophet Micah, the contemporary of Isaiah, evidently referring to the words before us, says, immediately after announcing the birth of the future ruler of Israel at Bethlehem, "Therefore will he give them up, until the time that she who shall bear hath brought forth" (v. 3). The peculiar expression, "she who shall bear" points to the already designated mother of the divine king, but only in this prediction of Isaiah designated as the virgin ; so that, in the language of Rosenmüller, "both predictions throw light on each other. Micah discloses the divine origin of the person predicted ; Isaiah the wonderful manner of his birth." The other allusion in inspired Scripture is by St Matthew, when, relating the miraculous circumstances of Christ's birth, he adds, "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child," &c. And the prophecy, as Bishop Lowth has well stated, "is introduced in so solemn a manner ; the sign is so marked, as a sign selected and given by God himself, after Ahaz had rejected the offer of any sign of his own choosing out of the whole compass of nature ; the terms of the prophecy are so peculiar, and the name of the child so expressive, containing in them much more than the circumstances of the birth of a common child required, or even admitted ; that we may easily suppose, that in minds prepared by the general expectation of a great deliverer to spring from the house of David, they raised hopes far beyond what the present occasion suggested ; especially when it was found, that in the subsequent prophecy, delivered immediately afterward, this child, called Immanuel, is treated as

the Lord and Prince of Judah (ch. viii. 8-10). Who could this be, other than the heir of the throne of David? under which character a great and even a divine person had been promised."

These things leave little doubt as to the real bearing of the prophecy. But as originally delivered, it is connected with two peculiarities—the one that it is given as a sign to the house of David, then represented by the wicked Ahaz, and trembling for fear on account of the combined hostility of Syria and Israel—the other that it is succeeded by a word to the prophet concerning a son to be born to him by the prophetess, which should not be able to cry, My Father, before the king of Assyria had spoiled both the kingdoms of Syria and Israel (ch. viii. 1-4). And it has been thought, from these peculiarities, that it was really this son of the prophet that was meant by the Immanuel, as this alone could be a proper sign to Ahaz of the deliverance that was to be so speedily granted to him from the object of his dread. So Grotius, who holds that St Matthew only applied it mystically to Christ, and a whole host of interpreters since, of whom many can think of no better defence for the Evangelist than that, as the words of the prophet were more elevated and full than the immediate occasion demanded, they might be said to be fulfilled in what more nearly accorded with them. Apologies of this kind, it is easy to be seen, will not avail much in the present day to save the common discernment, to say nothing of the inspired authority of the Evangelist. But there is really no need for them. It is quite arbitrary to suppose that the child to be born of the prophetess (an ideal child, we should suppose, conceived and born in prophetic vision—since otherwise it must have been born in fornication) is to be identified with the virgin's son; the rather so, as an entirely different name is given to it (Maher-shalal-hash-baz)—an ideal, but descriptive name, and pointing simply to the spoliation that was to be effected on the hostile kingdoms. Immanuel has another, a higher import, and bespeaks what the Lord should be to the covenant-people, not what he should do to the enemies. Nor is the other circumstance, of the word being uttered as a sign to the house of David, any reason for turning it from its natural sense and application. A sign in the ordinary sense had been refused, under a pretence of pious trust in God, but really from a feeling of distrust and reliance on mere earthly

confidences. And now the Lord gives a sign in a peculiar sense—much as Jesus met the craving of an adulterous generation for a sign from heaven, by giving the sign of the prophet Jonas—the reverse of what they either wished or expected—a sign, not from heaven, but from the lower parts of the earth. So here, by announcing the birth of Immanuel, the prophet gave a sign suited to the time of backsliding and apostacy in which he lived. For it told the house of David that, wearying God as they were doing by their sins, he would vindicate his cause in a way they little expected or desired; that he would provide for the occupancy of the throne over his land and people by raising up a child of divine, as well as human properties; but that, meanwhile, every thing should go to desolation and ruin—first, indeed, in the allied kingdoms of Israel and Syria (v. 16), but afterwards also in the kingdom of Judah (v. 17–25); so that the destined possessor of the throne, when he came, should find all in a prostrate condition, and grow up like one in an impoverished and stricken country, where only the natural products of milk and honey were to be found (comp. v. 16 with 22); like one that should be fed with the simple fare of a cottage shepherd. Thus understood, the whole is entirely natural and consistent; and the single sense of the prophecy proves to be identical, as well with the native force of the words, as with the interpretations of inspired men.

We have selected this as one of the most common and plausible specimens of the false style of interpretation to which we have referred. It is needless to adduce more, as the explanations given in the earlier part of the chapter have already met many of them by anticipation; and the supplementary treatise in the Appendix will supply what further is needed. If but honestly and earnestly dealt with, the Scripture has no reason to fear, in this or in other departments, the closest investigation; the more there is of rigid inquiry, displacing superficial considerations, the more will its inner truth and harmony appear.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

THE INTERPRETATION OF PARTICULAR TYPES—SPECIFIC PRINCIPLES AND DIRECTIONS.

It was one of the objections we urged against the typological views of our older divines, that their system admitted of no fixed or definite rules being laid down for guiding us to the knowledge and interpretation of particular types. Every thing was left to the discretion or caprice of the individual who undertook to investigate them. The few directions that were sometimes given upon the subject were too vague and general to be of any material service. That the type must have borne, in its original design and institution, a pre-ordained reference to the Gospel antitype—that there is often more in the type than in the antitype, and more in the antitype than the type—that there must be a natural and appropriate application of the one to the other—that the wicked as such, and acts of sin as such, must be excluded from the category of types—that one thing is sometimes the type of different and even contrary things, though in different respects—and that there is sometimes an interchange between the type and the antitype of the names respectively belonging to each :—These rules of interpretation, which are the whole that Glassius and other hermeneutical writers furnish for our direction, could not go far, either to restrain the license of conjecture, or to mark out the particular course of thought and inquiry that should be pursued. They can scarcely be said to touch the main difficulties of the subject, and throw no light on its more distinguishing peculiarities. Nor, indeed, could any other result have been expected. The rules could not be precise or definite, when the system on which they were founded was altogether loose and indeterminate. And only with the laying of a more solid and stable foundation

could directions for the practical treatment of the subject come to possess any measure of satisfaction or explicitness.

Even on the supposition that some progress has now been made in laying such a foundation, we cannot hold out the prospect, that no room shall be left for dubiety, and that all may be reduced to a kind of dogmatical precision and certainty. It would be unreasonable to expect this, considering both the peculiar character and the manifold variety of the field embraced by the Typology of Scripture. That there may still be particular cases in which it will be questionable whether anything properly typical belonged to them, and others in which a diversity of view may be allowable in explaining what is typical, seems to us by no means improbable. And in the specific rules or principles of interpretation that follow, we do not aim at dispelling every possible doubt and ambiguity connected with the subject, but only at fixing its more prominent and characteristic outlines. We believe, that with ordinary care and discretion, they will be sufficient to guard against material error.

I. The first principle we lay down has respect merely to the amount of what is typical in Old Testament Scripture; it is, that *nothing is to be regarded as typical of the good things under the Gospel, which was itself of a forbidden and sinful nature.* Something approximating to this has been mentioned among the too general and obvious directions which philological writers have been accustomed to give upon the subject. It is, indeed, so much of that description, that though in itself a principle most necessary to be observed and acted on, yet we should have refrained from any express announcement or formal proof of it here, were it not still frequently set at nought in theological discussions, as well as popular discourses.

The ground of the principle, as we have given it, lies in the connection which the type has with the antitype, and consequently with God. The antitype standing in the things which belong to God's everlasting kingdom, is necessarily of God; and so, by a like necessity, the type, which was intended to foreshadow and prepare for it, must have been equally of him. Whether a symbol in religion, or a fact in providence, it must have borne upon it the divine sanction and approval; otherwise,

there could have been no proper connection between the ultimate reality and its preparatory exhibitions. So far as the institutions of religion are concerned, this is readily admitted; and no one would think of contending for the idolatrous rites of worship which were sometimes introduced into the services of the sanctuary, being ranked among the shadows of the better things to come.

But there is not the same readiness to perceive the incongruity of admitting to the rank of types, actions which were as far from being accordant with the mind of God, as the impurities of an idolatrous worship. Such actions might, no doubt, differ in one respect from the forbidden services of religion; they might in some way be overruled by God for the accomplishment of his own purposes, and thereby be brought into a certain connection with himself. This was never more strikingly done than in respect to the things which befel Jesus—the great antitype—which were carried into effect by the operation of the fiercest malice and wickedness, and yet were the very things which the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God had appointed before to be done. It is one thing, however, for human agents and their actions being controlled and directed by God, so as, amid all their impetuosity and uproar, to be constrained to work out his righteous purposes; but another thing for them to stand in such close relationship to him, that they become express and authoritative revelations of his will. This last is the light in which they must be contemplated, if a typical character is ascribed to them. For the time, during which typical things lasted, they stood as temporary representations under God's own hand of what he was going permanently to establish under the Gospel. And, therefore, as amid those higher transactions, where the *antitype* comes into play, we exclude whatever was the offspring of human ignorance or sinfulness; so in the earlier and inferior transactions, which were *typical* of what was to come, we must, in like manner, exclude the workings of all earthly and sinful affections. The typical and the antitypical alike must bear on them the image and superscription of God.

Violations of this obvious principle are much less frequently met with now, than they were in the theological writings of last century. Still, however, instances are occasionally forcing them-

selves on one's notice. And in popular discourses, none perhaps occurs more frequently than that connected with Jacob's melancholy dissimulation and cunning policy for obtaining the blessing. His receiving the blessing, we are sometimes told, in the garments of Esau, which his mother arrayed him with, "is to be viewed as a faint shadow of our receiving the blessing from God in the garments of Jesus Christ, which all the children of the promise wear. It was not the feigned venison, but the borrowed garments, that procured the blessing. Even so, we are not blessed by God for our good works, however pleasing to him, but for the righteousness of our Redeemer." What a confounding of things that differ! The garments of the "profane" Esau made to image the spotless righteousness of Jesus! And the fraudulent use of the one by Jacob, viewed as representing the believer's simple and confiding trust in the other! Between things so essentially different, there can manifestly be nothing but superficial resemblances, which necessarily vanish the moment the real facts of the case rise into view. It was not Jacob's imposing upon his father's infirmities either with false venison, or with borrowed garments, which in reality procured for him the blessing. The whole that can be said of these is, that in the actual circumstances of the case, they had a certain influence, of an instrumental kind, in leading Isaac to pronounce it. But what had been thus spoken on false grounds and under mistaken apprehensions, might surely have been recalled, when the truth came to be known. The prophet Nathan, at a later age, found no difficulty in revoking the word he had too hastily spoken to David respecting the building of the temple, though it had been elicited by something very different from falsehood—simply by an exciting and unexpected display of goodness (2 Sam. vii. 3). And in the case now referred to, if there had been nothing more in the matter than the mock venison and the hairy garments of Esau, there can be little doubt that the blessing that had been pronounced, would have been instantly revoked, and the curse which Jacob dreaded uttered in its stead. In truth, Isaac erred in what he purposed to do, not less than Jacob in beguiling him to do what he had not purposed. He was going to utter in God's name a prophetic word, which, if it had been uttered as he intended, would have contravened the oracle originally given to

Rebekah concerning the two children, even before their birth—that the elder should serve the younger. And there were not wanting indications in the spirit and behaviour of the sons, after they had sprung to manhood, which might have led a mind of spiritual discernment to descry in Jacob, rather than Esau, the heir of blessing. But living as Isaac had done for the most part in a sort of luxurious ease, in his declining years especially yielding too much to the fleshly indulgences assiduously ministered to by the hand of Esau, the eye of his mind, like that of his body, grew dim, and he lost the correct perception of the truth. But when he saw how the providence of God had led him to bestow the blessing, otherwise than he himself had designed, the truth rushed at once upon his soul. “He trembled exceedingly”—not simply, nor perhaps chiefly, because of the deceit that had been practised upon his blindness, but because of the worse spiritual blindness which had led himself so grievously to misapprehend the purpose of God. And hence, even after the discovery of Jacob’s fraudulent behaviour, he declared with the strongest emphasis, “Yea, and he shall be blessed.”

Thus, when the real circumstances of the case are considered, there appears no ground whatever for connecting the improper conduct of Jacob with the mode of a sinner’s justification. The resemblances that may be found between them are quite superficial or arbitrary. And such always are the resemblances which appear between the workings of evil in man, and the good that is in God. The two belong to essentially different spheres, and a real analogy, or a divinely ordained connection cannot possibly unite them together. The principle, however, may be carried a step farther. As the operations of sin cannot prefigure the actings of righteousness, so the direct results and consequences of sin cannot justly be regarded as typical representations of the exercises of grace and holiness. When, therefore, (to refer again to the history of Jacob) the things that befel him in God’s providence, on account of his unbrotherly and deceitful conduct, are represented as typical foreshadowings of Christ’s work of humiliation—Jacob’s withdrawal from his father’s house, prefiguring Christ’s leaving the region of glory and appearing as a stranger on the earth—Jacob’s sleeping on the naked ground with nothing but a stone for his pillow, Christ’s descent into the lowest depths

of poverty and shame, that he might afterwards be exalted to the head-stone of the corner, and so forth¹—in such representations there is manifestly a stringing together of events which have no fundamental agreement, and are without any common relations. In the one case Jacob was merely suffering the just reward of his misdeeds, while the Redeemer, in the other and alleged parallel transactions, was voluntarily giving the highest display of the holy love that animated his bosom for the good of men. And whatever there might be in certain points of an outward and formal resemblance between them, it is in the nature of things impossible that there could be a real harmony and connection.

It is to be noted, however, that we apply the principle now under consideration to the extent merely of denying a typical connection between what in former times appeared of evil on the part of man, and the good subsequently introduced by God. And we do so on the ground that such things only as he sanctioned and approved in the past, could foreshadow the higher and better things which were to be sanctioned and approved by him in the future. But as all the manifestations of truth have their corresponding and antagonist manifestations of error, it is perfectly warrantable and scriptural to regard the form of evil which, from time to time, confronted the type, as itself the type of something similar, which should afterwards arise as a counter form of evil to the antitype. Antichrist, therefore, may be said to have had his types as well as Christ. Hagar was the type of a carnal church, in bondage to the elements of the world, and producing a seed after the flesh, as Sarah was of a spiritual church, possessing the freedom and enjoying the privileges of the children of God. Egypt, Edom, Assyria, Babylon without, and Saul, Ahithophel, Absalom, and others within the Old Testament church, have each their counterpart in the things belonging to the history of Christ and his church of the New Testament. In strictness of speech it is the other class of relations alone which were settled and ordained by God; but as God's acts and operations in his church never fail to call into existence the world's enmity and opposition, so the forms which this assumed in earlier times might well be regarded as prophetic of those, which were after-

¹ Kanne's *Christus in Alten Testament*, Th. ii., p. 133, &c.

wards to appear. And if so with the evil itself, still more with the visitations of severity sent to chastise the evil ; for these come directly from God. The judgments, therefore, he inflicted on iniquity in the past, typified like judgments on all similar aspects of iniquity in the future. And the period when the good shall reach its full development and final triumph, shall also be that in which the work of judgment sheds upon the evil perpetual desolation.

II. We pass on to another, which must still also be a somewhat negative principle of interpretation, viz. that in determining the existence and import of particular types, we must be guided, *not so much by any knowledge possessed, or supposed to be possessed, by the ancient worshippers concerning their prospective fulfilment, as from the light furnished by their realization in the great facts and revelations of the Gospel.*

Whether we look to the symbolical or the historical types, neither their own nature, nor God's design in appointing them, could warrant us in drawing very definite and conclusive inferences regarding the insight possessed by the Old Testament worshippers into their prospective or Gospel import. The one formed part of an existing religion, and the other of a course of providential dealings ; and in that more immediate respect there were certain truths they embodied, and certain lessons they taught for those who had directly to do with them. Their fitness for unfolding such truths and lessons formed, as we have seen, the ground-work of their typical connection with Gospel-times. But though they must have been understood in that primary aspect by all sincere and intelligent worshippers, these did not necessarily perceive their further reference to the things of Christ's kingdom. Nor does the reality or the precise import of their typical character depend upon the correctness or the extent of the knowledge held respecting it by the members of the Old Covenant. For the connection implied in their possessing such a character between the preparatory and the final dispensations was not of the Church's forming, but of God's ; and the greater part of the design which he intended these to serve with ancient believers, may have been accomplished, though they knew little, and perhaps in some cases nothing, of the germs

that lay concealed in them of better things to come. These germs *were* concealed in all typical events and institutions, not directly exhibited—since the events and institutions had a significance and use for the time then present, apart from what might be evolved in the future purposes of God. Now, we are expressly told, even in regard to direct prophecies of gospel-times, that not only the persons to whom they were originally delivered, but the very individuals through whom they were communicated, did not always or necessarily understand their precise meaning. Sometimes, at least, they had to assume the position of inquirers, in order to get the more exact and definite information which they desired (Dan. xii. 8 ; 1 Pet. i. 12), and it would seem from the case of Daniel, that even then they did not always obtain it. The prophets were not properly the authors of their own predictions, but spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. *Their* knowledge, therefore, of the real meaning of the prophecies they uttered, was an entirely separate thing from the prophecies themselves ; and if we knew what it was, it would still by no means conclusively fix their full import. Such being the case in regard even to the persons who uttered the *spoken and direct* prophecies of the Old Testament, how preposterous would it be to make the insight obtained by believers generally into the *indirect and veiled* prophecies, (as the types may be called), the ground and standard of the gospel-truth they embodied ? In each case alike, it is the mind of God, not the discernment or faith of the ancient believer, that we have properly to do with.

Obvious as this may appear to some, it has been very commonly overlooked ; and typical explanations have in consequence too often taken the reverse direction of what they should have done. Writers in this department are constantly telling us, how formerly the eye of faith looked through the present to the future, and finding in that the reason why our present should be descried in the remote past. Thus Adam is represented in a popular work as having “believed the promise concerning Christ, in whose commemoration he offered continual sacrifice ; and in the assurance thereof he named his wife *Eve*, that is to say *life*, and he called his son *Seth*, *settled*, or persuaded in Christ.”¹ Another exalts in like manner the faith of Zipporah, and regards her,

¹ Fisher's Marrow of Modern Divinity, P. 1, c. 2.

when she said to Moses, "A bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision," as announcing "through one of her children, the Jehovah as the future Redeemer and bridegroom."¹ Another presents Moses to our view as wondering at the great sight of the burning bush, "*because* the great mystery of the incarnation and sufferings of Christ was there represented; a great sight he might well call it, when there was represented *God manifest in the flesh*, suffering a dreadful death, and rising from the dead."² And Owen, speaking of the Old Testament believers generally, says, "Their faith in God was not confined to the outward things they enjoyed, but on Christ in them, and represented by them. They believed that they were only resemblances of him and his mediation, which, when they lost the faith of, they lost all acceptance with God in their worship."³ Writers of a different class, and of later date, have followed substantially in the same track. Warburton maintains with characteristic dogmatism, that the transaction with Abraham, in offering up Isaac, was a typical action, in which the patriarch had scenically represented to his view the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ; and that on any other supposition, there can be no right understanding of the matter.⁴ Dean Graves expresses his concurrence in this interpretation, as does also Mr Faber, who says, that "Abraham must have clearly understood the nature of that awful transaction by which the day of Christ was to be characterised, and could not have been ignorant of the benefits about to be procured by it."⁵ And, to mention no more, Chevallier intimates a doubt concerning the typical character of the brazen serpent, because "it is not plainly declared, either in the Old or the New Testament, to have been ordained by God purposely to represent to the Israelites the future mysteries of the Gospel revelation."⁶

¹ Kanne's *Christus in Alt. Test.* I. p. 100.

² *History of Redemption*, by Jonathan Edwards. Period I. p. 4.

³ Owen on Heb. viii. 5. In another part of his writings, however, we find him saying, "Although those (Old Testament) things are now full of light and instruction to us, evidently expressing the principal works of Christ's mediation, yet they were not so unto them. The meanest believer may now find out more of the work of Christ in the types of the Old Testament, than any prophet or wise man could have done of old."—*On the Person of Christ*, ch. 8.

⁴ *Legation of Moses*, B. vi. sec. 5.

⁵ *Treatise on the Three Dispensations*, Vol. ii. p. 57.

⁶ *Historical Types*, p. 221.

These quotations sufficiently shew, how current the opinion has been, and still is, that the persons who lived amid the types must have perfectly understood their typical character, and that by *their* knowledge in this respect, we are bound in great measure, if not entirely, to regulate ours. It is, however, a very difficult question, and one (as we have already had occasion to state) on which we should seldom venture to give more than an approximate deliverance, how far the realities typified even by the more important symbols and transactions of ancient times were distinctly perceived by any individual who lived prior to their actual appearance. The reason for this uncertainty and probable ignorance is the same with that, which has been so clearly exhibited by Bishop Horsley, and applied in refutation of an infidel objection, in the closely related field of prophecy. It was necessary, for the very ends of prophecy, that a certain disguise should remain over the events it foretold, till they became facts in providence ; and therefore, "whatever private information the prophet might enjoy, the Spirit of God would never permit him to disclose the ultimate intent and particualar meaning of the prophecy."¹ Types being a species of prophecy, and from their nature less precise and determinate in meaning, they must certainly have been placed under the veil of a not inferior disguise. Whatever insight more advanced believers might have had into their ultimate design, it could neither be distinctly announced, nor, if announced, serve as a sufficient directory for us ; it could only furnish, according to the measure of light it contained, comfort and encouragement to themselves. And whether that measure might be great or small, vague and general, or minute and particular, we should not be bound, even if we knew it, to abide by its rule ; for here, as in prophecy, the judgment of the early Church "must still bow down to time as a more informed expositor."

That the sincere worshippers of God in former ages, especially such as possessed the higher degrees of spiritual thought and discernment, were acquainted not only with God's general purpose of redemption, but also with some of its more prominent features and results, we have no reason to doubt. It is impossible to read those portions of Old Testament Scripture which disclose the feelings and expectations of gifted minds, without being con-

¹ Horsley's Works, vol. i. p. 271—273.

vinced, that considerable light was sometimes obtained respecting the work of salvation. We shall find an opportunity for inquiring more particularly concerning this, when we come to treat, in a subsequent part of our investigations, respecting the connection between the moral legislation, and the ceremonial institutions of Moses. But that the views even of the better part of the Old Testament worshippers must have been comparatively dim, and that their acceptance as worshippers did not depend upon the clearness of their discernment in regard to the person and kingdom of Christ, is evident from what was stated in our second chapter as to the relatively imperfect nature of the earlier dispensations, and the childhood-state of those who lived under them. It was the period, when, as is expressly stated in the epistle to the Hebrews (ch. ix. 8), "the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest;" or, in other words, when the method of salvation was not fully disclosed to the view of God's people. And though we may not be warranted to consider what is written of the closing age of Old Testament times as a fair specimen of their general character, yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that not only did much prevailing ignorance then exist concerning the better things of the new covenant, but that instances occur even of genuine believers, who still betrayed an utter misapprehension of their proper nature. Thus Nathanael was pronounced "an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile," while he obviously laboured under inadequate views of Christ's person and work. And no sooner had Peter received the peculiar benediction bestowed, on account of his explicit confession of the truth, than he gave evidence of his ignorance of the design, and his repugnance to the thought, of Christ's sufferings and death. Such things occurring on the very boundary-line between the Old and the New, and after the clearer light of the New had begun to be partially introduced, render it plain, that they may also have existed, and in all probability did generally prevail, even among the believing portion of Israel in remoter times.

But this being the case, it would manifestly be travelling in the wrong direction, to make the knowledge, which was possessed by ancient believers regarding the prospective import of particular types, the measure of ours. The providential arrangements and religious institutions which constitute the types, had an end

to serve, independently of their typical design, in ministering to the present wants of believers, and nourishing in their souls the life of faith. Their more remote and typical import was for us, even more than for those, who had immediately to do with them. It does not rest upon the more or less imperfect information such persons might have had concerning it ; but chiefly on the light furnished by the records of the New Testament, and thence reflected on those of the Old. "It is Christ who holds the key of the types, not Moses ;" and instead of making every thing depend upon the still doubtful inquiry, what did pious men of old descry of Gospel realities through the shadowy forms of typical institutions ? we must repair to these realities themselves, and by the light radiating from them over the past, as well as the present and future things of God, read the evidence of that "testimony of Jesus," which lies written in the typical, not less than in the prophetic portions of ancient Scripture.

III. But if in this respect we have comparatively little to do with the views of those who lived under former dispensations, there is another respect, in which we have much to do with them. And our next principle of interpretation is, that we must always, in the first instance, *be careful to make ourselves acquainted with the truths or ideas exhibited in the types, considered merely as providential transactions or religious institutions.* In other words, we are to find in what they were in their immediate relation to the patriarchal or Jewish worshipper, the foundation and substance of what they typically present to the Christian Church.

There is no contrariety between this principle and the one last announced. We had stated, that in endeavouring to ascertain the reality and the nature of a typical connection between Old and New Testament affairs, we are not to reason downward from what might be known of this in earlier times, but rather upward from what may now be known of it, in consequence of the clearer light and higher revelations of the Gospel. What we farther state is, that the religious truths and ideas which were embodied in the typical events and institutions of former times, must be regarded as forming the ground and limit of their prospective reference to the affairs of Christ's kingdom. That they had a moral, political, or religious end to serve for the time then present, so far from

interfering with their destination to typify the spiritual things of the Gospel, forms the very sum and substance of their typical bearing. Hence their character in the one respect, the more immediate, may justly be regarded as the essential key to their character in the other and higher respect.

This principle of interpretation grows so necessarily out of the views advanced in the earlier and more fundamental parts of our inquiry, that it must here be held as in a manner proved. Its validity must stand or fall with that of the general principles we have sought to establish, as to the relation between type and antitype. That relation, it has been our object to shew, rests on something deeper than merely outward resemblances. It rests rather on the essential unity of the things so related, on their being alike embodiments of the same principles of divine truth ; but embodiments in the case of the type, on a lower and earthly scale, and as a designed preparation for the higher developement afterwards to be made in the Gospel. That, therefore, which goes first in the nature of things, must also go first in any successful effort to trace the connection between them. And the question, What elements of divine truth are symbolized in the type ? must take precedence of the other question, How did the type foreshadow the greater realities of the antitype ? For it is in the solution we obtain for the one, that a foundation is to be laid for the solution of the other.

It is only by keeping steadfastly to this rule that we shall be able, in the practical department of our inquiry, to direct our thoughts to substantial, as opposed to merely superficial and fanciful resemblances. The palpable want of discrimination in this respect, between what is essential and what is only accidental, formed one of the leading defects in our older writers. And it naturally sprung from too exclusive a regard to the antitype, as if the things belonging to *it* being fully ascertained, we were at liberty to connect it with every thing formally resembling it in ancient times, whether really akin in nature to it or not. Thus, when Kanne, in a passage formerly referred to, represents the stone which Jacob took for his pillow at Bethel, as a type of Christ in his character, as the foundation-stone of his church, there is, no doubt, a kind of outward similarity, so that the same language may, in a sense, be applied to both ; but there is no com-

mon principle uniting them together. The use which Jacob made of the stone was quite different from that in respect to which Christ is exhibited as the stone laid in Zion—laid not for the repose or slumber, but for the stability and support of a ransomed people. The strength and durability of a rock were essentially needed for this ; but they contributed nothing to the fitness of what Jacob's necessities drove him to employ as a temporary pillow. It was his misfortune, not his privilege, to be obliged to resort to a stone for such a purpose.

We had occasion formerly to describe in what manner the lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness might be regarded as typical of the lifting up of a crucified Redeemer ; by shewing how the inferior objects and relations of the one had their correspondence in the higher objects and relations of the other !¹ But suppose we should proceed in the opposite direction, and should take these higher objects and relations of the antitype as the rule and measure of what we are to expect in the type ; then, having a far wider and more complicated subject for our starting-point, we should naturally set about discovering many slight and superficial analogies in the type, to bring it into a fuller correspondence with the antitype. This is what many who have treated of the subject actually do. And hence we find them expatiating upon the metal of which the serpent was formed, and which, from being inferior to some others, they regarded as foreshadowing Christ's outward meanness, while in its solidity they descried his divine strength, and in its dim lustre the veil of his human nature !² What did it avail to the Israelite, or for any purpose the serpent had to serve, of what particular stuff it was made ? A dead and senseless thing in itself, it must have been all one for those who were called to look to it, whether the material was brass or silver, wood or stone. And yet, as if it were not enough to make account of these trifling accidents, others were sometimes invented, for which there is no foundation in the inspired narrative, to obtain for the greater breadth of the one subject a corresponding breadth in the other. Thus Guild represents the serpent as not having been forged by man's hand or hammer, but by a mould, and in the fire, to image the divine con-

¹ Chap. iii. p. 81.

² Guild's *Moses Unveiled*, and Watson's *Holy Eucharist*.

ception of Christ's human nature ; and Justin Martyr, with still greater license, supposes the serpent to have been made in the form of a cross, the more exactly to represent a suffering Redeemer. Suppose it had been modelled after this form, would it have been rendered thereby a more effective instrument for healing the diseased ? Or, would one essential idea have been added to what either an Israelite or a Christian were otherwise at liberty to associate with it ? All such puerile straining of the subject arose from an inverted order being taken in tracing the connection between the spiritual reality and the ancient shadow. It would no longer be thought of, if the principle of interpretation here advanced were strictly adhered to ; that is, if the typical matter of an event or institution were viewed simply as standing in the truths or principles which it brought distinctly into view ; and if these were regarded as actually comprising all that in each particular case could legitimately be applied to the anti-typical affairs of Christ's kingdom.

The judicious application of this principle will serve also to rid us of another class of extravagances, which are of frequent occurrence in writers of the Cocceian school, and which mainly consist, like those already noticed, of external resemblances, deduced with little or no regard to any real principle of agreement. We refer to the customary mode of handling typical persons or characters, with no other purpose apparently than that of exhibiting the greatest possible number of coincidences between these and Christ. As many as forty of such have been reckoned between Moses and Christ, and even more between Joseph and Christ. Of course, a great proportion of such resemblances are of a quite superficial and trifling nature, and are of no moment, whether they happen to be perceived or not. For any light they throw on the purposes of Heaven, or any advantage they yield to our faith, we gain nothing by admitting them, and we lose as little by rejecting them. They would never have been sought for had the real nature of the connection between type and anti-type been understood, and the proper mode of exhibiting it been adopted : nor would typical persons or individuals, sustaining a typical character through the whole course and tenor of their lives, have been supposed to exist. It was to familiarise the Church with great truths and principles, not to occupy her thoughts with

petty agreements and fanciful analogies, that she was kept so long conversant with preparatory dispensations. And as that end might have been in part served by a single transaction, or a special appointment in a life-time ; so, whenever it was served, it must have been by virtue of its exhibiting important aspects of divine truth ; such as were to re-appear in the person and work of Christ. It is not, in short, individuals throughout the entire compass of their history, but individuals in certain divinely appointed offices or relations, in which we are to seek for what is typical in this province of sacred history.¹

IV. Another conclusion flowing not less clearly than the foregoing from the views already established, and which we propose as our next leading principle of interpretation, is, that while the symbol or institution constituting the type has properly *but one radical meaning, yet the fundamental idea or principle exhibited in it may often be capable of more than one application to the realities of the Gospel* ; that is, it may bear respect to, and be developed in, more than one department of the affairs of Christ's kingdom. But in illustrating this proposition, we must take in succession the several parts of which it consists.

1. The first part asserts each type to be capable of but one radical meaning. It has a definite way of expressing some fundamental idea—that, and no more. Were it otherwise, we should find any consistent or satisfactory interpretation of typical things quite impracticable, and should often lose ourselves in a sea of uncertainty. An example or two may serve to shew how far this

¹ Scarcely any of the late works on the types, published in this country, are free from the extravagances we have referred to respecting personal types. They assume, however, the most extreme form in the German work of Kanne, published in 1818. There the mere similarity of names is held as a conclusive proof of a typical connection ; so that Miriam, the sister of Moses, was a type of Mary, for the Jews call the former Maria, as well as the latter. The work is full of such puerilities. It is the same tendency, however, to rest in merely superficial resemblances which led Schöttgen, for example, in his *Horæ Heb.* on 1 Cor. x. 2, and leads some still, to hold that the Israelites must have been "bedewed and refreshed" by the cloud. It is true the sacred narrative is silent about that, nor is any support to be found for it in the Jewish writings ; but it seemed to the learned author necessary to make out a typical relation to baptism, and so he regards it as in a manner self-evident. On the same ground, of course, Noah and his family must have been all sprinkled or dipped in the flood, since this too was the type of baptism !

has actually been the case in the past. Glassius makes the deluge to typify both the preservation of the faithful through baptism, and the destruction of the wicked in the day of judgment ; and the rule under which he adduces this example is, that " a type may be a figure of two, and even contrary things, though in different respects."¹ In like manner, Taylor, taking the full liberty of such a canon, when interpreting the passage of the Israelites through the Red sea as a type of baptism, sees in that event, first, " the offering of Jesus Christ to their faith, through the Red sea, of whose death and passion they should find a sure and safe way to the celestial Canaan ;" and then this other truth, that " by his merit and mediation he would carry them through all difficulties and dangers, as deep as the bottom of the sea, unto eternal rest."² In this last specimen the Red sea is viewed as representing at the sametime, and in relation to the same persons, both the atoning blood of Christ and the outward trials of life. The other example is not so palpably incorrect, nor does it in fact go to the entire length, which the rule it is designed to illustrate properly warrants ; for the action of the waters in the deluge is considered by it, with reference to different persons, as well as in different respects. It is at fault, however, in making one event typical of two diverse and unconnected results. Many other examples might be produced of similar false interpretations from what has been written of the tabernacle and its services, equally indicative, on the part of the writers, of a capricious fancy, but utterly destitute in themselves of any solid foundation.

Our previous investigations, we trust, have removed this prolific source of ambiguity and confusion. For, if we have not entirely failed of our object, we have proved that the typical transactions and symbols of the Old Testament are by no means so vague and arbitrary as to be capable of bearing senses altogether variable and inconsistent. Viewed as a species of language, which they really were—a speaking by action instead of words—they could only reach the end they had to serve by giving forth a distinct and intelligible meaning. Such language can no more do

¹ Philolog. Sac. Lib. II. p. 1. Trac. II. sec. 4, § 8. He quotes from Cornelius à Lepide, but adopts the rule as good.

² Moses and Aaron, p. 237.

this than oral or written discourse, if constructed so as to be susceptible of the most diverse and even opposite senses. By the necessities of the case, therefore, we are constrained to hold, that whatever instruction God might design to communicate to the church, either in earlier or in later times, by means of the religious institutions and providential arrangements of past times, it must have been such as admits of being derived from them by a fixed and determinate mode of interpretation. To suppose that their virtue consisted in some capacity to express meanings quite variable and inconsistent with each other, would be to assimilate them to the uncertain oracles of heathenism. *Their* excellence, on the contrary, lay in the truth and importance of some one meaning, which it was their destination, not always, it may be, with equal distinctness, but still always without ambiguity, to unfold.

2. This is to be understood in the strictest sense of such typical acts and symbols, as, from their nature, were expressive of a simple, uncompounded idea. In that case, it would be an incongruity to make what was one in the type present, like a revolving light, a changeful and varying aspect toward the antitype. But the type itself might possibly be of a complex nature ; that is, it might embody a process which branched out into two or more lines of operation, and so combined two or more related ideas together. In such a case there will require to be a corresponding variety in the application that is made from the type to the antitype. The twofold, or perhaps still more complicated idea contained in the one must have its counterpart in the other, as much as if each idea had received a separate representation ; though due regard must be paid to the connection, which they appear to have one with another, as component elements of the same type. For example, the event of the deluge, recently adverted to, which at once bore on its bosom an elect seed, in safe preservation for the peopling of a new world, and overwhelmed in perdition the race of ungodly men who had corrupted the old, unquestionably involves a complex idea. It embodies in one great act a double process—a process, however, which was accomplished simultaneously in both its parts ; since the doing of the one carried along with it the execution of the other. In thinking, therefore, of the New Testament antitype, we must have respect not only to the

two ideas themselves severally represented, but also to their relation to each other ; we must look for some spiritual process, which in like manner combines a work of preservation with a work of destruction. In the different fates of the righteous and the wicked, the one as appointed to salvation, and the other to perdition, we have certainly a twofold process and result ; but have we the two in a similar combination ? We certainly have them so combined in the personal history and work of Christ, as his triumph and exaltation inevitably involved the bruising of Satan ; and the same shall also be found in the final judgment, when by putting down for ever all adverse authority and rule, Christ shall raise his church to the dominion and the glory. If the typical connection between the deluge and God's grander works of preservation and destruction, is put in either of these lights, the objection we lately offered to the interpretation of Glassius will be obviated, and the requirements of a scriptural exegesis satisfied. A like combination of two ideas is found in the application made of the deluge by the Apostle Peter to the ordinance of baptism, as will be shewn in due time. And there are, besides, many things connected with the tabernacle and its services—for example, the use made in them of symbolical numbers, the different kinds of sacrifice, the ritual of cleansing—which are usually so employed as to convey a complex meaning, and a meaning that of necessity assumes different shades, according to the different modifications introduced into the symbolical materials. Such differences, however, can only be of a minor kind ; they can never touch the fundamental character of the typical phenomena so as to render them expressive in one relation of something totally unlike to what they denoted in another. A symbolical act or institution can as little be made to change its meaning arbitrarily, as a term in language. Its precise import must always be determined first by an intelligent consideration of its inherent nature, and then by the connection in which it stands.

3. It is one thing, however, to maintain that a type, either as a whole, or in its component parts, can express only one meaning ; and another, to allow more than one application of it to the affairs of Christ's kingdom. Not only is there an organic connection between the old and the new dispensations, giving rise to the relation of type and antitype, but also an organic connection be-

tween one part and another of the Gospel dispensation ; in consequence of which the ideas and principles exhibited in the types may find their realisation in more than one department of the Gospel system. The types, as well as the prophecies, hence often admit of "a springing and germinant accomplishment." They do so, especially in those things which concern the economical relation subsisting between Christ and his people ; by reason of which he is at once the root out of which they grow, and the pattern after which their condition and destiny is to be formed. If on this account it be necessary that in all things he should have the pre-eminence, it is not less necessary that they should bear his image, and share in his heritage of blessing. So closely are they identified with him in their present experience and their future prospects, that they are now spoken of as having "fellowship with him in his sufferings," being "planted with him in the likeness of his death," and again, "planted with him in the likeness of his resurrection," "sitting with him in heavenly places," having "their life hid with him in God," and being at last raised to "inherit his kingdom, and sit with him upon his throne." In short, the church as a whole is formed after his likeness, while again, in each one of her members is reproduced an image of the whole. Therefore, the principles and ideas, which by means of typical ordinances and transactions were perpetually exhibited before the eye of the Old Testament church, while they must find their grand development in Christ himself, must also have further developements in the history of his church and people. They have respect to *our* relations and experiences, *our* state and prospects, in so far as these essentially coincide with Christ's ; for so far, the one is but a partial renewal, or a prolonged existence of the other.

There are things of a typical nature, it is proper to add, which in a more direct and special manner bear respect to the church and people of Christ. The rite of circumcision, for example, the passage through the Red Sea, the judgments in the wilderness, the eating of manna, and many similar things, must obviously have their antitypes in the heirs of salvation rather than in him, who, in this respect, stood alone ; he was personally free from sin, and did not himself need the blessings he provided for others. So that, when the apostle writes of the ordinances of the law, that

they were "shadows of good things to come, but the body is of Christ" (Col. ii. 17), he is not to be understood as meaning that Christ personally and alone is the object they prospectively contemplated, but Christ together with his body the church—the events and interests of the Gospel dispensation. In this collective sense Christ is mentioned also in 1 Cor. xii. 12, and Gal. iii. 16. Nor is it by any means an arbitrary sense; for it is grounded in the same vital truth, on which we have based the admissibility of a twofold application or bearing of typical things, viz. the organic union subsisting between Christ and his redeemed people—"he in them and they in him."

V. Another principle of interpretation arising out of the preceding investigations, and necessary to be borne in mind for the right understanding of typical symbols and transactions, is, that *due regard must be had to the essential difference between the nature of type and antitype*. For, as the typical is divine truth on a lower stage, exhibited by means of outward relations and terrestrial interests, so, when making the transition from this to the antitypical, we must expect the truth to appear on a loftier stage, and, if we may so speak, with a more heavenly aspect. What in the one bore immediate respect to the bodily life, must in the other be found to bear immediate respect to the spiritual life. While in the one it is seen and temporal objects that ostensibly present themselves, their proper counterpart in the other are the unseen and eternal:—*there*, the outward, the present, the worldly; *here*, the inward, the future, the heavenly.

A change and advance of the kind here supposed, enters into the very vitals of the subject, as unfolded in the earlier part of our inquiry. The reason why typical symbols and institutions were employed by God in his former dealings with his church, arose from the adoption of a plan, which indispensably required that very progression in the mode of exhibiting divine truth. The world was treated for a period as a child that must be taught great principles, and prepared for events of infinite magnitude and eternal interest, by the help of familiar and sensible objects, which lay fully open to their view, and came within the grasp of their comprehension. But now that we have to do with the things themselves, for which those means of preparation were in-

stituted, we must take care, in tracing the connection between the one and the other, to keep steadily in view the essential difference between the two periods, and with the rise in the divine plan give a corresponding rise to the application we make of what belonged to the ancient economy. To proceed without regard to this—to look for the proper counterpart of any particular type in the same class of objects and interests, as that to which the type itself immediately referred, would be to act like those Judaizing Christians, who, after the better things had come, held fast at once by type and antitype, as if they belonged to one sphere, and consisted of the same materials. It would be to remain at the old foundations, while the scheme of God has risen to a higher place, and laid a new world, as it were, open to our view. If, therefore, we enter aright into the change which has been effected in the position of the divine kingdom, and give to that its proper weight in determining the connection between type and antitype, we must look for things in the one, similar, indeed, to those in the other, but, at the same time, proportionally higher and greater; and, in particular, must remember, that according to the rule, internal things now take the place of external, and spiritual of bodily.

Much discretion, however, which it is impossible to bound by such precise and definite rules as might meet all conceivable cases, will be necessary in applying the principle now stated to individual examples. In the majority of cases there will be no difficulty; for the distinction we mention between the Old and the New is so manifest as to secure a certain degree of uniformity even among those who are not remarkable for discrimination. And, indeed, the writers most liable to err in other respects, persons of delicate sensibilities and spiritual feeling, are less in danger of erring here, as they have usually a clear perception of the more inward and elevated character of the Gospel dispensation. The point, in regard to which they are most likely to err concerning it, and that which really forms the chief difficulty in applying the principle now under consideration, arises from what may be called the mixed nature of the things belonging to Messiah's kingdom. As contradistinguished from those of earlier dispensations, and rising above them, we denominate the realities of the Gospel spiritual, heavenly, eternal. And yet they are not totally disconnected with the objects of flesh and time. The centre-

point of the whole, Jesus Christ, not only sojourned in bodily form upon the earth, but had certain conditions to fulfil of an outward and bodily kind, which were described beforehand in prophecy, and may also, of course, have had their typical adumbrations. In the case of the Church, too, her life of faith is not altogether of an inward nature, and confined to the hidden man of the heart. It touches continually on the corporeal and visible; and certain events essentially connected with her progress and destiny—such as the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, the calling of the Gentiles, the persecutions of the world, the doom of Antichrist—could not take place without assuming an outward and palpable form. What then, it may be asked, becomes of the characteristic difference between the Old and the New, so far as such things are concerned? Must not type and antitype still be found substantially on the same level?

No; the only legitimate conclusion is, that there are cases in which the difference is less broadly marked; but it still exists. The operations, experiences, and blessings peculiar to the dispensation of the Gospel, are not all of an entirely inward and spiritual nature, but they all bear directly on the interests of a spiritual salvation, and the realities of a heavenly and eternal world. The members of Christ's kingdom, so long as they are in flesh and blood, must have their history interwoven on every side with the relations of sense and time, and be themselves dependent upon outward ordinances for the existence and nourishment of their spiritual life. Yet whatever is external in their privileges and condition, has its internal side and even its avowed reason in things pertaining to the soul's salvation, and the coming inheritance of glory. So that the spiritual and heavenly is here always kept prominently in view, as the end and object of all; while in Old Testament times every thing was veiled under the sensible relations of flesh and time, and, excepting to the divinely illuminated eye, seemed as if it did not look beyond them.

For example, the deluge and baptism so far agree in form, that they have both an outward operation; but the operation, in the one case, has to do directly with the preservation and destruction of an earthly life; while in the other it bears immediately

upon the life of immortality in the soul. The crucifixion of Christ and the slaying of the paschal lamb, were alike outward transactions ; but the direct and ostensible result contemplated in the first, was salvation from the condemnation and punishment of sin ; in the second, escape from corporeal death, and deliverance from the yoke of an earthly bondage. In like manner, it might be said to be as much an outward transaction for Christ to ascend personally into the presence of the Father, as for the High-priest to go within the veil with the blood of the yearly atonement ; but to rectify men's relation to a worldly sanctuary and an earthly inheritance, was the immediate object sought by this action of the high-priest, while the appearance of Christ in the heavenly places was to secure for his people access to the everlasting kingdom of light and glory. In such cases the common property of a certain outwardness in the acts and operations referred to, is far from placing them on the same level ; a higher element still appears in the one as compared with the other. But if, on the other hand, we should say, as has often been said, that Isaac's bearing the wood for the altar typified Christ's bearing his cross to Calvary, we bring together two circumstances which do stand precisely upon the same level, alike outward in themselves, and the one no more than the other involving any rise to a higher sphere of truth. Else, how should a common man, Simon the Cyrenian, have shared with Christ in the bearing of the burden ?

But the most pernicious examples of this false style of typical applications are to be found in the Grotian school of interpretation, whose low and carnal tone is continually betraying itself in a tendency to depress and lower the spiritual truths of the Gospel to a conformity with the simple letter of Old Testament Scripture. The Gospel is read, not only through a Jewish medium, but also in a Jewish sense, and nothing but externals admitted in the New, wherever there is described, in the form of the representation, any reference to such in the Old. It is one of the few services which neological exegesis has rendered to the cause of divine truth, that by a process of exhaustion it has nearly emptied this meagre style of interpretation of the measure of plausibility it originally possessed. But it is still occasionally followed, in the particular respect now under consideration, by

theological writers of a higher stamp. Thus, the doctrine of election, as unfolded in the epistles of the New Testament, is held by the advocates of a modified Arminianism to be improperly understood of an appointment to personal salvation and an eternal life, on the special ground that the election of the Jewish people was only their calling as a nation to outward privileges and a temporal inheritance. Nay, we reply, this is rather a reason why election in the Christian sense must go farther and deeper. For, the proper counterpart under the Gospel to those external relations of Judaism is the gift of grace and the heirship of glory—the lower in the one case shadowing the higher in the other—the outward and temporal representing the spiritual and eternal. Even Macknight, who cannot certainly be charged with any excess of the spiritual element in his interpretations, perceived the necessity of making, as he expresses it, “the natural seed the type of the spiritual, and the temporal blessings the emblems of the eternal.” Hence, he justly regards the outward professing church in the one case, with its election to the earthly Canaan, as answering in the other, to the “invisible church, consisting of believers of all nations, who, partaking the nature of God by faith and holiness, are truly the sons of God, and have the inheritance of his blessing.”¹

¹ On Rom. ix. 8. For the other side see Whitby on the same chapter, and on 1 Pet. ii. 9; Graves' Works, vol. iii. p. 233. Archbishop Whately, in his Essays on the Peculiarities of the Gospel, p. 95, gives the representation a somewhat different turn from Whitby and Graves. He regards the Israelites as not having been “elected absolutely and infallibly to enter the promised land, to triumph over their enemies, and live in security, wealth, and enjoyment; but only to the privilege of having these blessings placed *within their reach*, on the condition of their obeying the law which God had given them.” Whence, he infers, Christians are only elected, in the same sense, to the privileges of a Gospel condition and the *promise* of final salvation. In regard to election in the Gospel sense, such a representation vanishes before a few plain texts—such as “Many are called, but few are chosen;” “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus;” “according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world . . . having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself.” If such passages do not imply election to a state of personal salvation, it is not in the power of language to express the idea. In regard to the Israelites, we maintain that the election and the promise were also made absolutely—“to thy seed will I give this land”—and the proper inference respecting those, who afterwards perished in the wilderness, without being permitted to enter the land, is simply, that they were not of that portion of the seed who were elect, according to the foreknowledge of God, to

The characteristic differences, with their respective limitations and apparent anomalies, may be briefly stated thus:—It belongs properly to the New dispensation to reveal divine and spiritual things distinctly to the soul, while in the Old they are presented under the veil of something outward and earthly. The spiritual and divine itself, which always, as a living under-current, ran beneath this exterior veil, might, even during the existence of the Old, come directly into view; but whenever it did so, there was no longer a figure or type of the true, but the true itself. Thus, in so far as the seed of Israel were found an election of God, actually partaking of the grace and blessing of the covenant—in so far as they were a royal priesthood, circumcised in heart to the Lord, they shewed themselves to be possessed of the reality of a justified condition and a regenerated life. The exhibitions that may have been given by any of them of such a state, were not typical in the sense of foreshadowing something higher and better under the Gospel; and if those, in whom they appeared, are spoken of as types, it must be as specimens, not as adumbrations—patterns of what is common to the children of faith in every age. The only connection possible in such a case, is that which subsists between type and impression, exemplar and copy, not that between type and antitype.

Turning to the things of the New dispensation, we have simply to reverse the statement now made. While here the spiritual and divine are exhibited in unveiled clearness, it is quite conceivable that they may at times have appeared under the distinctive guise of the Old, imbedded in fleshly and material forms. Especially might this be expected to happen at the beginning of the Gospel, when the transition was in the course of being made from the Old to the New, as the Messiah came forth to lay the foundations of his spiritual and everlasting kingdom on the external theatre of a present world. It was natural at such a time for God graciously to accommodate his ways to a weak faith, and facilitate its exercise, by making the things that appeared under

the possession of the land. It is true, they might justly be said to have lost it for disobeying the law, but viewed in respect to their connection with the calling and promise of God, it was their want of faith to connect them with these, their unbelief, which was the immediate cause of their perdition.

the New, wear the very livery of those that prefigured them under the Old. This is precisely what was done in some of the more noticeable parts of Christ's earthly history. But in so far as it *was* done; that is, in so far as some outward transaction in the Old re-appeared in a like outward transaction in the New, their relation to each other could not properly be that of type and antitype, but only of exemplar and copy—unless the New Testament transaction, while it bore a formal resemblance to that of the Old, was itself at the same time the sensible exponent of some higher truth. If it were this, then the relation would still be substantially that of type and antitype. And such, indeed, it is, in the few cases which actually fall within the range of these remarks, and which, when superficially viewed, seem at variance with the principle of interpretation we are seeking to establish.

Let us, in conclusion, glance at the cases themselves. The recal of the infant Jesus from the land of Egypt, after a temporary sojourn there, is regarded by the evangelist Matthew as the correlative in New Testament times to the deliverance of Israel under the Old. It is impossible to overlook the indication of a similar connection, though none of the evangelists have expressly noticed it, between Israel's period of trial and temptation for forty years in the wilderness, and Christ's withdrawal into the wilderness to be tempted forty days of the devil. The evangelist John sets the singular and apparently accidental preservation of Christ's limbs on the cross, beside the prescription regarding the Paschal Lamb, not to let a bone of him be broken, and sees in the one a divinely appointed compliance with the other (ch. xix. 36). And in the epistle to the Hebrews (ch. xiii. 12), the crucifixion of Jesus beyond the gates of Jerusalem is represented, not indeed as done to establish a necessary, but still as exhibiting an actual correspondence with the treatment of those sin-offerings which were burned without the camp. There can be no doubt, that in each of these instances of formal agreement between the Old and the New, the transactions look as if they were on the same level, and appear equally outward in the one as in the other. Shall we say, then, that on this account they do not really stand to each other in the relation of type and antitype? Or, that there was some peculiarity in the later transactions, which still, amid the apparent sameness, raised them to a sufficient ele-

vation above the earlier? This last supposition we conceive to be the correct one.

In the first instance, it was not unnatural, when there was so little faith in the Church, and when such great things were in the course of being accomplished, that certain outward and palpable correspondences, such as we have noticed, should have been exhibited. It was a kind and gracious accommodation, on the part of God, to the ignorance and weakness of the times. The people were almost universally looking in the wrong direction for the things connected with the person and kingdom of Messiah; and he mercifully controlled in various respects the course and progress of events, so as, in a manner, to force on their notice the marvellous similarity of his working now to what he had done in the days of old. He did what was fitted to impress visibly upon the darker features of the evangelical history his own image and superscription, and to mark them out to men's view as wrought according to the law of a foreseen and pre-established harmony. Yet we should not expect such obvious and palpable marks of agreement to be commonly stamped by the hand of God upon the new things of his kingdom, as compared with the old; we should rather regard them as a sort of extraordinary and peculiar helps granted to a weak and unenlightened faith at the commencement of the kingdom. And even when so granted, we should not expect them to constitute the whole of the matter, but should suppose something farther to be veiled under them than immediately meets the eye—a deeper agreement, of which the one outwardly appearing was little more than the sign and herald.

This supposition gathers strength when we reflect that the outward agreement, however manifest and striking in some respects, is still never so uniform and complete as to convey the impression that the entire stress lay there, or that it was designed to be anything more than a stepping-stone for the mind to rise higher. Thus, while the child Jesus was for a time located in Egypt, and again brought out of it by the special providence of God, like Israel in its youth; yet what a difference between the two cases—in the length of time spent in the transactions, and the whole circumstances connected with their accomplishment! Jesus and Israel alike underwent a period of temptation in a wilderness before entering on their high calling; but again, how widely

different in the precise region selected for the scene of trial, and the time during which it was continued! Christ's crucifixion beyond the gates of Jerusalem, and the preservation of his limbs from external violence, exhibited a striking resemblance to peculiarities in the sacrifices of the passover and sin-offering—enough to mark the overruling agency of God; but in other outward things there were scarcely less marked discrepancies—nothing, for example, in the sacrifices referred to, corresponding with the pierced side of Jesus, or his suspension on the cross; and nothing again in Jesus formally answering to the sacrificial rites of the imposition of hands, the sprinkling of blood, or the burning of the carcase. These, and other defects that might be named in the external correspondence between the New and the Old, plainly enough indicates that the outward agreement was, after all, not the main thing, nor the thing that properly constituted the typical connection between them. Else, where such agreement failed, the connection must have failed too; and in many respects Christ should not have been the “body” of the ancient shadows, in more, perhaps, than those in which he actually was. Who would not shrink from alleging this? But we can find no consistent reason for denying it, except on the ground that the occasional outward coincidences between our Lord's personal history and things in God's earlier dispensations, were the *signs* of a typical relationship rather than that relationship itself—a likeness merely on the surface, that gave notice of a deeper and more essential agreement.

This peculiarity in some of the typical applications of Scripture, has its parallel in the applications also sometimes made of the prophecies. We merely point for examples to the employment by St John, ch. xix. 37, of Zech. xii. 10, “They shall look on me whom they have pierced,” or by St Matthew in ch. ii. 23, viii. 17 of other prophetic testimonies, and refer to the explanations given of them in our appendix. In such cases it is obvious, on a little reflection, that the outward and corporeal things with which the word of prophecy is immediately connected, fell so far short of their full meaning, that if they were fitly regarded as a fulfilment of what had been spoken, it was more because of the index they afforded to other and greater things yet to come, than of what they themselves actually were. It was like pointing to

the little cloud in the horizon, which may be scarcely worth noticing in itself, but which assumes another aspect when it is discerned to be the sign and the forerunner of rising vapours and torrents of approaching rain. The beginning and the end, the present sign and the coming reality, are then seen blending together, and forming but one object.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

THE PLACE DUE TO THE SUBJECT OF TYPES AS A BRANCH OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY, AND THE ADVANTAGES ARISING FROM ITS PROPER CULTIVATION.

THE loose and incorrect views which have so long prevailed regarding the types, and which have latterly assumed a form, that tends at once to circumscribe their number and lessen their importance, have told so adversely on the subject, that little more than a nominal place has been assigned it in our more recent theological systems. For any real value to be attached to it in the order of God's revelations, or any light it is fitted to throw, when rightly understood, on the interpretation of Scripture, we search in vain amid the writings of our leading hermeneutical and systematic divines. The treatment it has most commonly received at their hands is rather negative than positive. They appear greatly more concerned about the abuses to which it may be carried, than the advantages to which it may be applied. And were it not for the purpose of exploding errors, delivering cautions, and disowning unwarrantable conclusions, it is too plain the subject would scarcely have been deemed worthy of any separate and particular consideration.

If the discussion pursued through the preceding chapters has been conducted with any success, it must have tended to beget a quite different feeling upon the subject. Various points of moment connected with the purposes of God and the interpretation of Scripture must have suggested themselves to the reflective reader, as capable both of receiving fresh light, and acquiring new importance from a well-grounded system of Typology. One entire branch of the subject—its connection with the closely related field of prophecy—we have already, on account of its special im-

portance, considered in a separate chapter. At present we shall look to some other points of a more general kind, which have, however, an essential bearing on the character of divine revelation, and which will enable us to bring out, in a variety of lights, the soundness and importance of the views we have been endeavouring to establish.

I. We mark, first, an *analogy in God's methods of preparatory instruction*, as adopted by him at different, but somewhat corresponding periods of the Church's history. In *one* brief period of its existence the Church of the New Testament might be said to stand in a very similar relation to the immediate future, that the Church of the Old Testament generally did to the more distant future, of gospel-times. It was the period of our Lord's earthly ministry, during which the materials were in preparation for the actual establishment of his kingdom, and his disciples were subjected to the training which was to fit them for taking part in its affairs. The process that had been proceeding for ages with the Church had, in *their* experience, to be virtually begun and completed in the short space of a few years. And we are justly warranted to expect, that the method adopted during this brief period of special preparation toward the first members of the New Testament Church, should present some leading features of resemblance to that pursued with the Old Testament Church as a whole, during her immensely more lengthened period of preparatory training.

Now, the main peculiarity, as we have seen, of God's method of instruction and discipline in respect to the Old Testament Church, consisted in the use of symbol and action. It was chiefly by means of historical transactions and symbolical rites that the ancient believers were taught what they knew of the truths and mysteries of grace. For the *practical* guidance and direction of their conduct they were furnished with means of information the most literal and express ; but in regard to the *spiritual* concerns and objects of the Messiah's kingdom, all was couched under veil and figure. The instruction given addressed itself to the eye rather than to the ear. It came intermingled with the things they saw and handled ; and while it necessarily made them

familiar with the elements of gospel-truth, it not less necessarily left them in comparative ignorance as to the particular events and operations in which the truth was to find its ultimate and proper realisation.

How entirely analogous was the course pursued by our Lord with his immediate disciples during the period of his earthly ministry ! The direct instruction he imparted to them was, with few exceptions, confined to lessons of moral truth and duty—freeing the law of God from the false glosses of a carnal and corrupt priesthood, which had entirely overlaid its meaning, and disclosing the pure and elevated principles on which his kingdom was to be founded. But in regard to what might be called the mysteries of the kingdom—the constitution of Christ's person, the peculiar character of his work for and in the souls of men, and the connection of all with a higher and future world—no direct instruction of any moment was imparted up to the very close of Christ's earthly ministry. On one or two occasions, when he sought to convey some definite information upon such points, the disciples either completely misunderstood his meaning, or shewed themselves incapable of profiting by his instructions (Matth. xvi. 21-23 ; Luke xviii. 34 ; John ii. 19-22, vi.) So that in the last discourse he held with them before his sufferings, he spoke of the many things he had yet to say to them, but which, as they still could not bear them, had to be reserved to the teaching of the Holy Spirit, who was afterwards to lead them into all the truth. Were they, therefore, left without instruction of any kind respecting those higher truths and mysteries of the kingdom ? By no means ; for throughout the whole period of their connection with Christ, they were constantly receiving such instruction as could be conveyed through action and symbol ; or more correctly, through action and allegory, which was here made to take the place of symbol, and served substantially the same design.

The public life of Jesus was full of action, and in that, to a large extent, consisted its fulness of instruction. Every miracle he performed was a type in history ; for, on the outward and visible field of nature, it revealed the divine power he was going to manifest, and the work he came to achieve in the higher field of grace. In every act of healing men's bodily diseases, and supplying of men's bodily wants, there was an exhibition to the eye

of sense at once of his purpose to bring salvation to their souls, and of the principles on which he should proceed in doing so. In like manner, when he resorted to the parabolic method of instruction, what was it but another employment of the familiar and sensible things of nature, under the form of allegory, to convey still further instruction respecting the spiritual and divine things of his kingdom? There was in the procedure something of judgment to his adversaries, who had failed to profit, as they ought, by his more simple and direct teaching (Matth. xiii. 11-15). But for his own disciples, it formed a cover, through which he could present to them a larger amount of spiritual truth, and give them a more correct idea of his kingdom, than it was possible, as yet, for them to obtain in any other way. Every parable contained an allegorical representation of some particular aspect of the kingdom, which, like the types of an earlier dispensation, only needed to be illuminated by the facts of Gospel history, to render it a clear and intelligible image of spiritual and divine realities. In all, the outward and earthly was made to present the form of the inward and heavenly.

Thus, the special training of our Lord's disciples very closely corresponded to the course of preparatory dispensations through which the church at large was conducted before the time of his appearing. Such an analogy, pursued in circumstances so altered, and through periods so widely different, bespeaks the consistent working and presiding agency of Him, "who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." It furnishes also a ready and effective answer to the Socinian argument against the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, on account of the comparative silence maintained respecting them in the direct instructions of Christ. "Can such doctrines," they have sometimes asked, "enter so essentially, as is alleged, into the original plan of Christianity, when its divine author himself says so little about them? When in all he taught his disciples we look in vain for any explicit or systematic exhibition of them?" Look, we reply, to the analogy of God's dealings with his church, and let that supply the answer. Christ and the mysteries of his redemption were the end of all the earlier proceedings of God, and of the institutions of worship he gave to his church; and yet many centuries of preparatory instruction and discipline were permitted to elapse before the objects them-

selves were brought distinctly into view. Should it then be deemed strange or unaccountable that the persons immediately chosen by Christ to announce them, were made to undergo a brief but perfectly similar preparatory course, under the eye of their divine Master? The *facts* of Christianity are the basis of its *doctrines*; and until those facts had become matter of history, the doctrines could neither be explicitly taught, nor clearly understood. They could only be obscurely represented to the mind through the medium of typical actions, symbolical rites, or parabolical narratives. And it results as much from the essential nature of things as from the choice of its divine author, that the mode of instruction, which was continued through the lengthened probation of the Old Testament church, should have found its parallel in "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

II. But there is an *analogy of faith and practice* which is of still greater importance than any analogy that may appear in the methods of instruction. However important it may be to note resemblances in the mode of communicating divine truth, at one period as compared with another, it is more so to know that the truth, however communicated, has always been found one in its tendency and working; that the earlier and the later, the Old and the New Testament churches, though differing widely in light and privilege, yet breathed the same spirit, walked by the same rule, possessed and manifested the same elements of character. A correct acquaintance with the Typology of Scripture alone explains, how, with such palpable differences subsisting between them, there should still have been such essential uniformity in the result.

In the writings of the New Testament, especially in the epistles, it is very commonly the *differences* between the Old and the New, rather than the *agreements*, that are pressed on our notice. A necessity for this arose from the abuse to which the Jews had turned the handwriting of ordinances delivered to them by Moses. In the carnality of their minds, they mistook the means for the end, embraced the shadow for the substance, and so converted what had been set up for the express purpose of leading them to Christ, into a mighty stumbling-block to obstruct the way of their approach to him. On this account it became necessary to bring

prominently out the differences between the preparatory and the ultimate schemes of God, and to shew that what was perfectly suited to the one was quite unsuited to the other. But there were, at the same time, many real agreements of a most essential nature between them, and these also are often referred to in New Testament Scripture. Moses and Christ, when closely examined and viewed as to the more fundamental parts of their respective systems, are found to teach in perfect harmony with each other. The law and the prophets of the Old Testament, and the Gospels and Epistles of the New, exhibit but different phases of the same wondrous scheme of grace. The light varies from time to time in its clearness and intensity, but never as to the elements of which it is composed. And the very differences, which so broadly distinguish the Gospel dispensation from all that went before it, when taken in connection with the entire plan and purpose of God, afford evidence of an internal harmony, and a profound agreement.

The truth of what we say, if illustrated to its full extent, would require us to traverse almost the entire field of Scripture Typology. We shall, therefore, content ourselves here with selecting a single point, which, in its most obvious aspect, belongs rather to the differences than the arguments between the Old and the New dispensations. For in what do the two more apparently and widely differ from each other than in regard to the place occupied in them respectively by the doctrine of a future state? In the Scriptures of the New Testament the eternal world comes constantly into view; it meets us in every page, inspires every religious character, mingles with every important truth and obligation, and gives an ethereal tone and an ennobling impress to the whole genius and framework of Christianity. Nothing of this, however, is to be found in the earlier portions of the Word of God. That these contain no reference of any kind to a future state of rewards and punishments, we are far from believing, as will abundantly appear in the sequel. But still the doctrine of such a state is nowhere broadly announced, as an essential article of faith, in the revelations of Old Testament Scripture; it has no distinct and easily-recognized place either in the patriarchal or the Levitical dispensations; it is never set forth as a formal ground of action, and is implied, rather than distinctly affirmed, or avow-

edly acted on, excepting when it occasionally appears among the confessions of pious individuals, or in the later declarations of prophecy ; so that, though itself one of the first principles of all true religion, there yet was maintained respecting it a studied caution and reserve in the revelations of God to men up to the time when He came who was to “bring life and immortality to light.”¹

This obvious difference between the Old and the New Testament revelations, in respect to a future state, has been deemed such a palpable incongruity, that sometimes the most forced interpretations have been resorted to with the view of getting rid of the fact, while, at other times, extravagant theories have been proposed to account for it. But we have no need to travel farther than to the typical character of God’s earlier dispensations for a satisfactory explanation of the difficulty—and we shall find it in nothing else. For, leave this out of view—suppose that God’s method of teaching and training the Old Testament Church was not *necessarily formed* on the plan of unfolding Gospel ideas and principles by means of earthly relations and fleshly symbols, then we see not how it could have consisted with divine wisdom to keep such a veil hanging for so many ages over the realities of a coming eternity. But let the typical element be duly taken into account, let it be understood that inferior and earthly things were systematically employed of old to image and represent those which are heavenly and divine ; and then we can as little see how it could have consisted with divine wisdom to have disclosed the doctrine of a future state, otherwise than under the figures and shadows of what is seen and temporal. For this doctrine, in its naked form, stands inseparably connected with the facts of Christ’s death and resurrection, on which it is entirely based as a ground of consolation and an object of hope to the believer. And if the one had been openly disclosed, while the other still remained under the

¹ A clear proof in a single instance of what is here said of the Old Testament in respect to an eternal world, may be found in what is written of Enoch, “He was not, for God took him,” and this *because* he had walked with God. A causal connection plainly existed between his walk on earth and his removal to God’s presence ; and yet this is so indicated as clearly to shew that it was the divine purpose to spread a veil of secrecy over the future world, as if the distinct knowledge of it depended on conditions that could not then be formally brought out.

veil of typical shadows, utter confusion must necessarily have been introduced into the dispensations of God ; the old covenant, with ordinances suited only to an inferior and preparatory course of training, should have possessed a portion of the light properly belonging to a complete and finished revelation. The ancient Church, with her faith in that case *professedly* directed on the eternal world, must have lost her symbolical relation to the present ; her experiences must have been as spiritual, her life as hidden, her conflict with temptation, and victory over the world, as inward as those of believers under the Gospel. But then the Church of the Old Testament, being without the clear knowledge of Christ and his salvation, still wanted the true foundation for so much of a spiritual, inward, and hidden nature ; and it must have been next to impossible to prevent false confidences from mingling with her expectations of the future, since she had only the shadowy and carnal in worship with which to connect the real and eternal in blessing.

Is this not what actually happened in the case of the later Jews ? In the course of that preparatory training through which they were conducted, an increasing degree of light was at length imparted, among other things, in respect to a future state of reward and punishment ; the later Scriptures contained not a few quite explicit intimations on the subject (as in Hos. xiii. 14, Dan. xii. 2, Isaiah xxvi. 19) ; and by the time of Christ's appearing, the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead to a world of endless happiness or misery, formed nearly as distinct and prominent an article in the Jewish faith as it does now in the Christian. (Acts xxiii. 6 ; xxvi. 6-8 ; Matt. v. 29 ; x. 28, &c.) Now, this had been well, and should have only disposed the Jews to give to Jesus a more enlightened and hearty reception had they been careful to couple with the clearer view thus obtained, and the more direct introduction of a future world, the intimations that accompanied it of a higher and better dispensation—of the old things, under which they lived, being to be done away, that others of a nobler description might take their place. But this was what the later Jews, as a class, failed to do. Partial in their knowledge of Scripture, and confounding together the things that differed, they took the prospect of immortality as if it had been directly unfolded, and ostensibly provided for in the shadowy dispensation itself.

The result necessarily was, that that dispensation ceased in their view to *be* shadowy ; it contained in itself, they imagined, the full apparatus required for sinful men, to redeem them from the curse of sin, and bring them to eternal life ; and whatever purposes the Messiah might come to accomplish, that he should supplant its carnal observances by something of a higher nature, and more immediately bearing on the immortal interests of man, formed no part of their expectations concerning him. Thus, by coming to regard the doctrine of a future state of happiness and glory as, in its naked or direct form, an integral part of the revelations of the old covenant, they naturally fell into two most serious mistakes. They first overlooked the shadowy nature of their religion, and exalted it to an undue rank by looking to it for blessings which it was never intended, unless typically, to impart—and then, when the Messiah came, they entirely misapprehended the great object of his mission, and lost all inheritance in his kingdom.

So much, then, for the palpable difference in this respect between the Old and the New. There was a necessity in the case, arising from the very nature of the divine plan. So long as the church was under symbolical ordinances and typical relations, the future world must fall into the background ; the things concerning it could only appear imaged in the seen and present. But that they did appear so imaged—in this, with all the outward diversity that prevailed, there still lay an essential agreement between the Old dispensation and the New. The minds of believers under the former neither were nor could be an entire blank in regard to a future state of being. From the very first—as we shall see afterwards, when we come to trace out the elements of the primeval religion—there was in God's dealings and revelations toward them, what in a manner compelled them to look beyond a present world ; it was so manifestly impossible to realise here, with any degree of completeness, the objects he seemed to have in view. And the under-current of thought and expectation thus silently awakened toward the future, was continually fed by everything being arranged and ordered in the present, so as to establish in their minds a profound conviction of a divine retribution. The things connected with their relation to a worldly sanctuary, and an earthly inheritance of blessing, were one continued illustration of the principle so firmly expressed by Abraham, “ that the Judge

of all the earth must do right;" and, consequently, that in the final issues of things, "it must be well with the righteous, and ill with the wicked." The bringing distinctly out of this present recompense in the divine administration, and with infinite variety of light and vividness of colouring, impressing it on the consciences of God's people, was the peculiar service rendered by the ancient economy in respect to a coming eternity; and the peculiar service which, *as a preparatory economy, it required to render.* For the belief of a *present* retribution must, to a large extent, form the basis of a well-grounded belief in a *future* one. And for the believing Israelite himself, who lived under the operation of such strong temporal sanctions, and who was habituated to contemplate the unseen in the seen, the future in the past, there was everything in the visible movements of Providence around him, both to confirm in him the expectation of a coming state of reward and punishment, and to form him to the dispositions and conduct which might best prepare him for meeting it. His position so far differed from that of believers now, that he was not formally called to direct his views to the coming world, and he had comparatively slender means of information concerning its realities. But it agreed in this, that he too was a child of faith, believing in the retributive character of God's administration; and in him, as well as in us, only in a more outward and sensible manner, this faith had its trials and dangers, its discouragements, its warrings with the flesh and the world, its times of weakness and of strength, its blessed satisfactions and triumphant victories. In short, his light, so far as it went, was the same with ours; it was the same also in the nature of its influence on his heart and conduct; and if he but faithfully did his part amid the scenes and objects around him, he was equally prepared at its close to take his place in the mansions of a better inheritance,—though he might have to go to them as one not knowing whither he went.¹

Thus it appears, on careful examination, that all was in its proper place. A mutual adaptation and internal harmony binds together the Old and the New dispensations, even under the striking diversity that characterizes the two in respect to a future world. And the further the investigation is pursued, the more will such

¹ See Appendix C.

be found to be the case generally. It will be found that the connection of the Old with the New is something more than typical, in the sense of foreshadowing, or prefigurative of what was to come ; it is also inward and organic. Amid the ostensible differences, there is a pervading unity and agreement—one faith, one life, one hope, one destiny. And while the Old Testament church, in its outward condition and earthly relations, typically shadowed forth the spiritual and heavenly things of the New, it was also, in so far as it realized and felt the truth of God presented to it, the living root out of which the New ultimately sprang. The real beginnings were there, of all that exists in comparative perfection now.

III. Another advantage resulting from a correct knowledge and appreciation of the Typology of ancient Scripture, is *the increased value and importance with which it invests the earlier portions of Revelation*. This has respect more especially to the historical parts of Old Testament Scripture ; yet not to these exclusively. For, the whole of the Old Testament will be found to rise in our esteem, in proportion as we understand and enter into its typological bearing. But the point may be more easily and distinctly illustrated by a reference to its records of history.

Many ends, undoubtedly, had to be served by these ; and we must beware of making so much account of one, as if it were the whole. Even the least interesting and instructive parts of the historical records, the genealogies, are not without their use ; for they supply some valuable materials both for the general knowledge of antiquity, and for our acquaintance, in particular, with that chosen line of Adam's posterity, which was to have its culmination in Christ. But the narratives in which these genealogies are imbedded, which record the lives of so many individuals, portray the manners and customs of such different ages and nations, and relate the dealings of God's providence, and the communications of his mind with so many of the earliest characters and tribes in the world's history—these, in themselves, and apart altogether from any prospective reference they may have to gospel-times, are on many accounts interesting and instructive. Nor

can they be attentively perused, as simple records of the past, without being found "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness."

Yet when viewed only in that light, one-half their worth is still not understood; nor shall we be able altogether to avoid some feeling of strangeness occasionally at the kind of notices embraced in the inspired narrative. For, whatever interest and instruction may be connected with it, how trifling often are the incidents it records! how limited the range to which it chiefly draws our attention! and how easy might it seem, at various points, to have selected other histories, which would have led the mind through scenes more obviously important in themselves, and less closely, perhaps, interwoven with evil! Infidels have often given to such thoughts as these an obnoxious form, and have endeavoured by means of them to bring sacred Scripture into discredit. But in doing so, they have only displayed their own partiality and ignorance; they have looked at this portion of the word of God in a contracted light, and away from its proper connection with the entire plan of revelation. Let the notices of Old Testament history be viewed in their subservience to the scheme of grace unfolded in the Gospel—let the field which it traverses, however limited in extent, and the transactions it describes, however unimportant in a political respect, be regarded as that field, and those transactions, through which, as on a lower and common stage, the Lord sought to familiarize the minds of his people with the truths and principles, which were ultimately to appear in the highest affairs of his kingdom—let the notices of Old Testament history be viewed in this light, which is the one Scripture itself would have us to take, and then what dignity and importance is seen to attach to every one of them! The smallest movements on the earth's surface acquire a sort of greatness, when connected with the law of gravitation; since then even the fall of an apple from the tree stands related to the revolution of the planets in their courses. And, in like manner, the relation which the historical facts of ancient Scripture bear to the glorious work and kingdom of Christ, gives to the least of them such a character of importance, that they are brought within the circle of God's highest purposes, and are perceived to be in reality "the con-

necting links of that golden chain which unites heaven and earth."

This, however, is not all. While a proper understanding of the Typology of Scripture imparts an air of grandeur and importance to its smallest incidents, and makes the little relatively great, it does more. It warrants us to proceed a step farther, and to assert, that such personal narratives and comparatively little incidents as fill up a large portion of the history, not only *might*, without impropriety, have been admitted into the sacred record, but that they *must* to some extent have been found there, in order to adapt it properly to the end which it was intended to serve. It was precisely the limited and homely character of many of the things related, which rendered them such natural and easy stepping-stones to the discoveries of a higher dispensation. It is one thing, that an arrangement exists in nature, which comprehends under the same law the falling of an apple to the ground, and the vast movements of the heavenly bodies; but it is another thing, and also true, that the perception of that law, as manifested in the motion of the small and terrestrial body—because manifested there on a scale which man could bring fully within the grasp of his comprehension—was what enabled him to mount upwards and scan the similar, though incomparably grander phenomena of the distant universe. In this case, there was not only a connection in nature between the little and the great, but also such a connection in the order of man's acquaintance with both, that it was the knowledge of the one that conducted him to the knowledge of the other. The connection is much the same that exists between the facts of Old Testament history, and the all-important revelations of the Gospel—with this difference, indeed, that the laws and principles developed amid the familiar objects and comparatively humble scenes of the one, were not so properly designed to fit man for discovering, as for receiving when discovered, the sublime mysteries of the other. But to do this, it was not less necessary here, than in the case above referred to, that the earlier developements should have been made in connection with things of a diminutive nature, such as the occurrences of individual history, or the transactions of a limited kingdom. A series of events considerably more grand and majestic could

not have accomplished the object in view. They would have been too far removed from the common course of things ; and would have been more fitted to gratify the curiosity and dazzle the imagination of those who witnessed or read of them, than to indoctrinate their minds with the fundamental truths and principles of God's spiritual economy. This result could be best produced by such a series of transactions as we find actually recorded in the Scriptures of the Old Testament—transactions infinitely varied, yet always capable of being quite easily grasped and understood. And thus, what to a superficial consideration appears strange or even objectionable in the structure of the inspired record, becomes, on a more comprehensive view, an evidence of wise adaptation to the wants of our nature, and of supernatural foresight in adjusting one portion of the divine plan to another.

It will be readily understood, that what we have said of the purpose of God with reference more immediately to those who lived in Old Testament times, applies, without any material difference, to such as are placed under the Christian dispensation. For what the transactions required to be for the accomplishment of God's purpose in regard to the one, the record of these transactions required to be for the accomplishment of his purpose in regard to the other. Whatever confirmation such things may lend to our faith in the mysteries of God—whatever force or clearness to our perceptions of the truth—whatever encouragement to our hopes or direction to our walk in the life of holiness and virtue, it may all be said to depend upon the history being composed of facts, so homely in their character and so circumscribed in their range, that the mind can without difficulty both realize their existence and enter into their spirit.

IV. Another service, the last we shall mention, which a truly scriptural typology is fitted to render to the cause of divine knowledge and practice, is the *aid it furnishes to help out spiritual ideas, in our minds, and enable us to realize them with sufficient clearness and certainty*. This follows very closely on the last-named benefit, and may be regarded rather as a further application of the truth contained in it, than the advancement of something

altogether new. But we wish to draw attention to an important advantage, not yet distinctly noticed, connected with the typical element in Old Testament Scripture, and on which to a considerable extent the people of God are still dependent for the strength and liveliness of their faith.

It is true, they have now the privilege of a full revelation of the mind of God respecting the truths of salvation ; and this elevates their condition as to spiritual things far above that of the Old Testament believers. But it does not thence follow, that they can in all respects so distinctly apprehend the truth in its naked spirituality, as to be totally independent of some outward exhibition of it. We are still in a state of imperfection, and are so much creatures of sense, that our ideas of abstract truth, even in natural science, often require to be aided by visible forms and representations. But things strictly spiritual and divine are yet more difficult to be brought distinctly within the reach and comprehension of the mind.—It was a relative advantage possessed by the Old Testament worshipper, in connection with his worldly sanctuary, and the more fleshly dispensation under which he lived, that spiritual and divine things, so far as they were revealed to him, acquired a sort of local habitation to his view, and assumed the appearance of a life-like freshness and reality. Hence chiefly arose that “impression of passionate individual attachment,” as it has been called, which, in the authors of the Old Testament Scriptures, appears mingling with and vivifying their faith in the Invisible, and which breathes in them like a breath of supernatural life. What Hengstenberg has said in this respect of the Book of Psalms, may be extended to Old Testament Scripture generally: “It has contributed vast materials for developing the consciousness of mankind, and the Christian church is more dependent on it for its apprehensions of God than might at first sight be supposed. It presents God so clearly and vividly before men’s eyes, that they see him, in a manner, with their bodily sight, and thus find the sting taken out of their pains. In this, too, lies one great element of its importance for the present times. What men now most of all need, is to have the blanched image of God again freshened up in them. And the more closely we connect ourselves with these sacred writings, the

more will God cease to be to us a shadowy form, which can neither hear, nor help, nor judge us, and to which we can present no supplication."¹

Besides, there are portions of revealed truth which relate to events still future, and do not at all come within the range of our present observation and experience, though very important as objects of faith and hope to the church. It might materially facilitate our conception of these, and strengthen our belief in the certainty of their coming existence, if we could look back to some corresponding exemplar of things, either in the symbolical handwriting of ordinances, or in the typical transactions of an earthly and temporal kingdom. But this also has been prepared to our hand by God in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. And to shew how much may be derived from a right acquaintance, both in this and in the other respect mentioned, with the typical matter of these Scriptures, we shall give here a twofold illustration of the subject—the one referring to truths affecting the present state and condition of believers, and the other to such as respect the still distant future.

1. For our first illustration we shall select a topic, that will enable us, at the same time, to explain a commonly misunderstood passage of Scripture. The passage is 1 Pet. i. 2, where, speaking of the elevated condition of believers, the apostle describes them as "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The peculiar part of the description is the last—"sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ"—which, being represented along with obedience as the end, to which believers are both elected of the Father and sanctified of the Spirit, seems at first sight to be out of its proper place. The application of the blood of Christ is usually thought of in reference to the pardon of sin, or its efficacy in the matter of the soul's justification before God; when, of course, its place stands between the election of the Father and the sanctification of the Spirit. Nor, in that most common reference to the effect of Christ's blood, is it of small advantage for the attainment of a clear and realizing faith, that we have in many of the Levitical services, and especially

¹ Supplem. Treatises on Psalms, § vii.

in those of the great day of yearly atonement, an outward form and pattern of things by which more distinctly to picture out the sublime spiritual reality.

It is plain, however, that the sprinkling of Christ's blood, mentioned by St Peter, is not that which has for its effect the sinner's pardon and acceptance (although Leighton and most commentators have so understood it); for it is not only coupled with a personal obedience, as being somewhat of the same nature, but the two together are set forth as the result of the electing and sanctifying grace of God upon the soul. The good here intended must be something inward and personal; something not wrought for us, but wrought upon us and in us; implying our justification, as a gift already received, but itself belonging to a higher and more advanced stage of our experience—to the very top and climax of our sanctification. What, then, is it? Nothing new, certainly, or of rare occurrence in the word of God, but often described in the most explicit terms; while yet the idea involved in it is so spiritual and elevated, that we greatly need the aid of the Old Testament types to give strength and vividness to our conceptions of it. "The blood of the yearly sacrifice," says Steiger on the passage, "was divided (as previously at the altar in the wilderness, Ex. xxiv. 6-8) into two parts, of which the first served for sprinkling the tabernacle before and behind the veil, and especially the mercy-seat; the other for afterwards sprinkling the people (Lev. xvi. 14-19). Now, if we represent to ourselves the whole work of redemption, in allusion to this rite, it will be as follows:—The expiation of one and of all sin, the propitiation, was accomplished when Christ offered his blood to God on the altar of the accursed tree. That done, he went with his blood into the most Holy Place. Whosoever looks in faith to His blood, has part in the atonement (Rom. iii. 25); that is, he is justified on account of it, receiving the full pardon of all his sins (Rom. v. 9). Thenceforth he can appear with the whole community of believers (1 John i. 7), full of boldness and confidence before the throne of grace (Heb. iv. 16), in order that he may be purified by Christ, as high-priest, from every evil lust." It is this personal purifying from every evil lust, which the apostle describes in ritual language as "the sprinkling of the blood of

Jesus Christ," and which is also described in the epistle to the Hebrews, with a similar reference to the blood of Christ, by having "the heart sprinkled from an evil conscience," and again, "by having the conscience purged from dead works to serve the living God." The sprinkling or purging spoken of in these several passages, is manifestly the cleansing of the soul from all internal defilement, so as to dispose and fit it for whatever is pure and good, and the purifying effect is produced by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, or its spiritual application to the conscience of believers, because the blessed result is attained through the holy and divine life, represented by that blood becoming truly and personally theirs.

Now, this great truth is certainly taught with the utmost plainness in many passages of Scripture. As, when it is written of believers, that "their hearts are purified by faith;" that they "purify themselves even as Christ is pure." Or, when it is said, that "Christ lives in them," that "their life is hid with him in God," that "they are in him that is true, and cannot sin because their seed (the seed of that new, spiritual nature, to which they have been quickened by fellowship with the life of Jesus) remains in them;" and, in short, in every passage which connects with the pure and spotless life-blood of Jesus an impartation of life-giving grace and holiness to his people. I can understand the truth, even when thus spiritually, and, if I may so say, nakedly expressed. But I feel that I can obtain a more clear and comforting impression of it, when I keep my eye upon the simple and striking exhibition given of it in the visible type. For, with what effect was the blood of atonement sprinkled upon the true worshippers of the old covenant? With the effect of making whatever sacredness, whatever virtue (symbolically) was in that blood, pass over upon them; the life, which in it had flowed out in holy offering to God, was given to be theirs, and to be by them laid out in all pure and faithful ministrations of righteousness. Such precisely is the effect of Christ's blood sprinkled on the soul; it is to have his life made our life, or to become one with him in the stainless purity and perfection which expressed itself in his sacrifice of sweet-smelling savour to the Father. What a sublime and elevating thought! It is much, assuredly, for me to know,

that, by faith in his blood, the crimson guilt of my sins is blotted out, heaven itself reconciled, and the way into the holiest of all laid freely open for my approach. But it is much more still to know, that by faith in the same blood, realized and experienced through the power of the Holy Spirit, I am made a partaker of its sanctifying virtue ; the very holiness of the Holy One of Israel passes into me ; his life-blood becomes in my soul the well-spring of a new and deathless existence. So that to be sealed up to this fountain of life, is to be raised above the defilement of nature, to dwell in the light of God, and sit as in heavenly places with Christ Jesus. And, amid the imperfections of our personal experience, and the clouds ever and anon raised in the soul by remaining sin, it should unquestionably be to us a matter of unfeigned thankfulness, that we can repair to such a lively image of the truth as is presented in the Old Testament service, in which, as in a mirror, we can see how high in this respect is the hope of our calling, and how much it is God's purpose we should enter into the blessing.

2. There are revelations in the Gospel, however, which point to events still future in the Messiah's kingdom ; and in respect to these, also, the typical arrangements of former times are capable of rendering important service. A service, too, which is the more needed, as the things indicated, in regard to these future developments of the kingdom, are not only remote from present observation, but also in many respects different from what the ordinary course of events might lead us to expect. We do not refer to the last issues of the Gospel dispensation, when the concerns of time shall have become finally merged in the unalterable results of eternity ; but to events, of which this earth itself is still to be the theatre, in the closing periods of Messiah's reign. This prospective ground is in many points overlaid with controversy, and much concerning it must be regarded as matter of doubtful disputation. Yet, there are certain great landmarks, which intelligent and sober-minded Christians can scarcely fail to consider as fixed. It is not, for example, a more certain mark of the Messiah, who was to come, that he should be a despised and rejected man, should pass through the deepest humiliation, and, after a mighty struggle with evil, attain to the seat of empire, than it is of the Messiah,

who has thus personally fought and conquered, that he shall totally subdue all the adversaries of his church and kingdom, make his church co-extensive with the boundaries of the habitable globe, and exalt her members to the highest position of honour and blessing. For my own part, I should as soon doubt that the first series of events were the just object of expectation before, as the other have become since, the personal appearing of Christ ; and for breadth and prominence of place in the prophetic portions, especially of New Testament Scripture, this has all that could be desired in its behalf. But how far still is the object from being realized ? How unlikely, even, that it should ever be so, if we had nothing more to found upon than calculations of reason, and the common agencies of providence ?

That the progress of society in knowledge and virtue should gradually lead, at however distant a period, to the extirpation of idolatry, the abolition of the grosser forms of superstition, and a general refinement and civilization of manners, requires no great stretch of faith to believe. Such a result evidently lies within the bounds of natural probability, if only sufficient time were given to accomplish it. But, suppose it already done, how much would still remain to be achieved, ere the glorious King of Zion should have his promised ascendant in the affairs of men, and the spiritual ends for which he especially reigns should be adequately secured ! This happy consummation might still be found at an unapproachable distance, even when the other had passed into a reality ; nor are there wanting signs in the present condition of the world to awaken our fears, lest such may actually be the case. For in those countries, where the light of divine truth and the arts of civilization have become more widely diffused, we see many things prevailing that are utterly at variance with the purity and peace of the Gospel—numberless heresies in doctrine, disorders that seem to admit of no healing, and practical corruptions which set at defiance all authority and rule. In the very presence of the light of heaven, and amid the full play of Christian influences, the god of this world still holds possession of by far the larger portion of mankind ; and innumerable obstacles present themselves on every side against the universal diffusion and the complete ascendancy of the pure principles of the Gospel

of Christ. When such things are taken into account, how hopeless seems the prospect of a triumphant church, and a regenerated world! of a Saviour holding the undivided empire of all lands! of a kingdom, in which there is no longer any thing to offend, and all shall be replenished with life and blessing! The partial triumphs which Christianity is still gaining in single individuals and particular districts, can go but a little way to assure us of so magnificent a result. And it may well seem as if other influences, than such as are now in operation, would require to be put forth before the expected good can be realized.

Something, no doubt, may be done to reassure the mind, by looking back on the past history of Christianity, and contrasting its present condition with the point from which it started. The small mustard-seed has certainly sprung into a lofty tree, stretching its luxuriant branches over many of the best regions of the earth. See Christianity as it appeared in its divine Author, when he wandered about as a despised and helpless individual, attended only by a little band of followers as despised and helpless as himself,—or again, when he was hanging on a malefactor's cross, his very friends ashamed or terrified to avow their connection with him,—or even at another and more advanced stage of its earthly history, when its still small, and now resolute company of adherents, unfurled the banner of salvation, with the fearful odds everywhere against them of hostile kings and rulers, an ignorant and debased populace, a powerful and interested priesthood, and a mighty host of superstitions, which had struck their roots through the entire framework of society, and had become venerable, as well as strong, by their antiquity. See Christianity as it appeared then, and see it now standing erect upon the ruins of the hierarchies and superstitions which once threatened to extinguish it—planted with honour in the regions, where for a time it was scarcely suffered to exist—the recognized religion of the most enlightened nations of the earth, the delight and solace of the good, the study of the wise and learned, at once the source and the bulwark of all that is most pure, generous, free, and happy in modern civilization. Comparing thus the present with the past—looking down from the altitude that has been reached upon the low and unpromising condition out of which Christianity at

first arose, we are not without considerable materials in the history of the Gospel itself, for confirming our faith in the prospects which still wait for their fulfilment. On this ground alone it may scarcely seem more, that Christianity should proceed from the elevation it has already won to the greatly more commanding attitude it is yet destined to attain, than to have risen from such small beginnings, and in the face of obstacles so many and so powerful, to its present influential and honourable position.

But why not revert to a still earlier period in the Church's history? Why withhold from our wavering hearts the benefit which they might derive from the form and pattern of divine things, formerly exhibited in the parallel affairs of a typical and earthly kingdom? It was the divine appointment concerning Christ, that he should sit upon the throne of David, to order and to establish it. In the higher sphere of God's administration, and for the world at large, he was to do what had been done through David in the lower, and on the limited territory of an earthly kingdom. The history of the one, therefore, may justly be regarded as the shadow of the other. But it is still only the earlier part of the history of David's kingdom which has found its counterpart in the events of gospel-times. The Shepherd of Israel has been anointed king over the heritage of the Lord, and the impious efforts of his adversaries to disannul the appointment have entirely miscarried. The formidable train of evils which obstructed his way to the throne of government, and which were directed with the profoundest cunning and malice by him, who on account of sin, had been permitted to become the prince of this world, have been all met and overcome—with no other effect than to render manifest the Son's indefeasible right to hold the sceptre of universal empire over the affairs of men. Now, therefore, He reigns in the midst of his enemies; but He must also reign till these enemies themselves are put down—till the inheritance has been redeemed from all evil, and universal peace, order, and blessing, have been established.

Is not this also what the subsequent history of the earthly kingdom fully warrants us to expect? It was long after David's appointment to the throne, before his divine right to reign was

generally acknowledged ; and still longer before the overthrow of the last combination of adversaries and the termination of the last train of evils, admitted of the kingdom entering on its ultimate stage of settled peace and glory. The affairs of David himself never wore a more discouraging and desperate aspect, than immediately before his great adversary received the mortal blow which laid him in the dust. After this, years had to elapse before the adverse parties in Israel were even externally subdued, and brought to render a formal acknowledgment to the Lord's anointed. When this point again had been reached, what internal evils festered in the kingdom, and what smouldering fires of enmity still burned ! Notwithstanding the vigorous efforts made to subdue these, we see them at last bursting forth in the dreadful and unnatural outbreak of Absalom's rebellion, which threatened for a time to involve all in hopeless ruin and confusion. And with these internal evils and insurrections, how many hostile encounters had to be met from without ! some of which were so terrible, that the very earth was felt, in a manner, to shake under the stroke (Ps. lx.). Yet all at length yielded ; and partly by the prowess of faith, partly by the remarkable turns given to events in providence, the kingdom did reach a position of unexampled prosperity, peace and blessing. But in all this we have the developement of a typical dispensation, bringing the assurance, that the same position shall in due time be reached in the higher sphere and nobler concerns of Messiah's kingdom. The same determinate counsel and foreknowledge, the same living energy, the same overruling providence, is equally competent now, as it is alike pledged, to secure a corresponding result. And if the people of God have but discernment to read aright the history of the past, and faith and patience to fulfil their appointed task, they will find that they have no need to despair of a successful issue, but every reason to hope that judgment shall at length be brought forth into victory.

This one illustration may meanwhile be sufficient to show, (others will afterwards present themselves), how valuable an handmaid to the unfulfilled prophecies of Scripture may be found in a correct acquaintance with its Typology. Its province does not, indeed, consist in definitely marking out beforehand the particular

agents and transactions that are to fill up the page of the eventful future. It fulfils the whole that in this respect it is fitted to accomplish, when it enables us to obtain some insight—not into the *what*, or the *when*, or the *instruments by which*—but rather into the *how* and the *wherefore* of the future:—when it instructs us respecting the nature of the principles that must prevail, and the general lines of dealing that shall be adopted, in conducting the affairs of Messiah's kingdom to its destined results. The future here is mirrored in the past; and the thing that hath been, is, in all its essential features, the same that shall be.

BOOK SECOND.

THE DISPENSATION OF PRIMEVAL AND PATRIARCHAL TIMES.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

HITHERTO we have been occupied chiefly with an investigation of principles. It was necessary, in the first instance, to have these ascertained and settled, before we could apply, with any prospect of success, to the particular consideration of the typical materials of Old Testament Scripture. And in now entering on this, the more practical, as it is also the more varied and extensive, branch of our subject, it is proper to indicate at the outset the general features of the arrangement we propose to adopt, and notice certain landmarks of a more prominent kind that ought to guide the course of our inquiries.

1. As all that was really typical formed part of an existing dispensation, and stood related to a religious worship, our primary divisions must connect themselves with the divine dispensations. These dispensations were undoubtedly based on the same fundamental truths and principles. But they were also marked by certain characteristic differences, adapting them to the precise circumstances of the church and the world, at the time of their introduction. It is from these, therefore, we must take our starting-points; and in these also should find the natural order and succession of the topics which must pass under our consideration. In doing so we shall naturally look, first, to the fundamental facts on which the dispensation is based; then to the religious symbols in which its lessons and hopes were embodied; and finally, to the future and subsidiary transactions which afterwards carried forward and matured the instruction.

2. In the whole compass of sacred history we find only three grand eras, that can properly be regarded as the formative epochs

of distinct religious dispensations. They are those of the fall, of the redemption from Egypt, and of the appearance and work of Christ, as they are usually designated; though they might be more fitly described, the first as the entrance of faith and hope for fallen man, the second as the giving of the law, and the third as the revelation of the Gospel. For, it was not properly the fall, but the new state and constitution of things brought in after it, that, in a religious point of view, forms the first commencement of the world's history. Neither is it the redemption from Egypt, considered by itself, but this in connection with the giving of the law, which was its immediate aim and object, that forms the great characteristic of the second stage, as the coming of grace and truth by Jesus Christ does of the third. Between the first and second of these eras two very important events intervened—the deluge and the call of Abraham—both alike forming prominent breaks in the history of the period. Hence, not unfrequently, the antediluvian is distinguished from the patriarchal church, and the church, as it existed before, from the church as it stood after, the call of Abraham. But important as these events were, in the order of God's providential arrangements, they mark no material alteration in the constitutional basis, or even formal aspect of the religion then established. As regards the institutions of worship, properly so called, Abraham and his descendants appear to have been much on a footing with those who lived before the flood; and therefore, not primary and fundamental, but only subsidiary elements of instruction could be evolved by means of the events referred to. The same may also be said of another great event, which formed a similar break during the currency of the second period—the Babylonish exile and return. This occupies a very prominent place in Scripture, whether we look to the historical record of the event, or to the announcements made beforehand concerning it in prophecy. Yet it introduced no essential change into the spiritual relations of the church, nor altered in any respect the institutions of her symbolical worship. The restored temple was built at once on the site, and after the pattern of that which had been laid in ruins by the Chaldeans; and nothing more was aimed at by the immediate agents in the work of restoration, than the re-establishment of the rites and services enjoined by Moses. Omitting, therefore,

the gospel dispensation, as the antitypical, there only remain for the commencement of the earlier dispensations, in which the typical is to be sought, the two epochs already mentioned—those of Adam and Moses.

3. It is not simply the fact, however, of these successive dispensations which is of importance for our present inquiry. Still more depends for a well-grounded and satisfactory exhibition of divine truth as connected with them, upon a correct view of their mutual and interdependent relation to each other; the relation not merely of the Mosaic to the Christian, but also of the Patriarchal to the Mosaic. For as the revelation of law laid the foundation of a religious state, which, under the moulding influence of providential arrangements and prophetic gifts, developed and grew till it had assumed many of the characteristic features of the Gospel; so the original constitution of grace settled with Adam after the fall, comparatively vague and indistinct at first, gradually became more definite and exact, and, in the form of heaven-derived or time-honoured institutions, exhibited the germ of much that was afterwards established as law. In the primeval period nothing wears a properly legal aspect; and it has been one of the capital mistakes of theological writers, especially in this country—a source of endless controversy and arbitrary explanations—to seek there for law in the *direct and obtrusive*, when, as yet, the order of the divine plan admitted of its existing only in the *latent* form. We read of promise and threatening, of acts and dealings of God, pregnant with spiritual light and moral obligation, meeting from the very first the wants and circumstances of fallen man; but of express and positive enactments there is no trace. Some of the grounds and reasons of this will be adverted to in the immediately following chapters. At present, we simply notice the fact, as one of the points necessary to be kept in view for giving a right direction to the course of inquiry before us. Yet, on the other hand, while in the commencing period of the Church's history, we find nothing that bears the rigid and authoritative form of law, we find on every hand the foundations of law; and these gradually enlarging and widening, and sometimes even assuming a distinctly legal aspect, before the patriarchal dispensation closed. So that when the properly legal period came, the materials, to a considerable extent, were already in existence,

and only needed to be woven and consolidated into a compact system of truth and duty. It is enough to instance, in proof of what has been stated, the case of the Sabbath—not formally imposed, though divinely instituted from the first—the rite of peculiar sacrifice, very similar (as we shall shew) as to its original institution—the division of animals into clean and unclean—the consecration of the tenth to God—the sacredness of blood—the Levirate usage—the ordinance of circumcision. The whole of these had their foundations laid, partly in the procedure of God, partly in the consciences of men, before the law entered; and in regard to some of them the law's prescriptions might be said to be anticipated, while still the patriarchal age was in progress. As the period of law approached, there was also a visible approach to its distinctive characteristics. And, without regard had to the formal difference, yet gradual approximation of the two periods, we can as little hope to present a solid and satisfactory view of the progressive development of the divine plan, as if we should overlook either their fundamental agreement with each other, or their common relation to the full manifestation of grace and truth in the kingdom of Christ. We must hold it fast, that the Law—the intermediate point between the fall and redemption—had its preparation as well as the Gospel.

4. In regard to the mode of investigation to be pursued respecting particular types, as the first place is due to those which belonged to the institutions of religion, so our first care must be, according to the principles already established, to ascertain the views and impressions which, as parts of an existing religion, they were fitted to awaken in the ancient worshipper. It may, of course, be impossible to say, in any particular case, that such views and impressions were actually derived from them, with as much precision and definiteness as may appear in our description; for we cannot be sure that the requisite amount of thought and consideration was actually addressed to the subject. But due care should be taken in this respect, not to make the typical symbols and transactions indicative of more than what *may*, with ordinary degrees of light and grace, have been learned from them by men of faith in Old Testament Scripture. It is not, however, to be forgotten that, in their peculiar circumstances, much greater insight was attainable through such a medium, than it is quite easy for

us now to realize. At first, believers were largely dependent upon it for their knowledge of divine truth; it was their chief talent, and would hence be cultivated with especial care. Even afterwards, when the sources of information were somewhat increased, the disposition and capacity to learn by means of symbolical acts and institutions, would be materially aided by that mode of contemplation which has been wont to distinguish the inhabitants of the East. This proceeds (to use the language of Bähr) "on the ground of an inseparable connection subsisting between the spiritual and the bodily, the ideal and the real, the seen and the unseen. According to it, the whole actual world is nothing but the manifestation of the ideal one; the entire creation is not only a production, but, at the same time, also an evidence and a revelation of Godhead. Nothing real is merely dead matter, but is the form and body of something ideal; so that the whole world, even to its very stones, appears instinct with life, and on that account especially becomes a revelation of Deity, whose distinguishing characteristic it is to have life in himself. Such a mode of viewing things in nature may be called emphatically the religious one; for it contemplates the world as a great sanctuary, the individual parts of which are so many marks, words, and letters of a grand revelation-book of Godhead, in which God speaks and imparts information respecting himself. If, therefore, that which is seen and felt was generally regarded by men as the immediate impression of that which is unseen, a speech and revelation of the invisible Godhead to them, it necessarily follows, that if they were to have unfolded to them a conception of His nature, and to have a representation given them of what His worship properly consists in, the same language would require to be used which God spake with them; the same means of representation would need to be employed which God himself had sanctioned—the sensible, the visible, the external."¹

The conclusion drawn here goes somewhat farther than the premises fairly warrant. If the learned author had merely said that there was a propriety or fitness in employing the same means of outward representation, as they fell in with the prevailing cast of thought in those among whom they were instituted, and were

¹ Bähr's *Symbolik*, B. I. p. 24.

thus wisely adapted to the end in view, we would have entirely concurred in the statement. But that such persons absolutely required to be addressed by means of a symbolical language in matters of religion could scarcely be admitted, without conceding that they were incapable of handling another and more spiritual one, and that consequently a religion of symbols must have held perpetual ascendancy in the East. Besides, it may well be questioned, whether this "peculiarly religious mode of viewing things," as it is called, was not, to a considerable extent, the result of a symbolical religion already established, rather than the originating cause of such a religion. At all events, the *real* necessity for the preponderating carnality and outwardness of the earlier dispensations was of a different kind. It arose from the very nature of the institutions belonging to them, as temporary substitutes for the better and the more spiritual things of the Gospel; rendering it necessary that symbols should then hold the place of the coming reality. It is the capital error of Bähr's system to give to the symbolical in religion a place that does not properly belong to it; and so to assimilate too nearly the Old and the New—to represent the symbolical religion of the Old Testament as less imperfect than it really was, and inversely to convert the greatest reality of the New Testament—the atoning death of Christ—into a merely symbolical representation of the placability of heaven to the penitent.

But with this partial exception to the sentiments expressed in the quotation above given, there can be no doubt that the mode of contemplation and insight there described has remarkably distinguished the inhabitants of the East, and that it must have peculiarly fitted them for the intelligent use of a symbolical worship. They could give life and significance, in a manner *we* can but imperfectly understand, to the outward and corporeal emblems through which their converse with God was chiefly carried on. To reason from our own case to theirs would be to judge by a very false criterion. Accustomed from our earliest years to oral and written discourse, as the medium through which we receive our knowledge of divine truth, and express the feelings it awakens in our bosom, we have some difficulty in conceiving how any definite ideas could be conveyed on the one side or the other, where that was so sparingly employed as the means of communication.

But the "grey fathers of the world" were placed in other circumstances, having from their childhood been trained to the use of symbolical institutions as the most expressive and appropriate channels of divine communion. So that the native tendency first, and then the habitual use strengthening and improving the tendency, must have rendered them adepts, as compared with Christian communities now, in perceiving the significance, and employing the instrumentality of religious symbols.

5. When the symbolical institutions and services of former times shall have been explained in the manner now indicated, the next step will be to consider in detail the import and bearing of the typical transactions which took place during the continuance of each dispensation. In doing this, care will require, in the first instance, to be taken, that the proper place be assigned them as intended only to exhibit ideas subsidiary to those embodied in the religion itself. And as in reading the typical symbols, so in reading the typical transactions connected with them, we must make the views and impressions they were fitted to convey to those whom they immediately respected concerning the character and purposes of God, the ground and measure of that higher bearing which they carried to the coming events of the Gospel. Nor are we here again to overlook that religious tendency and habit of mind which has been noticed as a general characteristic of the inhabitants of the East; for they would certainly be disposed to do with the acts of providence as with the works of creation—would contemplate them as manifestations of Godhead, or revelations in the world of sense of what was thought and felt in the higher world of spirit. Besides, it is to be borne in mind, that the historical transactions referred to were all *special* acts of providence. While they formed part of the current events of history, they were, at the same time, so singularly planned and adjusted, that the persons immediately concerned in them could scarcely overlook either their direct appointment by God, or their intimate connection with his plans and purposes of grace. It is the hand of God himself that ever appears to be directing the transactions of Old Testament history. And the acts in which He more peculiarly discovers himself, being the operations of One, whose grand object, from the period of the fall, was the foiling of the tempter, and the raising up of a seed of blessing, they could

scarcely fail to be regarded by intelligent and pious minds as standing in a certain relation to this centre-point of the divine economy. In proportion as the people of God had faith to "wait for the consolation of Israel," they would also have discernment to read, with a view to the better things to come, the disclosures of His mind and will, which were interwoven with the history of His operations.

It is in this way we are chiefly to account for God's frequent appearance on the stage of patriarchal history, and His more direct personal agency in the affairs of the ancient church. The things that happened to it could not otherwise have accomplished the great ends of their appointment. For, through these God was continually making revelation of himself to the church, and imparting what it was needful for her to know of Him as the God of salvation. It was, therefore, of essential moment to the object in view, that His people should be able, without hesitation, to regard them as indications of His mind; that they should not merely consider them as His, in the general sense in which it may be said, that "God is in history;" but His also in the more definite and peculiar sense of conveying specific and progressive discoveries of the divine administration. How could they have been recognised as such, unless the finger of God had, in some form, laid its distinctive impress upon them? Taking into account, therefore, all the peculiarities belonging to the typical facts of Old Testament history—the close relation in which they commonly stood to the rites and institutions of a religion of hope—the evident manner in which many of them bore upon them the interposition of God—and the place occupied by others in the announcements of prophecy—they had quite enough to distinguish them from the more general events of Providence, and were perfectly capable of ministering to the faith and the just expectations of the people of God.

6. We simply note farther, that when passing under review acts and institutions of God, which stretch through successive ages and dispensations, there will necessarily recur, under somewhat different forms, substantially the same exhibitions of divine truth. It was unavoidable, but that all the more fundamental ideas of religion, and the greater obligations connected with it, should be the subject of many an ordinance in worship, and many a transaction in Providence. The briefest mode of treatment, as

it would naturally involve fewest repetitions, would be to classify, first the primary heads of doctrine and duty, and then arrange under them the successive exhibitions given of each in the future enactments and dealings of God, without adhering rigidly to the period of their appearance. This plan was partially followed in our first edition, but was found impracticable as a whole. We deem it necessary to keep by the historical order, though it may be occasionally attended with the disadvantage of having the same truths brought anew before us. For, thus alone can we mark aright the course of developement, which, in a work of this nature, is too important an element to be sacrificed to the fear of at times trenching on ground, that may have been partially trodden before.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE DIVINE TRUTHS EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE FALL, BEING THOSE ON WHICH THE FIRST SYMBOLICAL RELIGION WAS BASED.

THE religion of man, as it falls under our consideration at present, must be viewed as taking its commencement at the fall. What knowledge Adam possessed of the character and ways of God, before he fell; or with what forms of worship he gave expression to the thoughts and feelings which were called forth by his relation to God, and the circumstances of his condition, it is not possible for us now exactly to determine. Nor does it much concern us to know. Our interest in his religious views and prospects properly begins with the new aspect and constitution of things which arose with the entrance of sin. Then, too, for the first time, did an occasion arise for the introduction of typical acts and institutions, which otherwise should have had no proper foundation to rest on. From their very nature and object, they bear respect to another and better state of things preparing to be introduced; and hence necessarily imply, that man's existing condition already partook of evils and dangers which required to be met by the provisions of divine grace and benevolence, as necessary to prepare the way for a state of ultimate rest and satisfaction.

The opinion certainly began to be broached at an early period in the Christian church, and has often been formally propounded since, "That Paradise was to Adam a type of heaven; and that the never-ending life of happiness promised to our first parents, if they had continued obedient, and grown up to perfection under that economy wherein they were placed, should not have continued in the earthly paradise, but only have commenced there, and

been perpetuated in a higher state.”¹ It is possible, indeed, that such might have been the destination of man in the case supposed; but it is a point upon which Scripture is altogether silent, and in its original form too plainly bore the impress of the Eastern philosophy, which associated with matter in every form imperfection and evil. Those who were tinctured with this philosophy could not imagine, that Adam should feel himself to be in a state of proper satisfaction, so long as he was clothed upon with a body formed of the dust of earth, and dependent upon earthly productions for its support; and that he must, from the outset, have had his eye directed toward a higher and more ethereal state of being, of which the enjoyments he actually possessed could present him with nothing more than an image and a foretaste. Whatever elements of truth there might be in such ideas, they belong entirely to the region of speculation, and are so far at variance with the representations of Scripture, as there the original frame and constitution of things appears as the relatively perfect, and what is to be hereafter as the recovery of what has been lost—the restoration of what was at the beginning. It will, no doubt, be more than this; but its being so, is the incidental result of the way in which the good has been achieved, rather than its direct and professed object.

It was from an entirely different tendency—from a disposition to multiply typical meanings without rule or limit—that most writers of the Cocceian school were led to give a typical interpretation to many things in the primeval world—such as the mode of Adam’s creation, the formation of Eve from his side while he slept, his relation to the trees in the midst of the garden. An eminent writer of that school, however, has justly remarked, that “in the state of innocence there were no typical rites adumbrating Christ and his merits, whereof there was then neither know-

¹ This proposition, with the Patristic authorities that support it, may be found in the discourses of Bishop Bull. His proofs from the earlier Fathers—Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenæus, are very general. The first explicit proof is from Theophilus of Antioch, who speaks of Adam being “at length canonized or consecrated, and ascending to heaven,” if he had gone on to perfection. The testimony becomes more full, as the speculative influence of the Greek philosophy gains strength in the Church. And Clement of Alexandria expressly says in his Liturgy, that “if Adam had kept the commandments, he would have received immortality as the reward of his obedience”—that is, immortality in heaven.

ledge nor need ; as the very word *creation* imports, which has nothing to do with a restoration or a restorer. All typical ceremonies were subsequent to the fall, and the promise of grace in Christ."¹ This was said by Alting with immediate reference to the Sabbath, and for the purpose of proving the Sabbath, in respect to its typical foreshadowing of the final rest of the redeemed, to have been instituted after the fall. In which case, the whole series of transactions connected with the formation of Eve, her presentation to Adam, and their joint participation of the forbidden fruit, must have taken place on the very day on which Adam himself was created. This is altogether an improbable opinion ; although it appears to have obtained some prevalence in Alting's age, and the times immediately succeeding. A typical employment of the Sabbath with reference to better things to come, by no means inferred its original and primary establishment for such a purpose. It may only have inferred, that the institution was now invested with a new meaning and importance, and brought within the circle of God's purposes of grace ; precisely as in later times was done with articles of food and circumcision, and other things taken from the field of nature or of history, and associated with the hopes of salvation. Still, the general principle announced by Alting is undoubtedly correct. Nothing belonging to the garden of Eden could possess, in the theological sense, a typical character, till it had ceased to be the abode of man, and his relation to it had undergone an essential change. Till then the physical and moral constitution of this world must be regarded as in itself good, without any evil existing in it to call for the intervention of a Mediator, and consequently without any reference appearing to the work or benefits of redemption. Yet this by no means hinders, that all may have been so planned and arranged by the foreseeing eye of God, as to have readily admitted of various typical applications to the interests of redemption, after the entrance of sin required the things of redemption to be provided for. Nay, as the work of redemption is itself a creation—a new work of God fashioning after a higher ideal the materials of the old—we may reasonably expect that much in the second

¹ Altingi Opera, tom. v. p. 327.

should be made to assume the form and image of what had originally appeared in the first. It is on this ground, indeed, that the argument from analogy is based.

But this is not our present theme. We have to do simply with man as fallen—man as standing in need of redemption. And contemplating from this point of view his religious condition and prospects, we have first of all to take into account what has ever been, and what must necessarily be, a fundamental characteristic of the true religion—the historical nature of its origin. It does not come forth with a kind of independent and theoretical completeness, but grows, by successive stages, out of the actual manifestations God gives of himself, and the circumstances in which his creatures are placed. Its primary elements of truth and duty are but deductions—such as naturally force themselves on reflective minds—from facts already known, and relations actually established in the course of providence. It is by no means necessary, therefore, that they should appear in the shape of formal enunciations or authoritative precepts, to give them a claim on the heart and conscience. That claim may both exist, and be distinctly recognised and felt, where it has not been legislatively imposed. Indeed, direct and explicit enactments are rather a mark of imperfection than otherwise—of imperfection either in the objective grounds of religious instruction, or in the spiritual capacity and disposition to make an adequate use of those that exist. And hence it is that, as compared with Old Testament times, they are not to be found in the New. Believers in Christ are not under the law, but under grace. And yet, so far from being thereby released from the obligations of duty, they are placed in that respect on a higher level, and called to a more spiritual life. The law in its very form is an evidence of abounding iniquity. It contemplates a state of ignorance and depravity which it seeks to regulate and restrain by specific directions that presuppose an utter inability to discover the right, and a prevailing tendency to depart from it.

This, however, required time and opportunity for developement; and the world was at first no more prepared for the introduction of the Law than for the introduction of the Gospel. Man had fallen, indeed, from his original rectitude; but he had not therefore sunk into total blindness and corruption. Nor was he, in fact,

treated as in such a condition by God. On the contrary, he was still regarded as possessing somewhat of that nobility of nature, that divine image, in the likeness of which he was so recently created—as not needing, and, therefore, not receiving, any formal enactments to prescribe to him the path of duty, but capable himself of discerning these in God's manifested character and dealings, and in the facts connected with his own altered position. In these he was furnished with the materials of light and the grounds of obligation, such as, if rightly used, were perfectly sufficient to direct his course, and yet such as to allow ample scope for the display of the native tendencies of the heart. And only when these tendencies had proved to be so strong on the side of evil, that men were manifestly incapable of either knowing or doing what was right in the deteriorated condition of the world—then only did it become necessary to present them with positive enactments, and hedge them round with stringent rules and prohibitions. The history of mankind as a whole, viewed in connection with the divine dispensations, bears an exact analogy to the history of each individual man. First, he appears as a child, weak, indeed, and prone to err, yet bearing the paternal image, and capable of learning from, and copying after the paternal example. This is at once the safe and the dutiful course for him. By and bye, however, as youth advances, the lawless desires and irregular passions of nature break forth, and he must be restrained and checked on every side by the bonds of law. Farther on, again, when these have served their end—when the youth has sprung to manhood, and the paternal mind has become the mind also of the son, the age of law passes away; there is the liberty of the spirit, the freedom of full-grown man.

It will be understood, then, that we are not now to look for explicit statements of doctrines and authoritative commands, but, in the intentional absence of these, to consider what might be learned of divine truth and duty by the earliest race of worshippers, first, from the palpable facts of history and experience, and then from the symbolical acts and institutions, in connection with which their faith was to be maintained and exercised.

1. What, in such an enumeration, is obviously entitled to rank first, is the *doctrine of human guilt and corruption*.

From the moment of their transgression, our first parents knew

that their relation to God had become sadly altered. The calm of their once peaceful bosoms was instantly agitated and disturbed by tormenting fears of judgment. Nor did these prove to be groundless alarms; they were the forerunners of a curse, which was soon thundered in their ears by the voice of God, and written out in their exiled and blighted condition. It was impossible for them to escape the conviction, that they were no longer in the sight of God very good. And as their posterity grew, and one generation sprung up after another, the story of the lost heritage of blessing (no doubt perpetually repeated), and the still continued exclusion from the hallowed region of life, must have served to keep up the impression that sin had corrupted the nature, and marred the inheritance of man.

Evidences were not long wanting to shew, that sin in the first pair was evil in the root, which must, more or less, communicate itself to every branch of the human family. In the first-born of the family it sprung at once into an ill-omened maturity, as if to give warning of the disastrous results that might be expected in the future history of mankind. And constantly as the well-spring of life flowed on, the stream of human depravity swelled into a deeper and broader flood. There were things in God's earlier procedure that were naturally fitted to check its working, and repress its growth—especially the mild forbearance and paternal kindness with which He treated the first race of transgressors—the wonderful longevity granted to them—the space left for repentance even to the greatest sinners, while still sufficient means were employed to convince them of their guilt and danger—all seeming to betoken the tender solicitude of a father yearning over his infant offspring, and restraining for a season the curse that now rested on their condition, if so be they might be won to His love and service. But it was the evil, not the good in man's nature, which took advantage of this benign treatment on the part of God, to ripen into strength and fruitfulness. And, ere long, the very goodness of God found it needful to interpose, and relieve the earth of the mass of violence and corruption which, as in designed contrast to the benignity of heaven, had come to usurp possession of the world. So that, looking simply to the broad facts of history, the doctrine of human guilt and depravity stands forth with

a melancholy prominence and particularity which could leave no doubt concerning it upon thoughtful minds.

2. Another doctrine, which the facts of primeval history rendered it equally impossible for thoughtful minds to gainsay or overlook, is the *righteousness of God's character and government*.

For, that mankind should have been expelled from the region of life, and made subject to a curse which doomed them to sorrow and trouble, disease and death, in consequence of their violation of a single command of Heaven, was a proof patent to all, and memorable in the annals of the world, that everything in the divine government is subordinate to the principles of rectitude. "There was in it," as was said by Irving in one of his best moods, "a most sublime act of holiness. God, after making Adam a creature for an image and likeness of himself, did resolve him into vile dust through viler corruption, when once he had sinned; proving that one act of sin was, in God's sight, of far more account than a whole world teeming with beautiful and blessed life, which He would rather send headlong into death than suffer one sin of His creature to go unpunished. And though creation's teeming fountain might flow on ever so long, still the flowing waters of created life must ever empty themselves into the gulph of death. This is a most sublime exaltation of the moral above the material, shewing that all material beauty and blessedness of life is but, as it were, the clothing of one good thought, which, if it become evil, straightway all departs like the shadow of a dream." Who could seriously reflect on this—on the good that was lost, and the inheritance of evil that came in its place—without being solemnly impressed with the conviction, that the sceptre of God's government is a sceptre of righteousness, and that blessing might be expected under it only by such as love righteousness and hate iniquity?

3. But if nothing more had been manifested of God in the facts of primeval history than this—had He appeared only as a righteous judge executing deserved condemnation on the guilty, Adam and his fallen offspring might have been appalled and terrified before Him, but they could not have ventured to approach Him with acts of worship. We notice, therefore, as another truth brought out in connection with the circumstances of the fall, and an essentially new feature in the divine character, the *exhibition*

of grace which was then given on the part of God to the fallen. That everything was not subjected to instantaneous and overwhelming destruction, was itself a proof of the introduction of a principle of grace into the divine administration. The mere reprieve of the sentence of death (which, if justice alone had prevailed, must have been executed on the very day of transgression), and the establishment of an order of things which still contained many tokens of divine goodness, gave evidence of thoughts of mercy and loving-kindness in God toward man. But as no vague intimations, or even probable conclusions of reason, from the general course of providence, could be sufficient to re-assure the heart on such a matter as this, an explicit assurance was given, that "the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent,"—which, however dimly understood at first, could not fail even then to light up the conviction in the sinful heart, that it was the purpose of God to aid man in obtaining a recovery from the ruin of the fall. The serpent had been the ostensible occasion and instrument of the fall,—the visible and living incarnation of the evil power which betrayed man to sell his birthright of life and blessing. And that this power should be destined to be not only successfully withstood, but bruised in the very head by the offspring of her over whom he had so easily prevailed, clearly bespoke the intention of God to defeat the malice of the tempter, and secure the final triumph of the lost.

But this, if done at all, must evidently be done in a way of grace. All natural good had been forfeited by the fall, and death—the utter destruction of life and blessing—had become the common doom of humanity. Whatever inheritance, therefore, of good, or whatever opportunity of acquiring it, might be again presented, could be traced to no other source than the divine beneficence freely granting what could never have been claimed on the ground of merit. And as the recovery promised necessarily implied a victory over the might and malice of the tempter, to be won by the very victims of his artifice, how otherwise could this be achieved than through the special interposition and grace of the Most High? Manhood in Adam and Eve, with every advantage on its side of a natural kind, had proved unable to stand before the enemy, to the extent of keeping the easiest possible command, and retaining possession of an inheritance already con-

ferred. How greatly more unable must it have felt itself, if left unaided and alone, to work up against the evil, and destroy the destroyer? In such a case, hope could have found no solid footing to rest upon for the fulfilment of the promise, excepting what it descried in the gracious intentions and implied aid of the promiser. And when it appeared, as the history of the world advanced, how the evil continued to take root and grow, so as even for a time to threaten the extermination of the good, the impression must have deepened in the minds of the better portion of mankind, that the promised restoration must come through the intervention of divine power and goodness,—that the saved must owe their salvation to the grace of God.

4. Thus far the earliest inhabitants of the world might readily go in learning the truth of God, by simply looking to the broad and palpable facts of history. And without supposing them to have possessed any extraordinary reach of discernment, they might surely be conceived capable of taking one step more respecting the accomplishment of that salvation or recovery which was now the object of their desire and expectation. Adam saw—and it must have been one of the most painful reflections which forced itself on his mind, and one, too, which subsequent events came, not to relieve, but rather to embitter and aggravate—he saw how his fall carried in its bosom the fall of humanity; and the nature, which in him had become stricken with pollution and death, went down thus degenerate and corrupt to all his posterity. It was plain, therefore, that the original constitution of things was based on a *principle of headship*, in virtue of which the condition of the entire race was made dependent on that of its common parent. And the thought was not far to seek, that the same constitution might somehow have place in connection with the work of recovery. Indeed, it seems impossible to understand how, excepting through such an idea, any distinct hope could be cherished of the attainment of salvation. By the one act of Adam's disobedience, he and his posterity together were banished from the region of pure and blessed life, and made subject to the law of sin and death. Whence, in such a case, could deliverance come? How could it so much as be conceived possible, to re-open the way of life, and place the restored inheritance of good on a secure and satisfactory footing, except through some second head of humanity

supernaturally qualified for the undertaking? A fallen head could give birth only to a fallen offspring—so the righteousness of heaven had decreed; and the prospect of rising again to the possession of immortal life and blessing, seemed, by its very announcement, to call for the institution of another head, unfallen and yet human, through whom the prospect might be realised. Thus only could the divine government retain its uniformity of principle in the altered circumstances that had occurred; and thus only might it seem possible to have the end it proposed accomplished.

We do not suppose that the consideration of this principle of headship, as exhibited in the case of Adam and his posterity, could, of itself, have enabled those, who lived immediately subsequent to the fall, to obtain very clear or definite views in regard to the mode of its application in the working out of redemption. We merely suppose, that, in the circumstances of the case, there was enough to suggest to intelligent and discerning minds that it should in some way have a place. But the full understanding of the principle, and of the close harmony it establishes between the fall and redemption, as to the descending curse of the one, and the distributive grace and glory of the other, can be perceived only by *us*, whose privilege it is to look from the end of the world to its beginnings, and to trace the first dawn of the Gospel to the effulgence of its meridian glory. Even the Jewish Rabbins, who were far from occupying the vantage-ground we have reached, could yet discern some common ground between the heritage of evil derived from Adam, and the good to be effected by Messiah. "The secret of Adam," one of them remarks, "is the secret of the Messiah;" and another, "As the first man was the one that sinned, so shall the Messiah be the one to do sin away."¹ They recognised in Adam and Christ the two heads of humanity, with whom all mankind must be associated for evil or for good. On surer grounds, however, than lay within the ken of their apprehension, we know that Adam was in this respect "the type of him that was to come" (Rom. v. 14.) But in this respect alone; for in all other points we have to think of differences, not of resemblances. The principle, that belongs to them in common,

¹ See Tholuck Comm. on Rom. v. 12.

stands simply in the relation they alike hold, the one to a fallen, the other to a restored offspring. The natural seed of Adam are dealt with as one with himself, first in transgression, and then in death the wages of transgression. And, in like manner, the spiritual seed of Christ are dealt with as one with him, first in the consummate righteousness he brought in, and then in the eternal life, which is its appointed recompense of blessing. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive"—all, namely, who stand connected with Christ in the economy of grace, as they do with Adam in the economy of nature. How could this be, but by the sin of Adam being regarded as the sin of humanity, and the righteousness of Christ as the property of those who by faith rest upon his name! Hence, in the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, along with the facts which in the two cases attest the doctrine of headship, we find the parallel extended, so as to include also the respective grounds out of which they spring: "As by the *offence* of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the *righteousness* of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For, as by one man's *disobedience* many were made sinners, so by the *obedience* of one, shall many be made righteous."

These statements of the Apostle are no more than an explanation of the facts of the case by connecting them with the moral government of God; and it is not in the power of human reason to give, either a satisfactory view of his meaning, or a rational account of the facts themselves, on any other ground than this principle of headship. It has also many analogies in the constitution of nature, and the history of providence to support it. And though, like every other peculiar doctrine of the Gospel, it will always prove a stone of stumbling to the natural man, it will never fail to impart peace and comfort to the child of faith. Some degree of this he will derive from it, even by contemplating it in its darkest side—by looking to the inheritance of evil which it has been the occasion of transmitting from Adam to the whole human race. For, humbling as is the light in which it presents the natural condition of man, it still serves to keep the soul possessed of just and elevated views of the goodness of God. That all are naturally smitten with the leprosy of a sore disease, is matter of painful experience, and cannot be denied without

setting aside the plainest lessons of history. But how much deeper must have been the pain, which the thought of this awakened, and how unspeakably more pregnant should it have appeared with fear and anxiety for the future, if the evil could have been traced to the operation of God, and had existed as an original and inherent element in the state and constitution of man? It was a great relief to the wretched bosom of the prodigal, and was all, indeed, that remained to keep him from the blackness of despair, to know that it was not his father who sent him forth into the condition of a swine-herd, fain to feed himself with the husks with which they were fed; a comforting thing to know, that these husks and that wretchedness were not emblems of his father. And can it be less comforting for the thoughtful mind, when awakening to the sad heritage of sin and death, under which humanity lies burdened, to know, that this ascends no higher than the first parent of the human family, and that, as originally settled by God, the condition of mankind was in all respects "very good." The evil is thus seen to have been not essential, but incidental; a root of man's planting, not of God's; an intrusion into Heaven's workmanship, which Heaven may again drive out.

But a much stronger consolation is yielded by the consideration of this principle of headship, when it is viewed in connection with the second Adam; since it then assumes the happier aspect of the ground-floor of redemption—the actual, and, as far as we can perceive, the only possible foundation, on which a plan of complete recovery could have been reared. Excepting in connection with this principle, we cannot imagine how a remedial scheme could have been devised, that should have been in any measure adequate to the necessities of the case. Taken individually and apart, no man could have redeemed either his own soul, or the soul of a brother; he could not in a single case have recovered the lost good, far less have kept it in perpetuity if it had been recovered: and either divine justice must have foregone its claims, or each transgressor must have sunk under the weight of his own guilt and helplessness. But by means of the principle, which admits of an entire offspring having the root of its condition and the ground of its destiny in a common head, a door stood open in the divine administration for a plan of recovery co-

extensive (it might be) with the work of ruin. And unless we could have assured ourselves of an absolute and continued freedom from sin (which even angelic natures could not do), we may well reconcile ourselves to such a principle in the divine government, as for one man's transgression has made us partakers of a *fallen* condition, since in that very principle we perceive the one channel through which access could be found for those who have fallen, to the peace and safety of a *restored* condition.

He must know nothing aright of sin or salvation, who is incapable of finding comfort in this view of the subject. And yet there is a ground of comfort higher still, arising from the prospect it secures for believers of a condition better and safer than what was originally possessed by man before the fall. For, the second Adam, who, as the new head of humanity, gives the tone and character to all that belongs to the kingdom of God, is incomparably greater than the first, and has received for himself and his redeemed an inheritance corresponding to his personal worth and dignity. So that if the principle, of which we speak, appears in the first instance like a depressing load weighing humanity down to the very brink of perdition, it becomes at length a divine lever to raise it to a height far beyond what it originally occupied, or could otherwise have had any prospect of reaching. As the Apostle graphically describes in his first epistle to the Corinthians, "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthly, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Elevating thought! destined to be conformed to the image of the Son of God, and therefore to share with him in the life, the blessedness, and the glory, which he inherits in the kingdom of the Father! Coupling, then, the end of the divine plan with the beginning, and entering with childlike simplicity into its arrangements, we find, that the principle of headship on which the whole hinges for evil and for good, is really fraught with the richest beneficence, and should call forth our admiration of the manifold wisdom and goodness of God. For, through this an avenue has been laid open for us into the realms above, and our natures have become linked in fellowship of good with what is best and highest in the universe.

It thus appears, that there were four fundamental principles or ideas, which the historical transactions connected with the fall served strikingly to exhibit, and which must have been incorporated as primary elements with the religion then introduced. 1. The doctrine of human guilt and depravity; 2. of the righteousness of God's character and government; 3. of grace in God as necessary to open, and actually opening the door of hope for the fallen; 4. and, finally, of a principle of headship, by which the offspring of a common parent were associated in a common ruin, and by which again, under a new and better constitution, the heirs of blessing might be associated in a common restoration. In these elementary principles, however, we have rather the basis of the patriarchal religion, than the religion itself. For this, we must look to the symbols and institutions of worship. And, as far as appears from the records of that early time, the materials out of which these had at first to be fashioned were: The position assigned to man in respect to the tree of life, the placing before him of the cherubim and the flaming sword at the East of Eden, the covering of his guilt by the sacrifice of animal life, and his still subsisting relation to the day of rest originally hallowed and blessed by God. To these we now proceed, in succession, to direct our inquiries.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE TREE OF LIFE.

THE first mention made of the tree of life has respect to its place and use, as part of the original constitution of things, in which all presented the aspect of relative perfection and completeness. "Out of the ground," it is said, "made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." The special notice taken of these two trees plainly indicates their singular and pre-eminent importance in the economy of the primeval world; but in different respects. The design of the tree of knowledge was entirely moral; it was set there as the test and instrument of probation; and its disuse, if we may so speak, was its only allowable use. The tree of life, however, had its natural use, like the other trees of the garden; and both from its name, and from its position in the centre of the garden, we may infer that the effect of its fruit upon the human frame was designed to be altogether peculiar. But this comes out more distinctly in the next notice we have of it—when, from being simply an ordinance of nature, it passed into a symbol of grace. "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground, from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden the cherubim, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

These words put it beyond a doubt, that the tree of life was originally intended for the food of man; that the fruit it yielded was the divinely appointed medium of maintaining in him the

power of an endless life ; and that now, since he had sinned against God, and had lost all right to the possession of such a power, he was debarred from access to the natural means of sustaining it, by being himself rigorously excluded from the garden of Eden. What might be the peculiar properties of that tree—whether in its own nature it differed essentially from the other trees of the garden, or differed only by a kind of sacramental efficacy attached to it—we are left without any specific information. But in its relation to man's frame, there plainly was this difference between it and the other trees, that while they might contribute to his daily support, it alone could preserve in undecaying vigour a being to be supported. In accordance with its position in the centre of the garden, it possessed the singular virtue of ministering to human life in the fountainhead—of upholding that life in its root and principle, while the other trees could only furnish what was needed for the exercise of its existing functions. *They* might have kept nature alive for a time, as the fruits of the earth do still ; but to *it* belonged the property of fortifying the vital powers of nature against the injuries of disease and the dissolution of death.

This was undoubtedly well known to Adam, as it was an essential part of the constitution of things around him. And if he had remained steadfast in his allegiance to God, ever restraining his desire from the tree of knowledge, and partaking only of the tree of life, he would have continued to possess life, in incorrupt purity and blessedness, as he received it from the hand of God. But choosing the perilous course of transgression, he forfeited his inheritance of life, and became subject to the threatened doom of death. The tree of life, however, did not lose its life-sustaining virtue, because the condition, on which man's right to partake of it, had been violated. It remained what God originally made it. And though effectual precautions must now be taken to guard its sacred treasure from the touch of polluted hands, yet there it stood in the centre of the garden still, the object of fond aspirations as well as hallowed recollections—though enshrined in a sacredness which rendered it for the present inaccessible to fallen man. Why should its place have been so carefully preserved ? and the symbols of worship, the emblems of fear and hope, planted in the very way that led to it ? if not to

intimate, that the privilege of partaking of its immortal fruit was only for a season withheld, not finally withdrawn—waiting till a righteousness should be brought in, which might again open the way to its blessed provisions. For, as the loss of righteousness had shut up the way, it was manifest the re-possession of righteousness alone could re-open it. And hence it became, as we shall see, one of the leading objects of God's administration, to disclose the necessity, and unfold the nature and conditions of such a work of righteousness, as might be adequate to so important an end. The relation man now occupied to the tree of life could of itself furnish no information on this point. It could only indicate, that the inheritance of immortal life was still reserved for him, on the supposition of a true and proper righteousness being attained. So that in this primary symbolical ordinance, the hope, which had been awakened in his bosom by the first promise, assumed the pleasing aspect of a return to the enjoyment of that immortal life, from which, on account of sin, he was appointed to suffer a temporary exclusion.

But, coupled as this hope was with the present existence of a fallen condition, and the certainty of a speedy return for the body to the dust of death, it of necessity carried along with it the expectation of a future state of being, and of a resurrection from the dead. The prospect of a deliverance from evil, and of a restored immortality of life and blessing, was not to be immediately realized. The now forbidden tree of life was still to be forbidden, so long as men bore about with them the body of sin and death. They could find the way of life only through the charnel-house of the grave. And it had been a mocking of their best feelings and aspirations, to have held out to them the promise of a victory over the tempter, or to have embodied that promise in a new direction of their hopes toward the tree of life, if there had not been couched under it the assured prospect of a life after death, and out of it. In truth, religious faith and hope could not have taken form and being in the bosom of fallen men, excepting on the ground of such an anticipated futurity. Nor were there long wanting events in the history of divine providence which would naturally tend to strengthen, in thoughtful and considerate minds, this hopeful regard to a future world. The untimely death of Abel and the translation of Enoch in the mid-

time of his days, must especially have wrought in this direction ; as, viewed in connection with the whole circumstances of the time, they could scarcely fail to produce the impression, that not only was the real inheritance of blessing to be looked for in a scene of existence beyond the present, but that the clearest title to this might be conjoined with a comparatively brief and contracted portion of good on earth. Such facts, read in the light of the promise, that the destroyer was yet to be destroyed, and a pathway opened to the lost for partaking anew of the food of immortality, could lead to but one conclusion—that the good to be inherited by the heirs of promise necessarily involved a state of life and blessing after this. We find the later Jews—notwithstanding their false views respecting the Messiah—indicating in their comments some knowledge of the truth thus signified to the first race of worshippers by their relation to the tree of life. For, of the seven things which they imagined the Messiah should shew to Israel, two were, the garden of Eden and the tree of life ; and again, “ There are also that say of the tree of life, that it was not created in vain, but the men of the resurrection shall eat thereof, and life for ever.”¹ These were but the glimmerings of light obtained by men, who had to grope their way amid judicial blindness and the misguiding influence of hereditary delusions. Adam and his immediate offspring were in happier circumstances for the discernment of the truth now under consideration. And unless the promise of recovery remained absolutely a dead letter to them, and nothing was learned from their symbolical and worshipful position in respect to the tree of life (a thing impossible in the circumstances), there must have been cherished in their minds the conviction of a life after death, and the hope of a deliverance from its corruption. Religion at the very first rooted itself in the belief of immortality.

So much for what the things connected with the tree of life imported to those whom they more immediately respected. Let us glance for a little to the fuller insight afforded into them for such as possess the later revelations of Scripture. “ To-day,” said Jesus on the cross to the penitent malefactor, “ to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise”—shewing how confidently he regarded

¹ R. Elias ben Mosis, and R. Menahem, in Ainsworth on Gen. iii.

death as the way to victory, and how completely he was going to bruise the head of the tempter, since he was now to make good for himself and his people a return to the region of bliss, which that tempter had been the occasion of alienating. "To him that overcometh," says the same Jesus, after having entered on his glory, "will I give to eat of the tree of life, that is in the midst of the paradise of God." And again, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city" (Rev. ii. 7; xxii. 14). The least we can gather from such declarations is, that every thing which was lost in Adam, shall be again recovered in Christ for the heirs of his salvation. The far distant ends of revelation are seen embracing each other; and the last look we obtain into the workmanship of God corresponds with the first, as face answers to face. In both alike there is seen a paradise of delight, with the river of life flowing through it, and the tree of life in the midst, bearing its immortal fruit. The same God of love and beneficence who was the beginning, proves himself to be also the ending. It is the intermediate portion alone which seems less properly to hold of him—being in so many respects marred with evil, and chequered with adversity to the members of his family. *There*, indeed, we see much that is unlike God—his once beautiful workmanship defaced—the comely order of his government disturbed—the world he had destined for "the house of the glory of his kingdom" rendered the theatre of a fierce and incessant warfare between the elements of good and evil, in which the better part is too often put to the worse—and humanity, which he had made to be an image of himself, smitten in all its members with the wound of a sore disease, beset when living with numberless calamities, and becoming, when dead, the prey of its most vile and loathsome adversaries. How cheering to know that this ungod-like state of disorder and confusion is not to be perpetual—that it occupies but the mid-region of time—and is destined to be supplanted in the final issues of providence by the restitution of all things to their original harmony and blessedness of life! The tempter has prevailed long, but, God be thanked, he is not to prevail for ever. There is yet to come forth from the world, which he has filled with his works of evil, new heavens and a new earth, where righteousness shall dwell—another para-

dise with its tree of life—and a ransomed people created anew after the image of God, and fitted for the high destiny of manifesting his glory before the universe. How blessed to be indeed the heirs of such a destiny !

But great as this is, it is not the whole. The antitype is always higher than the type ; and the work of grace transcends in excellence and glory the work of nature. When, therefore, we are told of a new creation, with its tree of life, and its paradisiacal delights yet to be enjoyed by the people of God, much more is actually promised than the simple recovery of what was lost by sin. There will be a sphere and condition of being similar in kind, but, in the nature of the things belonging to it, immensely higher and better than what was originally set up by the hand of God. All things proceeding from him are beautiful in their place and season. And it is true of the paradise which has been lost, that its means of life and enjoyment were in every respect wisely adapted to the frames of those who were made for occupying it. But of these it is written, that they were “ of the earth, earthy ”—only relatively, not absolutely good—in themselves lumpish and infirm tenements of clay, and as such necessarily imperfect in their tastes, their faculties of action and enjoyment, as compared with what is found in the higher regions of existence.

But, undoubtedly, the same adaptation that existed in the old creation between the nature of the region and the frames of its inhabitants shall exist also in the new. And as the occupants here shall be the second Adam and his seed—the Lord from heaven, in whom humanity has been raised to peerless majesty and splendour—there must also be a corresponding rise in the nature of the things to be occupied. A higher sphere of action and enjoyment shall be brought in, because there is a higher style of being to possess it. There shall not be the laying anew of earth's old foundations, but rather the raising of these aloft to a nobler elevation—not nature revived merely, but nature glorified—humanity, no longer as it was in the earthy and natural man, but as it is and ever shall be in the spiritual and heavenly, and that placed in a theatre of life and blessing every way suitable to its exalted condition.

Such being the case, it will readily be understood, that the promise, symbolically exhibited in the Old, and distinctly ex-

pressed in New Testament Scripture, of a return to paradise and its tree of life, is not to be taken literally. The dim shadow only, not the very image of the good to be possessed, is presented under this imperfect form. And we are no more to think of an actual tree, such as that which originally stood in the centre of Eden, than of actual manna, or of a material crown, which are, in like manner, promised to the faithful. These, and many similar expressions employed respecting the world to come, are but a figurative employment of the best in the past or present state of things, to aid the mind in conceiving of the future ; as thus alone can it attain to any distinct conception of them whatever. Yet, while all are figurative, they have still a definite and intelligible meaning. And when the assurance is given to sincere believers, not only of a paradise for their abode, but also of a tree of life for their participation, they are thereby certified of all that may be needed for the perpetual refreshment and support of their glorified natures. These shall certainly require no such carnal sustenance as was provided for Adam in Eden ; they shall be cast in another mould. But, as they shall still be material frameworks, they must have a certain dependence on the material elements around them for the possession of a healthful and blessed existence. The internal and the external, the personal and the relative, shall be in harmonious and fitting adjustment to each other. All hunger shall be satisfied, and all thirst for ever quenched. The inhabitant shall never say, " I am sick." And like the river itself, which flows in perennial fulness from the throne of God, the well-spring of life in the redeemed shall never know interruption or decay. Blessed, then, truly are those who do the commandments of God, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. What can a sinful and perishing world afford in comparison of such a prospect !

CHAPTER THIRD.

THE CHERUBIM (AND THE FLAMING SWORD).

THE truths symbolized by man's new relation to the tree of life have still to be viewed in connection with the means appointed by God to fence the way of approach to it, and the creaturely forms that were now planted on its borders. "And the Lord God," it is said, "placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." We can easily imagine that the sword, with its flaming brightness and revolving movements, might be suspended there simply as the emblem of God's avenging justice, and as the instrument of man's exclusion from the region of life. In that one service the end of its appointment might be fulfilled, and its symbolical meaning exhausted. Such, indeed, appears to have been the case. But the cherubim, which also had a place assigned them toward the east of the garden, must have had some farther use, as the sword alone would have been sufficient to prevent access to the forbidden region. The cherubim must have been added for the purpose of rendering more complete the instruction intended to be conveyed to man by means of the symbolical apparatus here presented to his contemplation. And as these cherubic figures hold an important place also in subsequent revelations, we shall here enter into a somewhat minute and careful investigation of the subject. The view we mean to exhibit cannot be said to differ radically from that presented in our former edition; but it will certainly differ considerably in the mode of investigation pursued, and in some also of the results obtained. We lean formerly too much upon the representations of Bähr, which we now perceive to be in themselves, as well as in the purpose to which they are applied, of a more fanciful and objectionable nature than they at first appeared.

There is nothing to be expected here from etymological researches. Many derivations and meanings have been ascribed to the term *cherub*; but nothing certain has been established regarding it; and it may now be confidently assigned to that class of words, whose original import is involved in hopeless obscurity.¹ In the passage of Genesis above cited, where the word first occurs, not only is no clue given in regard to the meaning of the name, but there is not even any description presented of the objects it denoted; they are spoken of as definite forms or existences, of which the name alone afforded sufficient indication. This will appear more clearly if we adhere to the exact rendering: "And he placed (or, made to dwell) at the east of the garden of Eden *the cherubim*"—not certain unknown figures or imaginary existences, but the specific forms of being, familiarly designated by that name.

In other parts of Scripture, however, the defect is in great measure supplied; and by comparing the different statements there contained with each other, and putting the whole together, we may at least approximate, if not absolutely arrive at, a full and satisfactory knowledge of the symbol.

But in ascertaining the sense of Scripture on the subject, there are two considerations which ought to be borne in mind, as a necessary check on extreme or fanciful deductions. The first is, that in this, as well as in other religious symbols (those, for example, connected with food and sacrifice), there may have been, and most probably was, a progression in the use made of it from time to time. In that case, the representations employed at one period must have been so constructed as to convey a fuller meaning than those employed at another. Whatever aspects of divine truth, therefore, may be discovered in the later passages which

¹ Hofmann has lately revived the notion, that כַּרְיֹוב (cherub), is simply רֶכֶב (chariot), with a not unusual transposition of letters; and conceives the name to have been given to the cherubim on account of their being employed as the chariot or throne of Jehovah (Weissagung und Erfüllung, i. p. 80). Delitzsch, too, is not disinclined to this derivation and meaning, though he would rather derive the term from כָּרַב to lay hold of, and understands it of the cherubim as laying hold of and bearing away the throne of Jehovah (Die Genesis Ausgelegt, p. 46). Thenius in his Comm. on Kings also adopts this derivation, but applies it differently. Both derivations, and the ideas respecting the cherubim they are intended to support, are quite unsupported.

treat of the cherubim, should not, as a matter of course, be ascribed in all their entirety to the earlier. Respect must always be had to the relative differences of place and time. Another consideration is, that whatever room there may be for diversity in the way now specified, we must not allow any representation that may be given in one place—a specific representation—to impose a generic meaning on the symbol, which is not borne out, but possibly contradicted by representations in others. Progressive differences can only affect what is circumstantial, not what is essential to the subject; and all that is properly fundamental in the cherubic imagery, must be found in accordance, not with a partial, but with the complete testimony of Scripture respecting it.

With these guiding principles in our eye, we proceed to exhibit what may be collected from the different notices of Scripture on the subject—ranging our remarks under the following natural divisions: the descriptions given of the cherubim as to form and appearance, the designations applied to them, the positions assigned them, and the kinds of agency with which they are associated.

1. In regard to the first of these points—the descriptions given of the cherubim as to form and appearance—there is nothing very definite in the earlier Scriptures, nor are the accounts in the later perfectly uniform. Even in the detailed narrative of Exodus respecting the furniture of the tabernacle, it is still taken for granted, that the forms of the cherubim were familiarly known; and we are told nothing concerning their structure, besides its being incidentally stated, that they had faces and wings (Ex. xxv. xxxvii.) It would seem, however, that while certain elements were always understood to enter into the composition of the cherub, the form given to it was not absolutely fixed, but admitted of certain variations. The cherubim seen by Ezekiel beneath the throne of God, are represented as having each four faces and four wings (ch. i. 6), while in the description subsequently given by him of the cherubic representations on the walls of his visionary temple (ch. xli. 18, 19), mention is made of only two faces appearing in each. In Revelation, again, (ch. iv. 7, 8) while four composite forms, as in Ezekiel, are adhered to throughout, the creatures are represented as not having each four faces, but having each their several face different; and the number of wings belonging to each is also

different—not four but six.¹ In the Apocalyptic vision the creatures themselves appear full of eyes, before and behind, as they do also in Ezek. x. 12, where “their whole flesh, and their backs, and their hands, and their wings,” are said to have been full of eyes; but in Ezekiel’s first vision, the eyes were confined only to the wheels connected with the cherubim (ch. i. 18.) It is impossible, therefore, without doing violence to the accounts given in the several delineations, to avoid the conviction, that a certain latitude was allowed in regard to the particular forms; and that, as exhibited in vision at least, they were not altogether uniform in appearance. They *were* uniform, however, in two leading respects, which may hence be regarded as the more important elements in the cherubic form. They had, first, the predominating appearance of a man—a man’s body and gesture—as is evident, first, from their erect posture; then from Ezek. i. 5, “they had the appearance of a man;” and also, from the peculiar expression in Rev. iv. 7, where it is said of the third, “that it had a face as a man”—which is best understood to mean, that while the other creatures were unlike man in the face, though like in the body, this was like in the face too. The same inference is still further deducible from the part taken by the cherubim in the Apocalypse, along with the elders and the redeemed generally, in celebrating the praise of God. The other point of agreement is, that in all the descriptions actually given, the cherubim have a composite appearance—with the form of a man, indeed, predominating, but with other animal forms combined—those, namely, of the lion, the ox, and the eagle.

Now, there can be no doubt that these three creatures, along with man, make up together, according to the estimation of a remote antiquity, the most perfect forms of animal existence. They belong to those departments of the visible creation which constitute the first in rank and importance of its three kingdoms—the kingdom of organic life. And in that kingdom they belong to the highest class—to that which possesses warm blood and phy-

¹ Vitringa justly remarks as to the difference between St John’s representation and Ezekiel’s respecting the faces, that “it is not of essential moment; for the beasts most intimately connected together form, as it were, one beast-existence, and it is a matter of indifference whether all the properties are represented as belonging to each of the four, or singly to each.”

sical life in its fullest developement. Nay, in that highest class they are again the highest ; for the ox in ancient times was placed above the horse, on account of the useful purposes in husbandry which he was made to serve. And hence the old Jewish proverb, " Four are the highest in the world—the lion among wild beasts, the ox among tame cattle, the eagle among birds, man among all (creatures) ; but God is supreme over all." The meaning is, that in these four kinds are exhibited the highest forms of creature-life on earth, but that God is still infinitely exalted above these ; since all creature-life springs out of his fulness, and is dependent on his hand. So that a creature compounded of all these—bearing in its general shape and structure the lineaments of a man, but associating with the human the appearance and properties also of the three next highest orders of animal existence—might seem a kind of concrete manifestation of created life on earth—a sort of personified creaturehood.

But the thought naturally occurs, why thus strangely amalgamated and combined ? If the object had been simply to afford a representation of creaturely existence in general by means of its higher forms, we would naturally have expected them to stand apart as they actually appear in nature. But instead of this they are thrown into one representation ; and so, indeed, that however the representation may vary, still the inferior forms of animal life constantly appear as grafted upon, and clustering around, the organism of man. There is thus a striking unity in the diversity—a human ground and body, so to speak—in the grouped figures of the representation, which could not fail to attract the notice of a contemplative mind, and must have been designed to form an essential element in the symbolical instruction. It is an ideal combination ; no such composite creature as the cherub exists in the actual world ; and we can think of no reason why the singular combination it presents of animal forms, should have been set upon that of man as the trunk and centre of the whole, unless it were to exhibit the higher elements of humanity in some kind of organic connection with certain distinctive properties of the inferior creation. The nature of man is immensely the highest upon earth, and towers loftily above all the rest by powers peculiar to itself. And yet we can easily conceive how this very nature of man might be greatly raised and ennobled by having superadded

to its own inherent qualities, those of which the other animal forms now before us stand as the appropriate types.

Thus, the lion among ancient nations generally, and in particular among the Hebrews, was the representative of king-like majesty and peerless strength. All the beasts of the field stand in awe of him, none being able to cope with him in might ; and his roar strikes terror wherever it is heard. Hence the lion is naturally regarded as the king of the forest, where might is the sole ground of authority and rule. And hence, also, lions were placed both at the right and left of Solomon's throne, as symbols of royal majesty and supreme power.—As the lion among quadrupeds, so the *eagle* is king among birds, and stands pre-eminent in the two properties that more peculiarly distinguish the winged creation—those of sight and flight. The term *eagle-eyed* has been quite proverbial in every age. The eagle perceives his prey from the loftiest elevation, where he himself appears scarcely discernible ; and it has even been believed, that he can descry the smallest fish in the sea, and look with undazzled gaze upon the sun. His power of wing, however, is still more remarkable : no bird can fly either so high or so far. Moving with king-like freedom and velocity through the loftiest regions and the most extended space, we naturally think of him as the fittest image of something like angelic nimbleness of action. It is this more especially, or, we should rather say, this exclusively, which is symbolically associated with the eagle in Scripture. No reference is made there to the eagle's powers of vision, but very frequent allusion to his extraordinary power of flight (Deut. xxviii. 49 ; Job ix. 26 ; Prov. xxiii. 5 ; Hab. i. 8, &c.) And hence, too, in Rev. iv. 7, the epithet flying is attached to the eagle, to indicate that this is the quality to be made account of.—Finally, the *ox* was among the ancients the common image of patient labour and productive energy. It naturally came to bear this signification from its early use in the operations of husbandry—in ploughing and harrowing the ground, then bearing home the sheaves, and at last treading out the corn. On this account the bovine form was so frequently chosen, especially in agricultural countries like Egypt, as the most appropriate symbol of Deity, in its inexhaustible productiveness. And if associated with man, the idea would instinctively suggest itself of patient labour and productive energy in working.

Such, then, not by any conjectural hypothesis or strained interpretations, but by the simplest reading of the descriptions given in the Bible, appear to have been the generic form and idea of the cherubim. It is absolutely necessary, that we should apply the light furnished by those passages, in which they *are* described, to those also in which they are not, and that what are expressly named and described as the cherubim, when seen in prophetic vision, must be regarded as substantially agreeing with those which had a visible appearance, and a local habitation on earth—for, otherwise, the subject would be involved in inextricable confusion by Scripture itself. Assuming these points, we are warranted to think of the cherubim, wherever they are mentioned, as presenting in their composite structure, and having, as the very basis of that structure, the form of man—the only being on earth that is possessed of a rational and moral nature; yet combining, along with this, and organically uniting to it, the animal representatives of majesty and strength, winged velocity, patient and productive labour. Why united and combined thus, the mere descriptions of the cherubic appearances give no intimation; we must search for information concerning it in the other points that remain to be considered. So far, we have been simply putting together the different features of the descriptions, and viewing the cherubic figures in their individual characteristics and relative bearing.¹

¹ Hengstenberg, in his remarks on Rev. iv. 7, regarding the cherubim as simple representations of the animal creation on earth, objects to any symbolical meaning being attached to the separate animal forms, on the special ground that in that passage of Revelation it is the *calf*, not the *ox*, which is mentioned in the description—as it is also found once in the description of Ezekiel, ch. i. 7. He thinks this cannot be accidental, but must have been designed to prevent our attributing to it the symbolical meaning of productiveness, or such like; as no one would think of associating that idea with a calf. We are surprised at so weak an objection from such a quarter. There can be no doubt—and it is not only admitted but contended for by Hengstenberg himself in his *Beiträge*, i. p. 161, sq.—that in connection with that symbolical meaning the ox-worship of Egypt was erected, and from Egypt was introduced among the Israelites at Sinai, and again by Jeroboam at a later period. Yet in Scripture it is always spoken of, not as ox, or bull, or cow, but as calf-worship. This conclusively shews that, symbolically viewed, no distinction was made between ox and calf. And in the description of such figures as the cherubim, calf might very naturally be substituted for ox, simply on account of the smaller and more delicate outline which the form would present. It is possible the same appearance may partly have contributed to the idols at Bethel and Dan being designated calves rather than oxen.

2. We named, as our second point of inquiry, the designations applied to the cherubim in Scripture. The term cherubim itself being the more common and specific of these, would naturally call for consideration first—if any certain key could be found to its correct import. But this we have already assigned to the class of things over which a hopeless obscurity may be said to hang. There is another designation, however, originally applied to them by Ezekiel, and the sole designation given to them in the Apocalypse, from which some additional light may be derived. This expression is in the original חַיִּים , animantia, living ones, or living creatures. The Septuagint uses the quite synonymous term $\zeta\tilde{\omega}\alpha$; and this, again, is the word uniformly employed by St John, when speaking of the cherubim. It has been unhappily rendered by our translators *beasts* in the Revelation; thus incongruously associating with the immediate presence and throne of God mere bestial existences, and identifying in name the most exalted creaturely forms of being in the heavenly places, with the grovelling symbolical head of the antichristian and ungodly elements of the world. This is what bears, in the Apocalypse the distinctive name of the *beast* (Θηρίον); and the name should never have been applied to the ideal existences, which derive *their* distinctive appellation from the fulness of life belonging to them—the *living ones*. The frequency with which this name is used of the cherubim is remarkable. In Ezekiel and the Apocalypse together it occurs nearly thirty times; and may consequently be regarded as peculiarly expressive of the symbolical character of the cherubim. It presents them to our view as exhibiting the property of life in its highest state of power and activity; therefore, as creatures altogether instinct with life. And the idea thus conveyed by the name is further substantiated by one or two traits associated with them in Ezekiel and the Apocalypse. Such, especially, is the very singular multiplicity of eyes attached to them, appearing first in the mystic wheels that regulated their movements, and afterwards in the cherubic forms themselves. For, the eye is the symbol of intelligent life; the living spirit's most peculiar organ and index. And to represent the cherubim as so strangely replenished with eyes, could only be intended to make them known to us as wholly inspirited. Accordingly, in the first vision of Ezekiel, in which the eyes belonged immediately to the wheels, "the *spirit* of the

living creatures" is said to have been in the wheels (ch. i. 20)—where the eye was, there was the intelligent, thinking, directive spirit of life. Another, and quite similar trait, is the quick and restless activity ascribed to them by both writers—by Ezekiel, when he represents them as "running and returning" with lightning speed ; and by St John, when he describes them as "resting not day or night." Incessant motion is one of the most obvious symptoms of a plenitude of life. We instinctively associate the property of life even with the inanimate things that exhibit motion—such as fountains and running streams, which are called living, in contradistinction to stagnant pools, that seem comparatively dead. And in the Hebrew tongue, these two symbols of life—eyes and fountains—have their common symbolical meaning marked by the employment of the same term to denote them both (12). So that creatures which appeared to be all eyes and all motion, are, in plain terms, those in which the powers and properties of life were quite peculiarly displayed.

We believe there is a still further designation applied to the same objects in Scripture—the seraphim of Isaiah (ch. vi.) It is in the highest degree improbable, that the prophet should by that name, so abruptly introduced, have pointed to an order of existences, or a form of being, nowhere else mentioned in Scripture ; but quite natural that he should have referred to the cherubim in the sanctuary, as the scene of the vision lay there ; and the more especially, as three characteristics—the possession by each of six wings, the position of immediate proximity to the throne of God, and the threefold proclamation of Jehovah's holiness—are those also which re-appear again, at the very outset, in St John's description of the cherubim. That they should have been called by the name of seraphim (burning ones) is no way inconsistent with this idea, for it merely embodies in a designation the thought symbolized in the vision of Ezekiel under the appearance of fire, giving forth flashes of lightning, which the cherubim presented (ch. i. 13). In both alike the fire, whether connected with the name or the appearance, denoted the wrath, which was the most prominent feature in the divine manifestation at the time. But as, in thus identifying the cherubim with the seraphim, we tread on somewhat doubtful ground, we shall make no further use of the thoughts suggested by it.

It is right to notice, however, that the designation we have more particularly considered, and the emblematic representations illustrative of it, belong to the later portions of Scripture, which treat of the cherubim ; and while we cannot but regard the idea thus exhibited, as essentially connected with the cherubic form of being, a fundamental element in its meaning, it certainly could not be by any means so vividly displayed in the cherubim of the tabernacle, which were stationary figures. Nor can we tell distinctly how it stood in this respect with the cherubim of Eden ; we know not what precise form and attitude were borne by them. But not only the representations we have been considering—the analogy also of the cherubim in the tabernacle, with their outstretched wings, as in the act of flying, and their eyes intently directed toward the mercy-seat, as if they were actually beholding and pondering what was there exhibited, may justly lead us to infer, that in some way or another a life-like appearance was also presented by the cherubim of Eden. Absolutely motionless or dead-like forms would have been peculiarly out of place in the way to the tree of life. Yet of what sort this fulness of life might be, which was exhibited in the cherubim, we have still had no clear indication. From various things that have pressed themselves on our notice, it might not doubtfully have been inferred to be life in the highest sense—spiritual and divine. But this comes out more prominently in connection with the other aspects of the subject which remain to be contemplated.

3. We proceed, therefore, to the point next in order—the positions assigned to the cherubim in Scripture. These are properly but two, and, by having regard only to what is essential in the matter, might possibly be reduced to one. But as they ostensibly and locally differ, we shall treat them apart. They are the garden of Eden, and the dwelling-place, or throne of God.

The first local residence in which the cherubim appear, was the garden of Eden—the earthly paradise. What, however, was this, but the proper home and habitation of life ? of life generally, but emphatically of the divine life ? Every thing there seemed to breathe the air, and to exhibit the fresh and blooming aspect of life. Streams of water ran through it to supply all its productions with nourishment, and keep them in perpetual healthfulness ; multitudes of living creatures roamed amid its bowers, and

the tree of life, at once the emblem and the seal of immortality, rose in the centre, as if to shed a vivifying influence over the entire domain. Most fitly was it called by the Rabbins "the land of life." But it was life, we soon perceive, in the higher sense—life, not merely as opposed to bodily decay and dissolution, but as opposed also to sin, which is the soul's death. Eden was the garden of delight, which God gave to man as the image of himself, the possessor of that spiritual and holy life which has its fountainhead in God. And the moment man renounced his part in this divine property of life, and yielded himself as an instrument of unrighteousness, he lost his heritage of blessing, and was driven forth as a child of mortality and corruption from the hallowed region of life. When, therefore, the cherubim were set in the garden to occupy the place which man had forfeited by his transgression, it was impossible but that they should be regarded as the representatives, not of life merely, but of the life that is in God, and in connection with which evil cannot dwell. This they were by their very position within the sacred territory—whatever other ideas may have been symbolized by their peculiar structure, and more special relations.

The other and more common position assigned to the cherubim is in immediate connection with the dwelling-place and throne of God. This connection comes first into view when the instructions were given to Moses regarding the construction of the tabernacle in the wilderness. As the tabernacle was to be, in a manner, the habitation of God, where he was to dwell and manifest himself to his people, the whole of the curtains forming the interior of the tent were commanded to be inwoven with cherubic figures. But as the inner sanctuary was more especially the habitation of God, where he fixed his throne of grace, Moses was commanded, for the erection of this throne, to make two cherubims, one at each end of the ark of the covenant, and to place them so, that they should stand with outstretched wings, their faces toward each other, and toward the mercy-seat, the lid of the ark, which lay between them. That mercy-seat, or the space immediately above it, bounded on either side by the cherubim, and covered by their wings (Ex. xxv. 20), was the throne of God, as the God of the old covenant, the ideal seat of the divine commonwealth in Israel. "*There,*" said God to Moses, "will I meet with

thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment to the children of Israel" (Ex. xxv. 22.) This is the fundamental passage regarding the connection of the cherubim with the throne of God; and it is carefully to be noted, that while the seat of the divine presence and glory is said to be *above* the mercy-seat, it is also said to be *between* the cherubim. And the same form of expression is used in another passage in the Pentateuch, which may also be called a fundamental one, Numb. vii. 89, "And when Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation (more properly, the tent of meeting) to speak with him, then he heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the mercy-seat, that was upon the ark of testimony, from between the two cherubim." Hence the Lord was spoken of as the God "who dwelleth between the cherubims," according to our version, and correctly as to the sense; though as the verb is used without a preposition in the original, the more exact rendering would be, the God who dwelleth-in (inhabitest, יָשַׁב), or occupies (אָזַן viz. as a throne or seat) the cherubim. These two verbs are interchanged in the form of expression, which is used with considerable frequency (for example, 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; Ps. lxxx. 1; xcix. 1, &c.); and it is from the use of the first of them that the Jewish term Shekinah (the indwelling), in reference to the symbol of the divine presence, is derived. The space above the mercy-seat, enclosed by the two cherubim with their outstretched wings, bending and looking toward each other, was regarded as the precise local habitation which God possessed as a dwelling-place, or occupied as a throne in Israel. And it is entirely arbitrary, and against the plain import of the two fundamental passages, to insert *above*, as is still very often done by interpreters ("dwelleth," or "sitteth enthroned above the cherubim"), still more so to make anything depend, as to the radical meaning of the symbol, on the seat of God being considered above, rather than between the cherubim.

Hengstenberg is guilty of this error, when he represents the proper place of the cherubim as being *under* the throne of God, and holds that to be their first business—though he disallows the propriety of regarding them as material supports to the throne

(Comm. on Rev. iv. 6). The meaning he adopts of the symbol absolutely required them to be in this position ; since only by their being beneath the throne of God, could they with any fitness be regarded as imaging the living creation below, as subject to the overruling power and sovereignty of God. Hofmann and Delitzsch go still farther in this direction ; and, adopting the notion repudiated by Hengstenberg, consider the cherubim as the formal bearers of Jehovah's throne. Delitzsch even affirms, in defiance (we think) of the plainest language, that wherever the part of the cherubim is distinctly mentioned in Old Testament Scripture, they appear as the bearers of Jehovah and his throne, and that he sat enthroned upon the cherubim in the midst of the worldly sanctuary (*Die Genesis Ausgelegt*, p. 145). There are in fact only two representations of the kind specified. One is in Ps. xviii. 10, where the Lord is described as coming down for judgment upon David's enemies, and in doing so, "riding upon a cherub; and flying upon the wings of the wind"—obviously a poetical delineation, in which it would be as improper to press closely what is said of the position of the cherub, as what is said of the wings of the wind. The one image was probably introduced with the view merely of stamping the divine manifestation with a distinctively covenant aspect, as the other for the purpose of exhibiting the resistless speed of its movements. But if the allusion is to be taken less ideally, it must be borne in mind, that the manifestation described is primarily and pre-eminently for judgment, not as in the temple, for mercy ; and this may explain the higher elevation given to the seat of divine Majesty. The same holds good also of the other representation, in which the throne or glory of the Lord appears above the cherubim. It is in Ezekiel, where, in two several places (ch. i. 26, x. 1), there is first said to have been a firmament upon the heads of the living creatures, and then above the firmament the likeness of a throne. The description is so palpably different from that given of the Sanctuary, that it would be absurd to make the one rule the other. We must rather hold, that in the special and immediate object of the theophany exhibited to Ezekiel, there was a reason for giving such a position to the throne of God—one so much apart from the cherubim, and elevated so distinctly above them. And we believe that reason may be found, in its being predominantly

a manifestation for judgment, in which the seat of the divine glory naturally appeared to rise to a loftier and more imposing elevation, than it was wont to occupy in the Holiest. This seems to be clearly indicated in ch. x. 4, where, in proceeding to the work of judgment, the glory of the Lord is represented as *going up from the cherub*, and standing over the threshold of the house; immediately after which the house was filled with the cloud—the symbol of divine wrath and retribution. We may add, that the statement in Rev. iv. 6, where the cherubic forms are said to have appeared “in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne,” is plainly at variance with the idea of their acting as supports to the throne. The throne itself is described in v. 2, as being *laid* (*ἐπέθετο*) in heaven, which excludes the supposition of any instruments being employed to bear it aloft. And from the living creatures being represented as at once in the midst of the throne, and round about it, nothing further or more certain can be inferred beyond their appearing in a position of immediate nearness to it. The elders sat round about the throne; but the cherubim appeared in it, as well as around it—implying that theirs was the place of closest proximity to the divine Being, who sat on it.

The result, then, which arises, we may almost say, with conclusive certainty from the preceding investigation, is, that the kind of life which was symbolized by the cherubim, was life most nearly and essentially connected with God—life as it is, or shall be held, by those who dwell in his immediate presence, and form, in a manner, the very inclosure and covering of his throne;—pre-eminently, therefore, spiritual and holy life. Holiness becomes God’s house, in general; and of necessity it rises to its highest creaturely representation in those who are regarded as compassing about the most select and glorious portion of the house—the seat of the living God himself. Whether His peculiar dwelling were in the garden of Eden, or in the recesses of a habitation made by men’s hands, the presence of the cherubim alike proclaimed him to be One, who indispensably requires of such as are to be round about Him, the property of life, and in connection with that with the beauty of holiness, which is, in a sense, the life of life, as possessed and exercised by his intelligent offspring.

4. Our last point of scriptural inquiry, was to be respecting the kinds of agency attributed to the cherubim.

We naturally revert, first again, to what is said of them in connection with the garden of Eden, though our information there is the scantiest. It is merely said, that the cherubim were made to dwell at the east of the garden, and a flaming sword, turning every way, to keep the way to the tree of life. The two instruments—the cherubim and the sword—are associated together, in regard to this keeping; and, as the text draws no distinction between them, it is quite arbitrary to say, with Bähr, that the cherubim alone had to do with it, and to do with it precisely as Adam had. It is said of Adam, that “God put him into the garden to dress it and to keep it” (Gen. ii. 15)—not the one simply, but both together. He had to do a twofold office in respect to the garden—to attend to its cultivation, as far as might then be needful, and to keep or preserve it, namely, from the disturbing and desolating influence of evil. The charge to keep plainly implied some danger of losing. And it became still plainer, when the tenure of possession was immediately suspended on a condition, the violation of which was to involve the penalty of death. The keeping was to be made good against a possible contingency, which might subvert the order of God, and change the region of life into a charnel-house of death. Now, it is the same word that is used in regard to the cherubim and the flaming sword: These now were to keep—not, however, like Adam, the entire garden, but simply the way to the tree of life; to maintain in respect to this one point the settled order of Heaven, and that more especially by rendering the way inaccessible to fallen man. There is here also, no doubt, a present occupancy—but the occupancy of only a limited portion, a mere path-way, and for the definite purpose of defending it from unhallowed intrusion.

Still, not simply for defence; for occupancy as well as defence. And the most natural thought is, that as in the keeping there was a twofold idea, so a twofold representation was given to it; that the occupancy was more immediately connected with the cherubim, and the defence against intrusion with the flaming sword. One does not see otherwise, what need there could have been for both. Nor is it possible to conceive how the ends in view could otherwise have been served. It was, beyond all doubt, for

man's spiritual instruction, that such peculiar instruments were employed at the east of the garden of Eden, to awaken and preserve in his bosom right thoughts of the God with whom he had to do. But an image of terror and repulsion was not alone sufficient for this. There was needed along with it an image of mercy and hope. And in what was actually exhibited man had both. When his eye looked to the sword, with its burnished and fiery aspect, he could not but be struck with awe at the thought of God's severe and retributive justice. But when he saw, at the same time, in near and friendly connection with that emblem of Jehovah's righteousness, living or life-like forms of being, cast pre-eminently in his own mould, but bearing along with his the likeness also of the choicest species of the animal creation around him—when he saw this, what could he think, but that still for creatures of earthly rank, and for himself most of all, an interest was reserved by the mercy of God in the things that pertained to the blessed region of life? That region could not now, by reason of sin, be actually held by him; but it was ideally held—by composite forms of creature-life, in which his nature appeared as the predominating element. And for what end? if not to teach, that when that nature of his should have nothing to fear from the avenging justice of God, it should regain its place in the holy and blissful haunts from which it had meanwhile been excluded? So that, standing before the eastern approach to Eden, and scanning with intelligence the appearances that there presented themselves to his view, the child of faith might say to himself, That region of life is not finally lost to me. It has neither been blotted from the face of creation, nor entrusted to natures of another sphere. Earthly forms still hold possession of it. The very natures that have lost the privilege continue to have their representation in the new and unreal-like occupants that are meanwhile appointed to keep it. Better things, then, are doubtless in reserve for them; and *my* nature, which stands out so conspicuously above them all, fallen though it be at present, is assuredly destined to rise again, and enjoy in the reality what is there representatively assigned to it.

There is nothing surely unnatural or far-fetched in such a line of reflection. It manifestly lay within the reach of the very earliest members of a believing seed; especially, since the light

it is supposed to have conveyed, did not stand alone, but was only supplementary to that embodied in the first grand promise to the fallen, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent. The supernatural machinery at the east of the garden merely shewed how this bruising was to proceed, and in what result it might be expected to issue. It was to proceed, not by placing in abeyance the manifestation of divine righteousness, but by providing for its being exercised without the fallen creature being destroyed. Nor should it issue in a partial, but in a complete recovery—nay, in the possession of a state higher than before. For, the creaturehood of earth, it would seem, was yet to stand in a closer relation to the manifested glory of God, and was to become capable of enduring sights and performing ministrations, which were not known in the original constitution of things on earth.

It might not be possible, perhaps, for the primeval race of worshippers to go farther, or to get a more definite insight into the purposes of God, by contemplating the cherubim. We scarcely think it could. But we can easily conceive, how the light and hope therewith connected would be felt to grow, when this embodied creaturehood—or, if we rather choose so to regard it, this ideal manhood—was placed in the sanctuary of God's presence and glory, and so as to form the immediate boundary and covering of his throne. A relation of greater nearness to the divine was there evidently won for the human and earthly. And not that only, but a step also in advance toward the actual enjoyment of what was ideally exhibited. For, while at first men in flesh and blood were not permitted to enter into the region of holy life occupied by the cherubim, but only to look at it from without, now the way was at length partially laid open, and in the person of the high-priest, through the blood of atonement, they could make an approach, though still only at stated times, to the very feet of the cherubim of glory. The blessed and hopeful relation of believing men to these singular attendants of the divine majesty, rose thus more distinctly into view, and in more obvious connection also with the means, through which the ultimate realization was to be attained. But the information in this line, and by means of these materials, reaches its farthest limit, when, in the Apocalyptic vision of a triumphant church, the four

and twenty elders, who represent her, are seen sitting in royal state and crowned majesty close beside the throne, with the cherubic forms in and around it. *There*, at last, the ideal and the actual freely meet together—the merely symbolical representatives of the life of God, and its real possessors, the members of a redeemed and glorified church. And the inspiring element of the whole, that which at once explains all and connects all harmoniously together, is the central object appearing there of “a Lamb, as if it had been slain, in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders.” Here the mystery resolves itself; in this consummate wonder all other wonders cease, all difficulties vanish. The Lamb of God, uniting together heaven and earth, human guilt and divine mercy, man’s nature and God’s perfections, has opened a pathway for the fallen to the very height and pinnacle of created being. With him in the midst, as a sun and shield, there is ground for the most secure standing, and the closest fellowship with God.

We must glance, however, at the other kinds of agency connected with the cherubim. In the first vision of Ezekiel, it is by their appearance, which we have already noticed, not by their agency, properly speaking, that they convey instruction regarding the character of the manifestations of himself, which the Lord was going to give through the prophet. But at ch. x. 7, where the approaching judgment upon Jerusalem is symbolically exhibited by the scattering of coals of fire over the city, the fire is represented as being taken from between the cherubim, and by the hand of one of them given to the ministering angel to be cast forth upon the city. It was thus indicated—so far we can easily understand the vision—that the coming execution of judgment was not only to be of God, but of him in connection with the full consent and obedient service of the holy powers and agencies around him. And the still more specific indication might be intended to be given, that as the best interests of humanity required the work of judgment to be executed, so a fitting human instrument should be found for the purpose. The wrath of God, represented by the coals of fire, should be put in force by an earthly agency, represented by the cherub’s hand that ministered them.

An entirely similar action, differing only in the form it assumes,

is connected with the cherubim in ch. xv. of Revelation, where one of the living creatures is represented as giving into the hands of the angels the seven last vials of the wrath of God. The rational and living creaturehood of earth, in its state of alliance and fellowship with God, thus appeared to go along with the concluding judgments, which were necessary to bring the evil in the world to a perpetual end. Nor is the earlier and more prominent action ascribed to them materially different—that connected with the seven-sealed Book. This book, viewed generally, unquestionably represents the progress and triumph of Christ's kingdom upon earth over all that was there naturally opposed to it. The first seal, when opened, presents the divine king riding forth in conquering power and majesty; the last exhibits all prostrate and silent before him. The different seals, therefore, unfold the different stages of this mighty achievement; and as they successively open, the living creatures successively proclaim, Come and see. The work, in its fundamental character, was the going forth of the energetic and judicial agency of God upon the sinfulness of the world, for the purpose of subduing it to himself, of establishing righteousness and truth among men, and bringing the actual state of things on earth into conformity with what is ideally right and good. Who, then, should announce and herald such a work, if not the ideal creatures, in which earthly forms of being appeared replete with the life of God, and in closest contact with his throne? Such might be said to be *their* special interest and business. And hence, though there were only four of them in the vision, (with some reference, perhaps, to the four corners of the earth),¹ and so one for but the first four seals of the book; yet rather than introduce any less fitting agency, it was

¹ We say only *perhaps*; for though Hengstenberg and others lay much stress upon the number *four*, as the signature of the earth, yet there being only two in the tabernacle, would seem to indicate that nothing material depends on the number. We think, that the increase from the original two to four may, with more probability of truth, be accounted for historically. When the temple was built, two cherubim of immense proportions were put into the most Holy Place, and under these were placed the ark with its old and smaller cherubim: So that there were henceforth actually four cherubim over the ark. And as the form of Ezekiel's vision, in its leading elements, was evidently taken from the temple, and John's again from that, it seems quite natural to account for the four in this way.

deemed better to leave the three remaining seals without any separate heralding of their own.

We can discern the same leading characteristics in the further use made of the cherubic imagery in the Apocalypse. They are represented as ceaselessly proclaiming, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was and is, and is to come," thereby shewing it to be their calling to make known the absolute holiness of God, as infinitely removed, not merely from the natural, but also, and still more, from the moral imperfections and evils of creation. In their ascriptions of praise, too, they are represented not only as giving honour and glory, but also thanks to Him that sitteth on the throne, and as joining with the elders in the new song that was sung to the Lamb for the benefits of his salvation (Rev. iv. 9 ; v. 8). So that they plainly stand related to the redemptive as well as the creative work of God. And yet in all, from first to last, only ideal representatives of what pertains to God's kingdom on earth, not as substantive existences themselves possessing it. They belong to the imagery of faith, not to her abiding realities. And so, when the ultimate things of redemption come, their place is no more found. They hold out the lamp of hope to fallen man through the wilderness of life, pointing his expectations to the better country. But when this country breaks upon our view—when the new heavens and the new earth supplant the old, then also the ideal gives way to the real. We see another paradise, with its river and tree of life, and a present God, and a presiding Saviour, and holy angels, and a countless multitude of redeemed spirits rejoicing in the fulness of blessing and glory provided for them ;—but no sight is anywhere to be seen of the cherubim of glory. They have fulfilled the end of their temporary existence ; and when no longer needed, vanish like the guiding stars of night before the bright sunshine of eternal day.

To sum up, then : The cherubim were in their very nature and design artificial and temporary forms of being—uniting in their composite structure the distinctive features of the highest kinds of creaturely existence on earth—man's first and chiefly. They were set up for representations to the eye of faith of earth's living creaturehood, and more especially of its rational and immortal, though fallen head, with reference to the better hopes and destiny in prospect. From the very first they gave promise of a restored

condition to the fallen ; and by the use afterwards made of them, the light became clearer and more distinct. By their designations, the positions assigned them, the actions from time to time ascribed to them, as well as their own peculiar structure, it was intimated, that the good in prospect should be secured, not at the expense of, but in perfect consistence with the claims of God's righteousness,—that restoration to the holiness must precede restoration to the blessedness of life ; and that only by being made capable of dwelling beside the presence of the only Wise and Good, could man hope to have his portion of felicity recovered. But all this, they further betokened, it was in God's purpose to have accomplished, and in the process to raise humanity to a higher than its original destination ; in its standing nearer to God, and greatly ennobled in its powers of life and capacities of working.

Before passing from the subject of the cherubim, we must briefly notice some of the leading views that have been entertained by others respecting them. These will be found to rest upon a part merely of the representations of Scripture to the exclusion of others, and most commonly to a neglect of what we hold it to be of especial moment to keep prominently in view—the historical use of the cherubim in Scripture. That such must be the case with an opinion once very prevalent both among Jews and Christians, and not without its occasional advocates still,¹ which held them to be celestial existences, or more specifically angels, is obvious at first sight. For, the component parts of the cherubic appearance being all derived from the forms of being which have their local habitation on earth, it is terrestrial, as contradistinguished from celestial objects, which we are necessitated to think of. And their original position at the east of Eden would have been inexplicable, as connected with a religion of hope, if celestial and not earthly natures had been represented in them. The natural conclusion in that case must have been, that the way of life was finally lost for man. In the Apocalypse, too, they are expressly distinguished from the angels ; and in ch. v. the living creatures and the elders form one distinct chorus (v. 8), while the angels form another (v.

¹ Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.* Introd.—partially adopted also, and especially in regard to the cherubim of Eden, by Mr Mills in his recent work on *Sacred Symbology*, p. 136.

11). There is more of verisimilitude in another, and at present more prevalent opinion, that the cherubim represent the church of the redeemed. This opinion has often been propounded, and quite recently has been set forth in a separate work on the cherubim.¹ It evidently fails, however, to account satisfactorily for their peculiar structure, and is of a too concrete and specific character to have been represented by such ideal and shifting formations as the cherubim of Scripture. These are more naturally conceived to have had to do with natures than with persons. Besides, it is plainly inconsistent with the place occupied by the cherubim in the Apocalyptic vision, where the four-and-twenty crowned elders obviously represent the church of the redeemed. To ascribe the same office to the cherubim would be to suppose a double and essentially different representation of the same object. To avoid this objection, Vitringa (*Obs. Sac.* i. 846) modified the idea so as to make the cherubim in the Revelation (for he supposed those mentioned in *Gen.* iii. 24, to have been angels) the representatives of such as hold stations of eminence in the church, evangelists and ministers, as the elders were of the general body of believers. But it is an entirely arbitrary notion, and destitute of support in the general representations of Scripture; as indeed is virtually admitted by the learned author, in so peculiarly connecting it with the vision of St John. An opinion which finds some colour of support only in a single passage, and loses all appearance of probability when applied to others, is self-confuted.

It was the opinion of Michaelis, an opinion bearing a vivid impress of the general character of his mind, that the cherubim were a sort of "thunder-horses" of Jehovah, somewhat similar to the horses of Jupiter among the Greeks. This idea has so much of a heathen aspect, and so little to give it even an apparent countenance in Scripture, that no further notice need be taken of it. More acceptance on the continent has been found for the view of Herder, who regards the cherubim as originally feigned monsters, like the dragons or griffins, which were the fabled guardians among the ancients of certain precious treasures. Hence, he thinks, the cherubim are represented as first of all appointed to keep watch at the closed gates of paradise; and for the same rea-

¹ *Doctrine of the Cherubim*, by George Smith, F.A.S.

son were afterwards placed by Moses in the presence-chamber of God, which the people generally were not permitted to enter. Latterly, however, he admits they were differently employed, but more after a poetical fashion, and as creatures of the imagination. This admission obviously implies, that the view will not stand an examination with all the passages of Scripture bearing on the subject. Indeed, we shall not violate the truth if we say, that it can stand an examination with none of them. The cherubim were not set up even in Eden as formidable monsters to fray sinful man from approaching it. They were not needed for such a purpose, as this was sufficiently effected by the flaming sword. Nor were they placed at the door, or about the threshold of the sanctuary, to guard its sanctity, as on that hypothesis they should have been, but formed a part of the furniture of its innermost region. And the later notices of the cherubim in Scripture, which confessedly present them in a different light, are not by any means independent and arbitrary representations ; they have a close affinity, as we have seen, with the earlier statements ; and we cannot doubt that the same fundamental character is to be found in all the representations.

Spencer's idea of the cherubim was of a piece with his views generally of the institutions of Moses : they were of Egyptian origin, and were formed in imitation of those monstrous compounds which played so prominent a part in the sensuous worship of that cradle of superstition and idolatry. Such composite forms, however, were by no means so peculiar to Egypt as Spencer represents. They were common to heathen antiquity, and are even understood to have been more frequently used in the East than in Egypt. Nor is it unworthy of notice, that of all the monstrous combinations which are mentioned in ancient writings, and which the more successful investigations of later times have brought to light from the remains of Egyptian idolatry, not one has an exact resemblance to the cherub ; the four creature-forms combined in it seem never to have been so combined in Egypt ; and the only thing approaching to it yet discovered, is to be found in India. It is quite gratuitous, therefore, to assert that the cherubim were of Egyptian origin. But even if similar forms had been found there, it would not have settled the question, either as to the proper origin, or the real nature of the cherubim. If they

were placed in Eden after the fall, they had a known character and habitation in the world many centuries before Egypt had a being. And then, whatever composite images might be found in Egypt, or other idolatrous nations, these, in accordance with the whole character of heathen idolatry, which was essentially the deification of nature, must have been representations of the Godhead itself, as symbolized by the objects of nature, while the cherubim are uniformly represented as separate from God, and as ministers of righteousness before him. So well was this understood among the Israelites, that even in the most idolatrous periods of their history, the cherubim never appear among the instruments of their false worship. This separate and creaturely character of the cherubim is also fatal to the opinion of those who regard them as "emblematical of the ever-blessed Trinity in covenant to redeem man," which is, besides, utterly at variance with the position of the cherubim in the temple—for how could God be said to dwell between the ever-blessed Trinity?¹ And the same objections apply to another opinion, closely related to this, according to which the cherubim represent, not the Godhead personally, but the attributes and perfections of God; are held to be symbolical personifications of these as manifested in God's works and ways. This view has been adopted with various modifications by persons of great name, and of very different tendencies—such as Philo, Grotius, Bochart, Rosenmüller, De Wette; but it is not supported, either by the fundamental nature of the cherubim, or by their historical use. We cannot perceive, indeed, how the cherubim could really have been regarded as symbols of the divine perfections, or personifications of the divine attributes, without falling under the ban of the second commandment. It would surely have been an incongruity to have forbidden, in the strongest terms and with the severest penalties, the making of any likeness of God, and, at the same time, to have set up certain symbolical images of his perfections in the very region of his pre-

¹ It is Parkhurst, and the Hutchinsonian school, who are the patrons of this ridiculous notion. Horsley makes a most edifying improvement upon it, with reference to modern times: "The cherub was a compound figure, the calf (of Jeroboam) single. Jeroboam, therefore, and his subjects were Unitarians!"—(Works, vol. viii. 241). He forgot, apparently, that there were four parts in the cherub; so that not a trinity, but a quaternity, would have been the proper co-relative under the Gospel.

sence, and in immediate contact with his throne. No corporeal representation could consistently be admitted there of any thing but what directly pointed to creaturely existences, and their relations and interests. And the nearest possible connection with God, which we can conceive the cherubim to have been intended to hold, was that of shadowing forth how the creatures of his hand, and (originally) the bearers of his image on earth, might become so replenished with his spirit of holiness as to be, in a manner, the shrines of his indwelling and gracious presence.

Bähr, in his *Symbolik*, approaches more nearly to this view than any of the preceding ones, and theoretically avoids the more special objection we have urged against it; but it is by a philosophical refinement too delicate, especially without some accompanying explanation, to catch the apprehension of a comparatively unlearned and sensuous people. The cherubim, he conceives, were images of the creation in its highest parts—combining, in a concentrated shape, the most perfect forms of creature-life on earth—and, as such, serving as representatives of all creation. But the powers of life in creation are the signs and witnesses of those which, without limit or imperfection, are in God; and so, the relative perfection of life exhibited in the cherubim symbolized the absolute perfection of life that is in God—his omniscience, his peerless majesty, his creative power, his unerring wisdom. The cherub was not an image of the Creator, but it was an image of the Creator's manifested glory. We say, this is far too refined and shadowy a distinction to lie at the base of a popular religion, and to serve for instruction to a people surrounded on every hand by the gross forms and dense atmosphere of idolatry. It could scarcely have failed, in the circumstances, to lead to the worship of the cherubim, as, reflectively at least, the worthiest representations of God which could be conceived by men on earth. But, if this evil could have been obviated, which we can only think of as an inseparable consequence, there is another and still stronger attaching to the view, which we may call an inseparable ingredient. For, if the cherubim were representatives of created life, and thence factitious witnesses of the Creator's glory—if such were the sum and substance of what was represented in them, then it was, after all, but a symbol of things in nature; and, unlike all the other symbols in the religion of the Old Testament, it

would have borne no respect to God's work, and character, and purposes of grace. That religion was one essentially adapted to the condition, the necessities, and desires of fallen man ; and the symbolical forms and institutions belonging to it bear respect to God's nature and dealings, not so much in connection with the gifts and properties of creation, as with the principles of righteousness and the hopes of salvation. If the cherubim are held to be symbolical only of what is seen of God in nature, they stand apart from this properly religious province ; they have no real adaptation to the circumstances of a fallen world ; they have to do simply with creative, not with redemptive manifestations of God ; and, so far as *they* are concerned, the religion of the Old Testament would after all have been, like the different forms of heathenism, a mere nature-religion. No further proof, surely, is needed of the falseness of the view in question ; for, in a scheme of worship so wonderfully compact, and skilfully arranged toward a particular end, the supposition of a heterogeneous element at the centre necessarily carries its own refutation along with it.

We have already referred to the view of Hengstenberg, and shewn its incompatibility to some extent with the scriptural representations. His opinions upon this subject, indeed, appear to have been somewhat fluctuating. In one of his earlier productions, his work on the Pentateuch, he expresses his concurrence with Bähr, and even goes so far as to say, that he regarded Bähr's treatment of the cherubim as the most successful part of the *Symbolik*. Then in his *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, he gave utterance to an opinion, at variance with the radical idea of Bähr, that the cherubim had a connection, both in nature and origin, with the sphinxes of Egypt. And in his work on the Revelation, he expressly opposes Bähr's view, and holds that the living forms in the cherubim were merely the representation of all that is living on the earth. But representing the higher things on earth, they also naturally serve as representations of the earth itself ; and God's appearing enthroned above the cherubim symbolized the truth, that he is the God of the whole earth, and has every thing belonging to it, matter and mind, subject to his control. As mentioned before, this view, if correct, would have required the position of the cherubim to be always very distinctly and manifestly below the throne of God—which, however, it does not ap-

pear to have been, except when the manifestation described was primarily for judgment. It leaves unexplained also the prominence given in the cherubic delineations to the form and likeness of man, and the circumstance that the cherubim should, in the Revelation, be nearer to the throne than the elders—placing, according to that view, the creation merely as such, nearer than the church. But the representation errs, rather as giving a partial and limited view of the truth, than maintaining what is absolutely contrary to it. It approaches, in our judgment, much nearer to the right view than that more recently set forth by Delitzsch, who considers the cherubim as simply the bearers of Jehovah's chariot, and as having been placed originally at the eastern gate of Paradise, as if to carry him aloft to heaven for the execution of judgment, should mankind proceed farther in the course of iniquity. A poetical notion certainly ! but leaving rather too much to the imagination for so early an age, and scarcely taking the form best fitted for working either on men's fears or hopes ! What Adam dreaded when he sinned, was not God's going to heaven to inflict punishment, but his coming down from heaven to reckon with him for his guilt. And though, in later times, the cherubim are represented as leaving the temple, preparatory to the execution of judgment, yet this was only to indicate that the temple had now become a common place—a doomed, because a corrupt habitation ; and so abandoned to the destroying influences that were ready to alight on it. But the view seems altogether of an arbitrary and fanciful character, and it is unnecessary to enter more minutely into its refutation.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

SACRIFICIAL WORSHIP.

THE symbols, to which our attention has hitherto been directed, were simply ordinances of teaching. They spake in language not to be mistaken of the righteous character of God, of the evil of sin, of the moral and physical ruin it had brought upon the world, of a purpose of grace and a prospect of recovery—but they did no more. There were no rites of service associated with them; nor of themselves did they call men to embody in any outward action the knowledge and principles they were the means of imparting. But religion must have its active services as well as its teaching ordinances. The one furnish light and direction, only that the other may be intelligently performed. And a symbolical religion, if it could ever be said to exist, could certainly not have perpetuated itself, or kept alive the knowledge of divine truth in the world, without the regular employment of one or more symbolical institutions, fitted for the suitable expression of religious ideas and feelings. Now, the only thing of this description which makes its appearance in the earlier periods of the world's history, and which continued to hold, through all the after stages of symbolical worship, the paramount place, is the rite of sacrifice.

We are not told, however, of the actual institution of this rite in immediate connection with the fall; and the silence of inspired history regarding it till Cain and Abel had reached the season of manhood, and the mention of it then simply as a matter of fact in the narrative of their lives, has given rise to much disputation concerning the origin of sacrifice—whether it was of divine appointment, or of human invention? And if the latter, to what circumstances in man's condition, or to what views and feelings

naturally arising in his mind, might it owe its existence? In the investigation of these questions, a line of inquiry has not unfrequently been pursued by theologians, more befitting the position of philosophical reasoners, than of Christian divines. The solution has been sought for chiefly in the general attributes of human nature, and the practices of a remote and semi-barbarous heathenism, as if Scripture were entirely silent upon the subject till we come far down the stream of time. Discarding such a mode of conducting the investigation, and looking to the notices of Scripture for our only certain light upon the subject, we hope, without material difficulty, to find our way to conclusions on the leading points connected with it, which may be generally acquiesced in as legitimately drawn and firmly established.

1. In regard, first of all, to the divine authority and acceptable nature of worship by sacrifice—which is often mixed up with the consideration of its origin—Scripture leaves very little room for controversy. The only debateable ground, as concerns this aspect of the matter, respects that very limited period of time, which stretches from the fall of Adam to the offerings of Cain and Abel. From this latter period, verging too on the very commencement of the world's history, we are expressly informed that sacrifice of one kind had a recognised place in the worship of God, and met with his acceptance. Not only did Abel appear before God with a sacrificial offering, but by a visible token of approval—conveyed in all probability through some action of the cherubim or the flaming sword, near which, as the seat of the manifested presence of God, the service would naturally be performed—the seal was given of the divine acceptance and blessing. Thenceforth, at least, sacrifice presented after the manner of Abel's might be regarded as of divine authority. It bore distinctly impressed upon it the warrant and approbation of heaven; and whatever uncertainty might hang around it during the brief space which intervened between the fall and the time of Abel's accepted offering, it was from that time determined to be a mode of worship, with which God was well pleased. We might rather say *the* mode of worship; for sacrifice, accompanied, it is probable, with some words of prayer, is the only stated act of worship, by which believers in the earlier ages appear to have given more formal expression to their faith and hope in God. When it is said of the

times of Enos, the grandson of Adam in the pious line of Seth, that "then men began to call upon the name of the Lord," there can be little doubt that they did so after the example of Abel, by the presentation of sacrifice—only, as profiting by the fatal result of his personal dispute with Cain, in a more public and regularly concerted manner. It appears to have been then agreed among the worshippers of Jehovah, what offerings to present, and how to do so; as, in later times, it is frequently reported of Abraham and his family, in connection with their having built an altar, that they then "called upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 4; xxvi. 25). That sacrifice held the same place in the instituted worship of God after the deluge, which it had done before, we learn, first of all, from the case of Noah—the connecting link between the old and new worlds—who no sooner left the ark than he built an altar to the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings of every clean beast and fowl, from which the Lord is said to have smelled a sweet savour. In the delineation given of the earlier patriarchal times in the Book of Job, we find him, not only spoken of as exhibiting his piety in the stated presentation of burnt-offerings, but also as expressly required by God to make sacrifice for the atonement of his friends, who had sinned with their lips in speaking what was not right. And as we have undoubted testimonies respecting the acceptable character of the worship performed by Abraham and his chosen seed, so we learn, that in this worship sacrificial offerings played the principal part, and were even sometimes directly enjoined by God (Gen. xv. 9, 10, 17; xxii. 2, 13; xxxv. 1, &c.)

The very latest of these notices in sacred history carry us up to a period far beyond that to which the authentic annals of any heathen kingdom reach, while the earliest refer to what occurred only a few years subsequent to the fall. From the time of Abel, then, downwards through the whole course of antediluvian and patriarchal history, it appears that the regular and formal worship of God mainly consisted in the offering of sacrifice, and that this was not rendered by a sort of religious venture on the part of the worshippers, but with the known sanction and virtual, if not explicit, appointment of God. As regards the right of men to draw near to God with such offerings, and their hope of acceptance at his hands, no shadow of doubt can fairly be said to rest

upon any portion of the field of inquiry, except what may relate to the worship of the parents themselves of the human family.

2. It is well to keep in view the clear and satisfactory deliverance we obtain on this branch of the subject. And if we could ascertain definitely what were the views and feelings expressed by the worshippers in the kind of sacrifice which *was* accepted by God, the question of its precise origin would be of little moment; since, so recently after the institution of the rite, we have unequivocal evidence of its being divinely owned and approved, as actually offered. But it is here that the main difficulty presents itself, as it is only indirectly we can gather the precise objects for which the primitive race of worshippers came before God with sacrificial offerings. The question of their origin still is of moment for ascertaining this, and, at the same time, for determining the virtue possessed by the offerings in the sight of God. If they arose simply in the devout feelings of the worshipper, they might have been accepted by God as a natural and proper form for the expression of these feelings; but they could not have borne any typical respect to the higher sacrifice of Christ, as, in the things of redemption, type and antitype must be alike of God. And on this point we now proceed to remark negatively, that the facts already noticed concerning the first appearance and early history of sacrifice, present insuperable objections to all the theories which have sought on simply natural grounds to account for its *human* origin.

The theory, for example, which has received the suffrage of many learned men, both in this country and on the continent,¹ and which attempts to explain the rise of sacrifice by a reference to the feelings of men when they were in a kind of bestial roughness, capable of entertaining only the most gross and carnal ideas of God, and consequently disposed to deal with him much as they would have done with a fellow-creature, whose favour they desired to win by means of gifts,—this theory is utterly at variance with the earlier notices of sacrificial worship. It is founded upon a sense of the value of property, and of the effect wont to be produced by gifts of property between man and man, which could

¹ Spencer de Leg. Heb. L. iii. c. 9. So also substantially, Priestly, H. Taylor, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, &c.

not have been acquired at a period when society as yet consisted only of a few individuals, and these the members of a single family. And whether the gift were viewed in the light of a fine, a bribe, or a feast (for each in different hands has had its share in giving a particular shape to the theory), no sacrifice offered with such a view could have met with the divine favour and acceptance. The feeling that prompted it must in that case have been degrading to God, indeed essentially idolatrous ; and the whole history of patriarchal worship, in which God always appears to look so benignly on the offerings of believing worshippers, reclaims against the idea.

Of late, however, it has been more commonly sought to account for the origin of sacrifice, by viewing it as a symbolical act, such as might not unnaturally have suggested itself to men, in any period of society, from the feelings or practices with which their personal experience, or the common intercourse of life, made them familiar. But very different modes of explaining the symbol have been resorted to by those who concur in the same general view of its origination. Omitting the minor shades of difference which have arisen from an undue regard being had to distinctively Mosaic elements, Sykes, in his *Essay on Sacrifice*, raised his explanation on the ground, that "eating and drinking together were the known ordinary symbols of friendship, and were the usual rites of engaging in covenants and leagues." And in this way some plausible things may doubtless be said of sacrifice, as it appeared often in the later ages of heathenism, and also on some special occasions among the covenant people. But nothing that can seem even a probable account is thereby given of the offerings presented by believers in the first ages of the world. For it is against all reason to suppose that such a symbol of friendship should then have been in current use,—not to mention that the offerings of that period seem to have been precisely of the class in which no part was eaten by the worshippers—*holocausts*. Warburton laid the ground more deeply, and with greater show of probability, when he endeavoured to trace the origin of sacrifice to the ancient mode of converse by action, to aid the defects and imperfections of early language,—this being, in his opinion, sufficient to account for men being led to adopt such a mode of worship, whether the sacrifice might be eucharistical, propitiatory, or

expiatory. Gratitude for good bestowed, he conceives, would lead the worshipper to present, by an expressive action, the first-fruits of agriculture or pasturage—the *eucharistical* offering. The desire of the divine favour or protection in the business of life would, in like manner, dispose him to dedicate a portion of what was to be sown or propagated—the *propitiatory*. And for sacrifices of an *expiatory* kind, the sense of sin would prompt him to take some chosen animal, precious to the repenting criminal who deprecated, or supposed to be obnoxious to the Deity who was to be appeased, and slay it at the altar, in an action which, in all languages when translated into words, speaks to this purpose: “I confess my transgressions at thy footstool, O my God; and with the deepest contrition implore thy pardon, confessing that I deserve the death which I inflict on this animal.”¹ If for the infliction of death, which Warburton here represents as the chief feature in the action of expiatory sacrifice, we substitute the pouring out of the blood, or simply the giving away of the life to God, there is no material difference between his view of the origin of such sacrifices, and that recently propounded by Bähr. This ingenious and learned writer rejects the idea of sacrifice having come from any supernatural teaching or special appointment of God, as this would imply that man needed extraneous help to direct him, whether he was to sacrifice, or how he was to do it. He maintains, that “as the idea of God, and its necessary expression, was not something that came upon humanity from without, nothing taught it, but something immediate, an original fact; so also is sacrifice the form of that expression. From the point of view at which *we* are wont to contemplate things, separating the divine from the natural, the spiritual from the corporeal, this form must indeed always present a strange appearance. But if we throw ourselves back on that

¹ Warburton's Div. Legation, B. vii. c. 2. Davison substantially adopts this view, with no other difference than that he conceives it unnecessary to make any account of the defects and imperfections of early language in explaining the origin of sacrifice; but, regarding “representation by action as gratifying to men who have every gift of eloquence,” and “as singularly suited to great purposes of solemnity and impression,” he thinks “not simple adoration, not the naked and unadorned oblations of the tongue, but adoration invested in some striking and significant form, and conveyed by the instrumentality of material tokens, would be most in accordance with the strong energies of feeling, and the insulated condition of the primitive race.” (Inquiry into the Origin and Intent of Sacrifice, p. 19, 20.)

mode of contemplation, which views the divine and spiritual as inseparable from the natural and corporeal, we shall find nothing so far out of the way in man's feeling himself constrained to represent the internal act of the giving up of his whole life and being to the Godhead—and in that all religion lives and moves—through the external giving away of an animal, perhaps, which he loved as himself, or on which he himself lived, and which stood in the closest connection with his own existence.”¹ Something of a like nature (though exhibited in a form decidedly more objectionable) has also received the sanction of Tholuck, who, in the *Dissertation on Sacrifices*, appended to his *Commentary on Hebrews*, affirms, that “an offering was originally a gift to the Deity—a gift by which man strives to make up the deficiency of the always imperfect surrender of himself to God.” And in regard especially to burnt-offerings, he says: “Both objects, that of thanksgiving and of propitiation, were connected with them; on the one hand, gratitude required man to surrender what was external as well as internal, to God; and, on the other hand, the surrender of an outward good was considered as a substitution, a propitiation for that which was still deficient in the internal surrender.”² A salvation, it would seem, by works so far, and only where these failed, a calling in of extraneous and supplementary resources!

These different modes of explanation are obviously one in principle, and are but varying aspects of the same fundamental view. In each form it lies open to three serious objections, which together appear to us quite conclusive against it. 1. First, the analogy of God's method of dealing with his church in the matter of divine worship, at other periods in her history, is opposed to the simply human theory in any of its forms. Certainly at no other era did God leave his people altogether to their own inventions for the discovery of an acceptable mode of approaching him, and of giving expression to their religious feelings. Some indications he has always given of what in this respect might be accordant with his mind, and suitable to the position in which his worshippers stand towards him. The extent to which this directing influence was carried, formed one of the leading characteristics of the dispensation brought in by Moses; the whole

¹ Bähr's *Symbolik*, B. ii. p. 272.

² *Biblical Cabinet*, vol. xxxix. p. 252

field of religious worship was laid under divine prescription, and the inventions of men solemnly interdicted. But even in the dispensation of the Gospel, which is distinguished for the spirituality of its nature, and its comparative freedom from legal enactments and independence of outward forms, the leading ordinances of divine worship are indicated with sufficient plainness, and what has no foundation in the revealed word is expressly denounced as "will-worship." And if the church of the New Testament, with all her advantages of a completed revelation, a son-like freedom, and an unction from the Holy One, that is said to "teach her all things," was not without some direction and control in regard to the proper celebration of God's service, is it conceivable that all should have been left utterly loose and indeterminate, when men were still in the very infancy of a fallen condition, and their views of spiritual truth and duty only in the forming? Where, in that case, would have been God's jealousy for the purity of his church? And where, we may also ask, his compassion toward men? He had disclosed to them purposes of grace, and awakened in their bosoms the hope of a recovery from the ruin they had incurred; but to set them adrift without even pointing to any ordinance fitted to meet their sense of sin, and re-assure their hearts before God, would have been to leave the exhibition of mercy strangely defective and incomplete. For, while they knew they had to do with a God of grace and forgiveness, they should still have been in painful uncertainty how to worship and serve him, so as to get personal experience of his blessing, and how, especially when conscience of sin troubled them anew, they might get the uneasiness allayed. Never surely was the tenderness of God more needed to point the way to what was acceptable and right, than in such a day of small things to the children of hope. And if it had not been shewn, the withholding of it could scarcely seem otherwise than an exception to the general analogy of God's dealings with men. 2. But, secondly, the simply human theory of the origin of sacrifice is met by an unresolved, and, we are persuaded, on that supposition an unresolvable difficulty in respect to the nature of ancient sacrifice. For, as the earliest, and indeed the *only* recorded mode of sacrifice in primitive times, among acceptable worshippers of God, consisted in the offering of slain victims, it seems impossible that this particular form of sacrifice

should have been fallen upon at first, without some special direction from above. Let the symbolical action be viewed in either of the shades of meaning formerly described—as expressive of the offerer's deserved death, or of the surrender of his life to God, or as a propitiatory substitution to compensate for the conscious defect of such surrender—either way, how could he have imagined, that the devoting to death of a living creature of God should have been the appropriate mode of expressing the idea? Death is so familiar to *us*, as regards the inferior creation, and so much associated with the means of our support and comfort, that it might seem a light thing to put an animal to death for any purpose connected with the wants or even the convenience of men. But the first members of the human family were in different circumstances. They must have shrunk—unless divinely authorised—from inflicting death on any, and especially on the higher forms of the animal creation; since death, in so far as they had themselves to do with it, was the peculiar expression of God's displeasure on account of sin. All, indeed, belonging to that creation were to be subject to them. Their appointment from the very first was to subdue the earth, and render everything in it subservient to their legitimate use. But this use did not originally include a right to deprive animals of their life for the sake of food; the grant of flesh for that end was only given at the deluge. And that they should yet have thought it proper and becoming to shed the blood of animals merely to express a religious idea, nay, should have regarded that as so emphatically the appropriate way of worshipping God, that for ages it seems to have formed the more peculiar medium of approach to him, can never be rationally accounted for without something on the part of God directing them to such a course. 3. Finally, the theories now under consideration are still farther objectionable, in that they are confronted by a specific fact, which was evidently recorded for the express purpose of throwing light on the original worship of fallen man, and with which their advocates have never been able to reconcile them—the fact of Abel's accepted offering from the flock, as contrasted with the rejection of Cain's from the produce of the field (Gen. iv. ; Heb. xi. 4). The offerings of the two brothers differed, we are told in the epistle to the Hebrews, and the account in Genesis implies as much, not only in regard to the outward oblation—the

one being a creature with life, the other without it—but also in the principle which moved the two brothers respectively to present them. That principle in Abel was faith ; not this, therefore, but something else in Cain. And as it was faith which both rendered Abel's sacrifice in itself more excellent than Cain's, and drew down upon it the seal of Heaven's approval, the kind of faith meant must obviously have been something more than a general belief merely in the being of God, or his readiness to accept an offering of service from the hands of men. Faith in that sense must have been possessed by him who offered amiss, as well as by him who offered with acceptance. It must have been a more special exercise of faith which procured the acceptance of Abel—faith having respect not simply to the obligation of approaching God with some kind of offering, but to the duty of doing so with a sacrifice like that actually rendered, of the flock or the herd. But whence could such faith have come, if there had not been a testimony or manifestation of God for it to rest upon, which the one brother believingly apprehended, and the other scornfully slighted ? We see no way of evading this conclusion, without misinterpreting and doing violence to the plain import of the account of Scripture on the subject. Taking this in its obvious and natural meaning, Cain is presented to our view as a child of nature, not of grace—as one obeying the impulse and direction only of reason, and rejecting the more explicit light of faith as to the kind of service he presented to his Maker. His oblation is an undoubted specimen of what man could do in his fallen state to originate proper ideas of God, and give fitting expression to these in outward acts of worship. But unhappily for the advocates of nature's sufficiency in the matter, it stands condemned in the inspired record as a presumptuous and disallowed act of will-worship. Abel, on the other hand, appears as one who through grace had become a child of faith, and by faith first spiritually discerning the mind of God, then reverently following the course it dictated, by presenting that more excellent sacrifice (*πλείονα θυσίαν*) of the firstlings of the flock, with which God was well pleased.

On every account, therefore, the conclusion seems inevitable, that the institution of sacrifice must have been essentially of divine origin ; for though we cannot appeal to any record of its direct

appointment by God, yet there are notices concerning sacrificial worship which cannot be satisfactorily explained on the supposition, in any form, of its merely human origin. There is a recorded fact, however, which touches the very borders of the subject, and which, we may readily perceive, furnished a divine foundation on which a sacrificial worship, such as is mentioned in Scripture, might be built. It is the fact noticed at the close of God's interview with our parents after the fall—"And unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skin, and clothed them." The painful sense of nakedness that oppressed them after their transgression, was the natural offspring of a consciousness of sin—an instinctive fear lest the unveiled body should give indication of the evil thoughts and dispositions which now lodged within. Hence, to get relief to this uneasy feeling, they made coverings for themselves of such things as seemed best adapted to the purpose, out of that vegetable world which had been freely granted for their use. They girded themselves about with fig-leaves. But they soon found that this covering proved of little avail to hide their shame, where most of all they needed to have it hidden; it left them miserably exposed to the piercing glance of their offended God. If a real and valid covering should be obtained, sufficient to relieve them of all uneasiness, God himself must provide it. And so he actually did. As soon as the promise of mercy had been disclosed to the offenders, and the constitution of mingled goodness and severity brought in, he made coats to clothe them with, and these coats of skins. But clothing so obtained argued the sacrifice of life in the animal that furnished them; and thus, through the death of an inferior yet innocent living creature, was the needed relief brought to their disquieted and fearful bosoms. The outward and corporeal here manifestly had respect to the inward and spiritual. The covering of their nakedness was a gracious token from the hand of God, that the sin which had alienated them from him, and made them conscious of uneasiness, was henceforth to be in his sight as if it were not; so that in covering their flesh, he at the same time covered their consciences. If viewed apart from this higher symbolical aim, the outward act will naturally appear small and unworthy of God; but so to view it were to dis sever it from the very reason of its performance. It was done purposely to denote

the covering of guilt from the presence of God—an act which God alone *could* have done. But he did it, as we have seen, by a medium of death, by a sacrifice of life in those creatures which men were not yet permitted to kill for purposes of food, and in connection with a constitution of grace, which laid open the prospect of recovered life and blessing to the fallen. Surely it is not attributing to the venerable heads of the human family, persons who had so recently walked with God in paradise, an incredible power of spiritual discernment; or supposing them to stretch unduly the spiritual import of this particular action of God, if we should conceive them turning the divine act into a ground of obligation and privilege for themselves, and saying, Here is heaven's own finger pointing out the way for obtaining relief to our guilty consciences; the covering of our shame is to be found by means of the skins of irrational creatures, slain in our behalf; their life for our lives, their clothing of innocence for our shame; and we cannot err, we shall but shew our faith in the mercy and forgiveness we have experienced, if, as often as the sense of shame and guilt returns upon our consciences, we follow the footsteps of the Lord, and, by a renewed sacrifice of life, clothe ourselves anew with his own appointed badge of acquittal and acceptance.

We are not to be understood as positively affirming that our first parents, and their believing posterity reasoned thus, or that they actually had no more of instruction to guide them. We merely say, that they may quite naturally have so reasoned, and that we have no authority from the inspired record to suppose that any further instruction was communicated. Indeed, nothing more seems strictly necessary for the first beginnings of a sacrificial worship. And it was still but the age for beginnings; in what was taught and done, we should expect to find only the simplest forms of truth and duty. The Gospel, in its clearer announcements, even the law with its specific enactments, would then have been out of place. All that was absolutely required, and all that might be fairly expected, was some natural and expressive act of God toward men, laying, when thoughtfully considered, the foundation of a religious service toward him. The claims of the Sabbathical institution, and of the marriage-union, had a precisely similar foundation—the one in God's personal resting on the seventh day, hallowing and blessing it, the other in his formation

of the first wife out of the first husband. It was simply the divine procedure in these cases which formed the ground of man's obligations—because that procedure was essentially a revelation of the mind and will of Godhead for the guidance of the rational beings who, being made in God's image, were to find their glory and their wellbeing in appropriating his acts, and copying after his example. So here, God's fundamental act in removing and covering out of sight the shame of conscious guilt in the first offenders, would both naturally and rightfully be viewed, as a revelation of God, teaching them, how, in henceforth dealing with him, they were to proceed in effecting the removal of guilt, and appearing, notwithstanding it, in the presence of God. They found, in this divine act, the key to a justified condition, and an acceptable intercourse with heaven. Had they not done so, it would have been incapable of rational explanation, how a believing Abel should so soon have appeared in possession of it. Yet, it could not have been rendered so palpable, as to obtrude itself on the carnal and unbelieving—otherwise, it would scarcely be less capable of explanation, how a self-willed Cain should so soon have ventured to disregard it. The ground of dissension between the two brothers must have been of a somewhat narrower and more debateable character, than if an explicit and formal direction had been given. And in the divine act referred to—viewed in its proper light, and taken in connection with the whole circumstances of the time—there was precisely what might have tended to originate both results; enough of light to instruct the humble heart of faith, mainly intent on having pardon of sin and peace with God, and yet not too much to leave proud and unsanctified nature without an excuse for following a course more agreeable to its own inclinations.¹

¹ Substantially the correct view was presented of this subject in a work of Dr Croly, though, like several other things in the same volume, attended with the twofold disadvantage, of not being properly grounded, and of being encumbered with some untenable positions. "God alone is described as in act, and his only act is that of clothing the two criminals. The whole passage is but one of many, in which a rigid adherence to the text is the way of safety. The literal meaning at once exalts the rite, and illustrates its purposes. . . . Adam in Paradise has no protection from the divine wrath, but he needs none; he is pure. In his hour of crime, he finds the fatal difference between good and evil, feels that he requires protection from the eye of justice, and makes an ineffectual effort to supply that protection by his own means. But the expedient, which

3. We thus hold sacrifice—sacrifice in the higher sense, not as expressive of dependence and thankfulness merely, but as connected with sin and forgiveness, expiatory sacrifice—to have been, as to its foundation, of divine origin. It had its rise in an act of God, done for the express purpose of relieving guilty consciences of their sense of shame and confusion; and from the earliest periods of recorded worship it stands forth to our view as the religious solemnity, in which faith had its most peculiar exercise, and for which God bestowed the tokens of his acceptance and blessing. For the discussion of some collateral points belonging to the subject, and the disposal of a few objections, we refer to the Appendix.¹ And we now proceed here briefly to inquire what sacrifice as thus originating, and thus presented, symbolically expressed? What feelings on the part of the worshipper, what truths on the part of God, did it embody?

Partly, indeed, the inquiry has been answered already. It was impossible to conduct the discussion thus far without indicating the leading ideas involved in primitive sacrifice. It must be remembered, however, that we are still dealing with sacrifice in its simplest and most elementary form—radically, no doubt, the same as it was under the more complex and detailed arrangements of the Mosaic ritual, but in comparison of that wanting much in fulness and variety. As employed by the first race of believing worshippers, a few leading points are all that it can properly be regarded as embracing.

(1.) Both from the manner of its origin, and its own essential nature, as involving in every act of worship the sacrifice of a creature's life, it bore impressive testimony to the sinfulness of the offerer's condition. Those, who presented it, could not but know,

cannot be supplied by man, is finally supplied by the divine interposition. God clothes him, and his nakedness is the source of anguish and terror no more. The contrast of the materials of his imperfect and perfect clothing is equally impressive. Adam, in his first consciousness of having provoked the divine displeasure, covers himself with the frail produce of the ground, the branch and leaf; but from the period of forgiveness, he is clothed with the substantial product of the flock, the skin of the slain animal. If circumstances apparently so trivial, as the clothing of our original parents, are stated, what other reason can be assigned, than that they were *not trivial*, that they formed a marked feature of the divine dispensation, and that they were important to be recorded for the spiritual guidance of man?"—(Divine Providence, p. 194-196.)

¹ Appendix D.

that God was far from delighting in blood, and that death, either in man or beast, was not a thing in which he could be supposed to take pleasure. The explicit connection of death, also, with the first transgression, as the proper penalty of sin, was peculiarly fitted to suggest painful and humiliating thoughts in the minds of those who stood so near to the awful moment of the fall. And when death, under God's own directing agency, was brought so prominently into the divine service, and every act of worship, of the more solemn kind, carried in its bosom the life-blood of an innocent creature, what more striking memorial could they have had of the evil wrought in their condition by sin? With such an element of blood perpetually mingling in their services, they could not forget that they stood upon the floor of a broken covenant, and were themselves ever incurring anew the just desert of sin.

(2.) Then, looking more particularly to the sanction and encouragement of God, given to such a mode of worshipping him, it bespoke their believing conviction of his reconcileable and gracious disposition toward them, notwithstanding their sinfulness. They gave here distinct and formal expression to their faith, that as they needed mercy, so they recognised God as ready to dispense it to those who humbly sought him through this channel of communion. Such a faith, indeed, had been presumption, the groundless conceit of nature's arrogancy or ignorance, if it had not had a divine foundation to rest upon, and tokens of divine acceptance in the acts of service it rendered. But these, as we have seen, it plainly had. So that a sacrificial worship thus performed bore evidence as well to the just expectations of mercy and forgiveness on the part of those who presented it, as to their uneasy sense of guilt and shame, prompting them to do so.

(3.) But, looking again to the original ground and authority of this sacrificial worship,—the act of God in graciously covering the shame and guilt of sin,—and to the seal of acceptance afterwards set so peculiarly and emphatically on it, the great truth was expressed by it, on the part of God, that the taking away of life stood essentially connected with the taking away of sin—or, as expressed in later Scripture, that “without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.” In accordance with the general character of the primeval constitution of things, this truth comes

out, not as a formal enunciation of principle, or an authoritative enactment of Heaven, but as an embodied fact ; a fact, in the first instance, of God's hand, significantly indicating his mind and will, and then believingly contemplated, acted upon, substantially re-enacted by his sincere worshippers, with his clearly marked approval. The form may be regarded as peculiar, but not so the truth enshrined in it. This is common to all times, and, after holding a primary place in every phase of a preparatory religion, it rose at last to a position of transcendent importance in the work and kingdom of Christ. How far Adam and his immediate descendants might be able to descry, under their imperfect forms of worship, and the accompanying intimations of recovery, the ultimate ground in this respect of faith and hope for sinful men, can be to us only matter of vague conjecture, or doubtful speculation. Their views would, perhaps, considerably differ, according as their faith was more or less clear in its discernment, and lively in its perceptions of the truth couched under the symbolical acts and revelations of God. But unless more specific information was given them than is found in the sacred record (and it is mere conjecture to suppose there was more), the anticipations formed even by the most enlightened of those primitive believers, regarding the way and manner in which the blood of sacrifice was ultimately to enter into the plan of God, must have been comparatively vague and indefinite.

(4.) For us, however, who can read the symbol before us by the clear light of the Gospel, and from the high vantage-ground of a finished redemption can look back upon the temporary institutions that foreshadowed it, there is neither darkness nor uncertainty respecting the prophetic import of the primeval rite of sacrifice. We perceive there in the germ the fundamental truth of that scheme of grace which was to provide for the complete and final restoration of a seed of blessing—the truth of a suffering Mediator, giving his life a ransom for many. Here again we behold the ends of revelation mutually embracing and contributing to throw light on each other. And as amid the perfected glories of Messiah's kingdom all appears clustering around the Lamb that was slain, and doing homage to him for his matchless humiliation and triumphant victory, so the earliest worship of a believing church points to his coming sacrifice, as the one ground

of hope and security to the fallen. At a subsequent period, when the church was furnished with a fuller revelation and a more complicated worship, symbolical representations were given of many other and subordinate parts of the work of redemption. But when that worship existed in its simplest form, and embodied only the first elements of the truth, it was meet that what was ultimately to form the groundwork of the whole, should have been alone distinctly represented. And *we* shall not profit, as we should, by the contemplation of that one rite, which stands so prominently out in the original worship of the believing portion of mankind, if it does not tend to deepen upon our minds the peerless worth and importance of a crucified Redeemer, as *the* wisdom and power of God unto salvation.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

THE SABBATICAL INSTITUTION.

THE only remaining fact belonging to primeval history, which might present materials for the construction of a symbolical religion, is that of the day of sacred rest held by God at the close of creation: "And on the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work, which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." (Gen. ii. 2, 3.) This act of God was done in such immediate connection with the work of creation, that the bearing it was intended to have on man must primarily have had respect to his original condition; and if designed to lay the foundation of a stated ordinance, the ordinance must have been one perfectly suited to the region of paradise itself. Yet, a slight reflection could scarcely fail to satisfy a reflective mind, that whatever significance the divine act might possess, and whatever obligation it might carry for man in his primeval state, he should still have found in it, and found increased rather than impaired, when he became involved in the troubles and calamities resulting from the fall.

Now, in the procedure of God, as recorded in the passage cited above, there may be noted a threefold stage, each carrying a separate and important meaning. First, the rest itself; "he rested on the seventh day from all his work;" and in Ex. xxxi. 17, the yet stronger expression is used of God *refreshing* himself on that day. Such expressions do not necessarily imply weariness or fatigue on account of the previous exertion, which, as regards God, is excluded by the infinitude of his perfections. "The Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary" (Isa. xl. 28). They rather imply, that God's working in creation is

of a reasonable kind ; not an aimless activity, beginning and terminating in itself, but in acting toward a specific end, which on seeing accomplished, he withholds the outgoings of his creative energy, that he may rest in what he has done, and rejoice over the work of his hands. The end in this case was more particularly the creation of man with a living soul, bearing the rational and holy image of his Maker, and settled in a condition every way suited to his physical and moral nature. Throughout the whole of its stages the work was perceived to be good ; but it was only when it reached this consummation—when the Creator saw his own image reflected in an intelligent and happy offspring, that he could regard the work as finished and could rest in his love. With the introduction of man into the world creation received its proper crown ; and the Creator at length found among the works of his hands a spirit capable of discerning the manifestations of his glory, and returning love for love. It might be to give some intimation of this, of God's having found it then, and desiring to find it always, that the original seventh day is distinguished from the rest, not merely by the cessation of creative work, but also by the absence of any mention of a morning and an evening, at the beginning and the close ; for the divine Sabbath, as has been remarked by Delitzsch, " has no close ; it stretches over the entire future history of the world ; and is ever seeking to raise this into a participation of the same character with itself." God's rest, no more than his work, is of an exclusive character. It looks benignly and graciously on the creatures, especially on man, who alone of earthly creatures can rise into the conscious apprehension of his Maker. And as God in him, so he again, in God, must find his satisfying and refreshing rest.

Thus, even the first stage of this divine act has respect to man, and still more the second, which points directly and exclusively to him : " And God blessed the seventh day." This blessing of the day is not to be confounded with the sanctifying of it, which immediately follows, as if the meaning were, God blessed it by sanctifying it. The blessing is distinct from the sanctification, and is, so to speak, the settling of a special dowry on it for every one, who should give due heed to its proper end and object. Let man—the divine act of blessing virtually said—only enter into God's mind, and tread in his footsteps, by resting every seventh

day from his works, and he shall undoubtedly find it to his profit ; the blessing, which is life for evermore, shall descend on him. What he may lose for the moment in productive employment, shall be amply compensated by the refreshment it will bring to his frame—by the enlargement and elevation of his soul—above all, by the spiritual fellowship and interest in God, which becomes the abiding portion of those who follow Him in their ways, and perpetually return to Him as the supreme rest of their souls.

Then, the last stage in the procedure of God on this occasion, indicates how the two earlier ones were to be secured : “ He sanctified it,” made it a day of sacredness. Having appointed it to a distinctive end, he conferred on it a distinctive character, that his creature, man, might from time to time be doing in *his* line of things what the Creator had already done in his own—might, after six successive days of work, take one to re-invigorate his frame, to reflect calmly on the past, and view the part he has taken and the relations he occupies on the outward and visible theatre of the world, in the light of the spiritual and the eternal. It was to be his calling and his destiny on earth, not simply to work, but to work as a reasonable and moral being, after the example of his Maker, for specific ends. And for this he needed seasons of quiet repose and thoughtful consideration, not less than time and opportunity for active labour ; as, otherwise, he could neither properly enjoy the work of his hands, nor obtain for the higher part of his nature that nobler good which is required to satisfy it. God, therefore, when he had finished the work of creation by making man, sanctified the seventh day—*his own* seventh, but *man’s* first ; for man had not first to work and then to reap, but as God’s vicegerent, nature’s king and high-priest, could at once enter into his Maker’s heritage of blessing. And henceforth, in the career that lay before him, ever and anon returning from the field of active labour assigned him in cultivating and subduing the earth, he must on the hallowed day of rest gather in his thoughts and desires from the world, and, retiring into God as his sanctuary, hold with him a sabbatism of peaceful and blessed rest.

The divine procedure, then, in every one of its stages, plainly points to man, and aims at his participation in the likeness and enjoyment of God. “ With the Sabbath,” says Sartorius hap-

pily, and we rejoice and hail it as a token for good, that such thoughts on the Sabbath are finding utterance in the high places of Germany—"with the Sabbath begins the sacred history of man—the day on which he stood forth to bless God, and, in company with Eve, entered on his divine calling upon earth. The creation without the creation-festival, the world's unrest without rest in God, is altogether vain and transitory. The sacred day appointed, blessed, consecrated by God, is that from which the blessing and sanctification of the world and time, of human life and human society, proceed. Nor is anything more needed than the recognition of its original appointment and sacred destination, for our receiving the full impression of its sanctity. How was it possible for the first man ever to forget it? From the very beginning was it written upon his heart, Remember the Sabbath-day to sanctify it."¹ There is nothing new in such views. Substantially the same interpretation, that we have given, is put on the original notice in Genesis, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. iv.), where the record of God's rest at the close of creation is referred to as the first form of the promise made to man of entering into God's rest. The record, then, of what God in that respect did, was a revelation. It embodied a promise to man of high fellowship with the Creator in his peculiar felicity, and, consequently, inferred an obligation on man's part both to seek the end proposed, and to seek it in the method of God's appointment. But did the obligation cease when man fell? or was the promise cancelled? Assuredly not—not, at least, after the time that the introduction of an economy of grace laid open for the fallen the prospect of a new inheritance in God. So far from having lost its significance or its value, the Creator's Sabbatism then acquired fresh meaning and importance, and became so peculiarly adapted to the altered condition of the world, that we cannot but regard it as having from the first contemplated the physical and moral evils that were to issue from the fall. In the language of Hengstenberg, with whom we gladly concur on this branch of the subject, though on too many others we shall be constrained to differ from him,—“It pre-supposes work, and such work as has a tendency to draw us away from God. It is the remedy for the in-

¹ Sartorius über den alt und Neu Test. cultus, p. 17.

juries we are apt to incur through this work. If any thing is clear, it is the connection between the Sabbath and the fall. The work which needs intermission, lest the divine life should be imperilled by it, is not—[we would rather say, is not so much]—the cheerful and pleasant employment of which we read in Gen. ii. 15; it is [rather] the oppressive and degrading toil spoken of in Gen. iii. 19, work done in the sweat of the brow, upon a soil that brings forth thorns and thistles.”¹ We would put the statement comparatively, rather than absolutely; for the rest of God being held on the first seventh day of the world’s existence, and the day being immediately consecrated and blessed, it must have had respect to the place and occupation of man even in paradise. Why should work there be supposed to have differed in kind from work elsewhere and since? There could be room only for a difference in degree; and being work from its very nature that led the soul to aim at specific objects, and put forth continuous efforts *ad extra*, it required to be met by a stated periodical institution, that would recall the thoughts and feelings of the soul *ad intra*. Man’s perfection in that original state was only a relative one. It needed certain correctives and stimulants to secure the continued enjoyment of the good belonging to it. It needed, in particular, perpetual access to the tree of life for the preservation of the bodily, and an ever-returning Sabbatism for that of the spiritual life. But if such a Sabbatism was required even for man’s wellbeing in paradise, where the work was so light, and the order so beautiful, how could it be imagined that the Sabbatical institution might be either safely or lawfully disregarded in a world of sorrow, temptation, and hardship?

Was there really, however, *any* Sabbatical institution? There is no command respecting it in this portion of the inspired record. And may not the mention there made of God’s keeping the Sabbath, and blessing and sanctifying the day, have been made simply with a prospective reference to the precept that was ultimately to be imposed on the Israelites? So it has been alleged with endless frequency by those who can find no revelation of the divine will, and no obligation of moral duty excepting what comes in the authoritative form of a command, and it is still substantially reiterated by

¹ Ueber den Tag des Herrn, p. 12.

Hengstenberg, who certainly cannot be charged with such a bluntness of spiritual discernment. We meet the allegation with the statement that has already been repeatedly urged—that it was not yet the time for the formal enactments of law, and that it was by other means man was to learn God's mind and his own duty. The ground of obligation lay in the divine act; the rule of duty was exhibited in the divine example; and these were disclosed to men from the first, not to gratify an idle curiosity, but for the express purpose of leading them to know and do what is agreeable to the will of God. If such means were not sufficient to speak with clearness and authority to men's consciences, then it may be affirmed that the first race of mankind were free from all authoritative direction and control whatever. They were not imperatively bound either to fear God, or to regard man; for excepting in the manner now stated, no general obligations of service were laid on them. But to suppose this; to suppose even in regard to what is written of the original Sabbatism of God, that it did not bear directly upon the privileges and duties of the very first members of the human family, is in truth to make void that portion of revelation—to treat it, where it stands, as a superfluity or a blemish. We cannot so regard it. We hold by the truthfulness and natural import of the divine record. And doing this, we are shut up to the conclusion, that it was at first designed and appointed by God, that mankind should sanctify every returning seventh day, as a season of comparative rest from worldly labour, of spiritual contemplation and religious employment, that so they might cease from their own works and enter into the rest of God.

But we shall not pursue the subject farther at present. We even leave unnoticed some of the objections that have been raised against the existence of a primeval Sabbath, as the subject must again return, and in a more controversial aspect, when we come to consider the place assigned to the law of the Sabbath in the revelation from Sinai. It is enough, at this stage of our inquiry, to have exhibited the foundation laid for the perpetual celebration of a seventh-day Sabbath, in the original act of God at the close of his creation-work. In that we have a foundation broad and large as the theatre of creation itself and the general interests of humanity, free from all local restrictions and national peculiarities. That in the infancy of the world, and during the ages of a remote

antiquity, there would be much simplicity in the mode of its observance, may readily be supposed. Indeed, where all was so simple, both in the state of society and the institutions of worship, the symbolical act itself of resting from ordinary work, and in connection with that, the habit of recognising the authority of God, and realising the divine call to a participation in the blessed rest of the Creator, must have constituted no inconsiderable part of the practical observance of the day. And that this also in process of time should have fallen into general desuetude, is only what might have been expected from the fearful depravity and lawlessness which overspread the earth as a desolation. When men daringly cast off the fear of God himself, they would naturally make light of the privilege and duty set before them of entering into his rest. And considering the disadvantages, both personal and social, which were necessarily connected with a primeval Sabbath, it is not to be wondered at that, besides the original record of its divine origin and authoritative obligation, traces of its early existence should be found only in some occasional notices of history, and in the wide-spread sacredness of the number seven, which has left its impress on the religion and literature of nearly every nation of antiquity. But however neglected or despised, the original fact remains for the light and instruction of the world in all ages ; and there perpetually comes forth from it a call to every one who has ears to hear, to sanctify a weekly rest unto the Lord, and rise to the enjoyment of his blessing.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

TYPICAL THINGS IN HISTORY DURING THE PROGRESS OF THE FIRST
DISPENSATION.

HAVING now considered the typical bearing of the fundamental facts and symbolical institutions belonging to the first dispensation of grace, it remains that we endeavour to ascertain what there might afterwards be evolved of a typical nature during the progress of that dispensation, by means of the transactions and events that took place under it. These, it was already noted in our preliminary remarks, could only be employed to administer instruction of a subsidiary kind. In their remoter reference to gospels, as in their direct historical aspect, they can rank no higher than progressive developements—not laying a foundation, but proceeding on the foundation already laid, and giving to some of the points connected with it a more specific direction, or supplementing them with additional discoveries of the mind and will of God. It is impossible here, any more than in the subjects treated of in the preceding chapters, to isolate entirely the portions that have a typical bearing from others closely connected with them. And even in those which exhibit something of the typical element, it can scarcely be expected, at so early a period in the world's history, to possess much of a precise and definite character; for in type, as in prophecy, the progress must necessarily have been from the more general to the more particular. In tracing this progress, we shall naturally connect the successive developements with single persons or circumstances; yet without thereby meaning to indicate that these are in *every respect* to be accounted typical.

SECTION FIRST.

THE SEED OF PROMISE—ABEL, ENOCH.

THE first distinct appearance of the typical in connection with the period subsequent to the fall, is to be found in the case of Abel; but in that quite generally. Abel was the first member of the promised seed; and through him supplementary knowledge was imparted more especially in one direction, viz. in regard to *the principle of election, which was to prevail in the actual fulfilment of the original promise*. That promise itself, when viewed in connection with the instituted symbols of religion, might be perceived—if very thoughtfully considered—to have implied something of an elective process; but the truth was not clearly expressed. And it was most natural, that the first parents of the human family should have overlooked what but obscurely intimated a limitation in the expected good. They would readily imagine, when a scheme of grace was introduced, which gave promise of a complete destruction of the adversary, with the infliction only of a partial injury on the woman's seed, that the whole of their offspring should attain to victory over the power of evil. This joyous anticipation affectingly discovers itself in the exclamation of Eve at the birth of her first-born son, "I have gotten a man from (or, as it should rather be, with) the Lord"—gratefully acknowledging the hand of God in giving her, as she thought, the commencement of that seed which was assured through divine grace of a final triumph. This she reckoned a real getting—gain in the proper sense—calling her child by a name that expressed this idea (Cain); and she evidently did so by regarding it as the precious gift of God, the beginning and the pledge of the ascendancy that was to be won over the malice of the tempter.¹ Never was mother destined to receive a sorer dis-

¹ I think it quite impossible, in the circumstances, that the faith of Eve should have gone farther than this; as the promise of recovery had as yet assumed only the most

appointment. She did not want faith in the divine word, but her faith was still without knowledge, and she must learn by painful experience how the plan of God for man's recovery was to be wrought out. A like ignorance, though tending now in the opposite direction, again discovers itself at the birth of Abel, whose name (breath, nothingness) seems, as Delitzsch has remarked, to have proceeded from her felt regard to the divine curse, as that given to Cain did from a like regard to the divine promise. It is possible that, between the births of the two brothers, what she had seen of the helpless and suffering condition of infancy in the first-born may have impressed the mind of Eve with such a sense of the evils entailed upon her offspring by the curse, as to have rendered her for the time forgetful of the better things disclosed in the promise. It is possible, also, that the corporeal frame and personal appearance of Abel may have been greatly less prepossessing than those of his brother. However it might be, the name imposed clearly indicates, that Eve associated with this second child her misgivings and fears respecting the future, as she had associated with the first her buoyant hopes and joyful anticipations. The result shewed how little the operations of grace were to pursue the course that might seem accordant with the views and feelings of nature. In particular, it shewed that, so far from the whole offspring of the woman being included, there was from the first to pervade the scheme a principle of election, in virtue of which a portion only, and that by no means the likeliest, according to the estimation of nature, were to inherit the blessing, while the rest should fall in with the designs of the tempter, and be reckoned to him for a seed of cursing. Abel, therefore, in his acceptance with God, in his faith respecting the divine purposes, and his presentation of offerings that drew down the divine favour, stands as the type of an elect seed of blessing—

general aspect; and though it might well have been understood to depend upon the grace and power of God for its accomplishment, yet who, from the revelations actually given, could have anticipated these to manifest themselves in the birth of Jehovah himself as a babe? The supposition of Baumgarten—who here revives the old explanation, “I have gotten a man, Jehovah,” that Eve thought she saw in Cain “the redeeming and coming God,” is arbitrary and incredible. The $\text{יְהוָה יִהְיֶה לִּי$ should be taken as in ch. v. 24, vi. 9, *with, in fellowship with* the Lord; or. as in Judg. viii. 7, *with, with the help of*.

a seed that was ultimately to have its root and its culmination in Him, who was to be peculiarly *the* child of promise. In Cain, on the other hand, the impersonation of nature's pride, waywardness, and depravity, there appeared a representative of that unhappy portion of mankind who should espouse the interest of the adversary, and seek by unhallowed means to establish it in the world.

The brief notices of antediluvian history are evidently framed for the purpose of exhibiting the contrary state and tendencies of these two seeds, and of rendering manifest the mighty difference, which God's work of grace was destined to make in the character and prospects of man. The name given by Eve to her third son (Seth, appointed), with the reason assigned for it, "For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew," bespoke the insight the common mother of mankind had now obtained into this mournful division in her offspring. Cain, she regards as having, in a manner, ceased to belong to her seed; he had become too plainly identified with that of the adversary. He seems now to her view to stand at the head of a God-opposing interest in the world—and, as in contrast to him, the destroyer of the true seed, God is seen mercifully providing another in its room.¹ So that there were again the two seeds in the world, each taking root, and bringing forth fruit after its kind. But how different! On the one hand appears the Cainite section, smitten with the curse of sin, yet proudly shunning the path of reconciliation—retiring to a distance from the emblems of God's manifested presence—building a city, as if to lighten, by the aid of human artifice and protection, the evils of a guilty conscience

¹ It is to be noted, however, that *both* the parents of the human family, Adam as well as Eve, are associated with this seed of blessing. It is a circumstance that has been too much overlooked; but for the very purpose of marking it, a fresh commencement is made at Gen. v. of the genealogical chain that links together Adam and Christ: "This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him. . . . And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth:"—as if his progeny before this were not to be reckoned—the child of grace had perished, and the other in a spiritual sense was not. Adam, therefore, is here distinctly placed at the head of a spiritual offspring—himself the first link in the grand chain of blessing. And the likeness, in which he begat this son—"his own image"—must not be limited, as it too often is, to the corruption that now marred the purity of his nature—as if *his* image stood simply in contrast to God's. It is as the parental head of the whole lineage of grace that he is represented, and such a contrast would here especially be out of place.

and a blighted condition—cultivating with success the varied elements of natural strength and worldly greatness, inventing instruments of music and weapons of war, trampling under foot, as seemed good to the flesh, the authority of heaven and the rights of men, and at last, by deeds of titanic prowess and violence, boldly attempting to bring heaven and earth alike under its sway (Gen. iv. 13–24; vi. 4–6).¹ On the other hand appears the woman's seed of promise, seeking to establish and propagate itself in the earth by the fear of God, and the more regular celebration of his worship (Gen. iv. 26)—trusting for its support in the grace and blessing of God, as the other did in the powers and achievements of corrupt nature—and so, continuing uninterrupted its line of godly descendants, yet against such fearful odds, and at last with such a perilous risk of utter extinction, that divine faithfulness and love required to meet violence with violence, and bring the conflict in its first form to a close by the sweeping desolation of the flood. It terminated, as every such conflict must do, on the side of those who stood in the promised grace and revealed testimony of God. These alone live for ever; and the triumph of all that is opposed to them can be but for a moment.

This seed of the woman, however,—the seed that she produces in faith upon the promise of God, and in which the grace of God

¹ It is in connection with this later development of evil in the Cainites, that Lamech's song is introduced, and with special reference to that portion of his family, who were makers of instruments in brass and iron—instruments, no doubt, chiefly of a warlike kind. It is only by viewing the song in that connection, that we perceive its full meaning, and its proper place, as intended to indicate that the evil was approaching its final stage: "And Lamech said to his wives, Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; Ye wives of Lamech, hearken to my speech. For, men (the word is quite indefinite in the original, and may most fitly be rendered in the plural) I slay for my wound, and young men for my hurt. For, Cain is avenged seven times, and Lamech seventy times seven." He means apparently, that with such weapons as he now had at command, he could execute at will deeds of retaliation and revenge. So that his song may be regarded, to use the words of Drechsler, "as an ode of triumph on the invention of the sword. He stands at the top of the Cainite development, from thence looks back upon the past, and exults at the height it has reached. How far has he got a-head of Cain! what another sort of ancestor he! No longer needing to look up in feebleness to God for protection, he can provide more amply for it himself than God did for Cain's; and he congratulates his wives on being the mothers of such sons. Thus the history of the Cainites began with a deed of murder, and here it ends with a song of murder."

takes vital effect—is found, not only as to its *existence*, to be associated with a principle of election, but also as to the *relative place* occupied by particular members in its line. All have by faith an interest in God, and in consequence triumph over the power of the adversary. But some have a larger interest than others, and attain to a higher victory. There was an election within the election. So it appeared especially in the case of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, and again in Noah, who, as they alone of the antediluvians were endowed with the spirit of prophecy, so they alone, also, are said to have “walked with God” (Gen. v. 22, vi. 9)—an expression never used of any who lived in later times, and denoting the nearest and most confidential intercourse, as if they had all but regained the old paradisiacal freedom of communion with Heaven. And as the divine seal upon this higher elevation of the life of God in their souls, they were both honoured with singular tokens of distinction—the one having been taken, without tasting of death, to still nearer fellowship with God, to abide in his immediate presence (“He was not, for God took him”), and the other became under God the saviour and father of a new world. Of the latter we shall have occasion to speak separately, as there were connected with his case other elements of a typical nature. But in regard to Enoch, as the short and pregnant notice of his life and of his removal out of it, plainly indicates something transcendently good and great, so, we cannot doubt, the contemporaries of the patriarch knew it to be such. They knew—at least they had within their reach the means of knowing—that in consideration of his eminent piety, and of the circumstances of the time in which he lived, he was taken direct to a higher sphere, without undergoing the common lot of mortality. That there should have been but one such case during the whole antediluvian period, could not but be regarded as indicating its exceptional character, and stamping it the more emphatically as a revelation from Heaven. Nor could the voice it uttered in the ears of reflecting men sound otherwise than as a proclamation, that God was assuredly with that portion of the woman’s seed who served and honoured him—that he manifested himself to such, as a chosen people, in another manner than he did to the world, and made them sure of a complete and final victory over all the ma-

lice of the tempter and the evils of sin. If not usually without death, yet notwithstanding it, and through it, they should certainly attain to eternal life in the presence of God.

In this respect Enoch—as being the most distinguished member of the seed of blessing in its earlier division, and the most honoured heir of that life which comes through the righteousness of faith—is undoubtedly to be viewed as a type of Christ. Something he had in common with the line as a whole—he was a partaker of that electing grace and love of God, in virtue of which alone any could rise from the condemnation of sin to the inheritance of life in the divine kingdom. But apart from others in the same line, and above them, he passed to the inheritance by a more direct and triumphant path—a conqueror in the very mode of his transition from time to eternity. These characteristics, which in Enoch's case were broadly marked, though in themselves somewhat general, and incapable of being understood to have reference to a personal Messiah, till such a Messiah had been more distinctly announced, are yet pre-eminently the characteristics of Christ, and in the full and absolute sense could be found only in him. He is, as no other individual among men could be, the seed of the woman, considered as the seed of promise, destined by God's purpose of grace to bruise the head of the tempter, and reverse the process of nature's corruption. In him, as present from the first to the “determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,” was the ultimate root of such a seed to be found which should otherwise have had no existence in the world. He, therefore, beyond all others, was the chosen of God, “his elect in whom his soul delights.” And though to the eye of a carnal and superficial world, which judges only by the appearance, he wanted what seemed necessary to justify his claim to such a position, yet in reality he possessed, and gave infallible proof of his divine connection with the Father, by a faith that never faltered in the hardest trials, a righteousness free from every stain of impurity, and a life that could only underlie for a moment the cloud of death, but even there could see no corruption, and presently rose, as to its proper home, in the regions of eternal light and glory.

With our eyes resting on this exalted object in the ends of time, we have no difficulty in perceiving, that what appeared of supernatural in such men as Abel and Enoch, only foreshadowed

the higher and greater good that was to come. It did, however, foreshadow this—not indeed personally and formally, as if from the appearance of Abel and Enoch a personal Messiah could have been descried, or as if from the incidents in their respective lives, precisely similar ones might have been inferred as likely to happen in the eventful career of the man Christ Jesus. We could not descend thus to individual and personal marks of coincidence between the lives of those early patriarchs and the life of Messiah, without, in the first instance, anticipating the order of Providence, which had not yet directed the eye of the Church to a personal manifestation of Godhead, and then entangling ourselves in endless difficulties of practical adjustment—as in the case of Enoch’s translation, who went to heaven without tasting death, while Christ could not enter into glory till he *had* tasted it. But let those patriarchs be contemplated as the earlier links of a chain, which, from its very nature, must have some higher and nobler termination; let them be viewed as characters that already bore upon them the lineaments, and possessed the beginnings of the new creation; what do they, then, appear but embodied prophecies of a more general kind in respect to “Him who was to come?” They heralded his future redemptive work by exhibiting in part the signs and fruits of its prospective achievements. The beginning was prophetic of the end; for if the one had not been in prospect, the other could not have come into existence. And in their selection by God from the general mass around them, their faith in God’s Word, and their possession of God’s favour and blessing, as outwardly displayed and manifested in their histories, we see struggling, as it were, into being the first elements of that new state and destiny, which were only to find their valid reason, and reach their proper elevation, in the person and kingdom of Messiah.

SECTION SECOND.

NOAH AND THE DELUGE.

THE case of Noah, we have already stated, embodied some new elements of a typical kind, which gave to it the character of a distinct stage in the development of God's work of grace in the world. It did so in connection with the deluge, which had a gracious, as well as a judicial aspect, and, by a striking combination of opposites, brought prominently out the principle, that *the accomplishment of salvation necessarily carries along with it a work of destruction*. This was not absolutely a new principle at the period of the deluge. It had a place in the original promise, and a certain exemplification in the lives of believers from the first. By giving to the prospect of recovery the peculiar form of a bruising of the tempter's head, the Lord plainly intimated, that somehow a work of destruction was to go along with the work of salvation, and was necessary to its accomplishment. No indication, however, was given of the way in which this twofold process was to proceed, or of the nature of the connection between the one part of it and the other. But light to a certain extent soon began to be thrown upon it by the consciousness in each man's bosom of a struggle between the evil and the good—a struggle, which so early as the time of Cain drew forth the divine warning, that either his better part must vindicate for itself the superiority, or it must itself fall down vanquished by the destroyer. Still farther light appeared, when the contending elements grew into two great contending parties, which by an ever-widening breach, and at length by most serious encroachments from the evil on the good, rendered a work of judgment from above necessary to the peace and safety of the believing portion of mankind. The conviction of some approaching crisis of this nature had become so deep in the time of Enoch, that it gave utterance to itself in

the prophecy ascribed in the epistle of Jude to that patriarch : “ Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have committed against him.” The struggle, it was thus announced, should ere long end in a manifestation of God for judgment against the apostate faction, and, by implication, for deliverance to the children of faith and hope.

By the period of Noah’s birth, however, the necessity of a divine interposition had become much greater, and it appeared manifest to the small remnant of believers, that the era of retribution, which they now identified with the era of deliverance, must be at hand. Indication was then given of the state of feeling by the name itself of Noah, with the reason assigned for imposing it, “ This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground, which the Lord hath cursed.” The feeling is too generally expressed, to enable us to determine with accuracy, how the parents of this child might expect their troubles to be relieved through his instrumentality. But we hear, at least, in their words the groaning of the oppressed—the sighing of righteous souls, vexed on account of the evils which were thickening around them, from the unrestrained wickedness of those who had corrupted the earth ; and, at the same time, not despairing, but looking up in faith, and even confident that in the lifetime of that child the God of righteousness and truth would somehow avenge the cause of his elect. Whether they had obtained any correct insight or not, into the way by which the object was to be accomplished, the event proved that the spirit of prophecy breathed in their anticipation. Their faith rested upon solid grounds, and in the hope, which it led them to cherish, they were not disappointed. Salvation *did* come in connection with the person of Noah, and it came in the way of an overwhelming visitation of wrath upon the adversaries.

When we look simply at the outward results produced by that remarkable visitation, they appear to have been twofold—on the one side preservation, on the other destruction. But when we look a little more closely, we perceive, that there was a necessary connection between the two results, and that there was properly but

one object aimed at in the dispensation, though in accomplishing it there was required the operation of a double process. That object was, as stated by St Peter, "the saving of Noah and his house" (1 Pet. iii. 20)—saving them as the spiritual seed of God. But saving them from what? Not surely from the violence and desolation of the waters; for the watery element would then have acted as the preservative against itself, and instead of being saved *by* the water, according to the apostolic statement, the family of Noah would have been saved *from* it.¹ From what, then, were they saved? Undoubtedly from that, which, before the coming of the deluge, formed the real element of danger—the corruption, enmity, and violence of ungodly men. It was this which wasted the church of God, and brought it to the verge of destruction. All was ready to perish. The cause of righteousness had at

¹ I am aware many eminent scholars give a different turn to this expression in the first epistle of Peter, and take the proper rendering to be "saved through (*i. e.* in the midst of) the water"—contemplating the water as the space or region through which the ark was required to bear Noah and his family in safety. So Beza, who says that "the water cannot be taken for the instrumental cause, as Noah was preserved from the water, not by it;" so also Tittmann, Bib. Cab. vol. xviii. p. 251; Steiger in his Comm. with only a minute shade of difference; Robinson, in Lex., and many others. But this view is open to the following objections: 1. The water is here mentioned, not in respect to its several parts, or to the extent of its territory from one point to another, but simply as an instrumental agent. Had the former been meant, the expression would have been "saved through the waters," rather than saved by water. But as the case stood, it mattered nothing, whether the ark remained stationary at one point on the surface of the waters, or was borne from one place to another; so that *through*, in the sense of *passing through*, or *through among*, gives a quite unsuitable meaning. That Noah needed to be saved from the water, rather than by it, is a superficial objection, proceeding on the supposition that the water had the same relation to Noah that it had to the world in general. For him, the water and the ark were essentially connected together; it took both to make up the means of deliverance. In the same sense, and on the same account, we might say of the Red sea, that the Israelites were saved by it; for, though in itself a source of danger, yet as regarded Israel's position, it was really the means of safety (1 Cor. x. 2). 2. The application made by the Apostle of Noah's preservation requires the agency of the water, as well as of the ark, to be taken into account. Indeed, according to the best authorities (which read *ἐκ τοῦ*), the reference in the antitype is specially to the water as the type. But apart from that, baptism is spoken as a *saving*, in consequence of its being a *purifying* ordinance, which implies, as in the deluge, that the salvation be accomplished through means of a destruction. This is virtually admitted by Steiger, who, though he adopts the rendering "through the water," yet in explaining the connection between the type and the antitype, is obliged to regard the water as also instrumental to salvation. "The flood was for Noah a baptism, and as such saved; the same element, water, also saves us now—not, however, as mere water, but in the same quality as a baptism."

length but one efficient representative in the person of Noah ; and he much “ like a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, like a besieged city,”—the object of profane mockery and scorn, taunted, reviled, plied with every weapon fitted to overcome his constancy, and, if not in himself, at least in his family, in danger of suffering shipwreck amid the swelling waves of wickedness around him. It was to save him—and with him, the cause of God—from this source of imminent danger and perdition, that the flood was sent ; and it could only do so, by effectually separating between him and the seed of evil-doers—engulphing *them* in ruin, and sustaining *him* uninjured in his temporary home. So that the deluge, considered as Noah’s baptism, or the means of his salvation from an outward form of spiritual danger, was not less essentially connected with a work of judgment than with an act of mercy. It was by the one, that the other was accomplished ; and the support of the ark on the bosom of the waters, was only a collateral object of the deluge. The direct and immediate object was the extermination of that wicked race, whose heaven-daring impiety and hopeless impenitence was the real danger that menaced the cause and people of God,—“ the destroying of those (to use the language that evidently refers to it in Rev. xi. 18), who destroyed the earth.”

This principle of salvation with destruction, which found such a striking exemplification in the deluge, has been continually appearing anew in the history of God’s dealings among men. It appeared, for example, at the period of Israel’s redemption from Egypt, when a way of escape was opened for the people of God by the overthrow of Pharaoh and his host ; and again at the era of the return from Babylon, when the destruction of the enemy and the oppressor broke asunder the bands with which the children of the covenant were held captive. But it is in New Testament times, and in connection with the work of Christ, that the higher manifestation of the principle appears. Here alone perfection can be said to belong to it. Complete as the work in one respect was in the days of Noah, in another it soon gave unmistakable evidence of its own imperfection. The immediate danger was averted by the destruction of the wicked in the waters of the deluge, and the safe preservation of Noah and his family as a better seed to replenish the depopulated earth. But

it was soon found that the old leaven still lurked in the bosom of the preserved remnant itself; and another race of apostates and destroyers, though of a less ferocious spirit, and under more of restraint in regard to deeds of violence and bloodshed, rose up to prosecute anew the work of the adversary. In Christ, however, the very foundations of evil from the first were struck at, and nothing is left for a second beginning to the cause of iniquity. He came, as foretold by the prophet Isaiah (ch. lxi. 3), "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God," which was, at the same time, to be the "year of his redeemed." And, accordingly, by the work he accomplished on earth, "the prince of this world was judged and cast out" (John xii. 31); or, as it is again written, "principalities and powers were spoiled," and "he that had the power of death destroyed" (Col. ii. 14; Heb. ii. 14), thereby giving deliverance to those who were subject to sin and death. He did this once for all, when he fulfilled all righteousness, and suffered unto death for sin. The victory over the tempter then achieved by Christ, no more needs to be repeated than the atonement made for human guilt; it needs to be appropriated merely by his followers, and made vital in their experience. Satan has no longer any right to exercise lordship over men, and hold them in bondage to his usurped authority; the ground of his power and dominion is taken away, because the condemnation of sin, on which it stood, has been forever abolished. Christ, therefore, at once destroys and saves—saves by destroying—casts the cruel oppressor down from his ill-gotten supremacy, and so relieves the poor, enthralled, devil-possessed nature of man, and sets it into the glorious liberty of God's children.

In the case of the Redeemer himself, this work is absolutely complete; the man Christ Jesus thoroughly bruised Satan under his feet, and won a position where in no respect whatever he could be any more subject to the power of evil. Theoretically, we may say, the work is also complete in behalf of his people; on *his* part, no imperfection cleaves to it. By virtue of the blood of Jesus, the house of our humanity, which naturally stood accursed of God, and was ready to be assailed by every form of evil, is placed on a new and better foundation. It is made holiness to the Lord. The handwriting of condemnation that was

against us, is blotted out. The adversary has lost his bill of indictment; and nothing remains but that the members of the human family should, each for themselves, take up the position secured for them by the salvation of Christ, to render them wholly and for ever superior to the dominion of the adversary. But it is here that imperfection still comes in. Men will not lay hold of the advantage obtained for them by the all-prevailing might and energy of Jesus, or they will but partially receive into their experience the benefits it provides for them. Yet there is a measure of success also here, in the case of all genuine believers. And it is to this branch of the subject more immediately that the apostle Peter points, when he represents Christian baptism as the antitype of the deluge. In the personal experience of believers, as symbolized in that ordinance, there is a re-enacting substantially of what took place in the outward theatre of the world by means of the deluge. "The like figure whereunto (literally, the antitype to which, viz. Noah's salvation by water in the ark) even baptism doth also now save us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter iii. 21). Like the apostle's delineations generally, the passage briefly indicates, rather than explicitly unfolds, the truths connected with the subject. Yet, on a slight consideration of it, we readily perceive, that with profound discernment, it elicits from the ordinance of baptism, as spiritually understood and applied, the same fundamental elements, discovers there the same twofold process, which appeared so strikingly in the case of Noah. Here also there is a salvation finding its accomplishment by means of a destruction—"not the putting away of the filth of the flesh"—not so superficial a riddance of evil, but one of a more important and vital character, bringing "the answer of a good conscience," or the deliverance of the soul from the guilt and power of iniquity. The water of baptism—let the subject be plunged in it ever so deep, or sprinkled ever so much—can no more of itself save him than the water of the deluge could have saved Noah, apart from the faith he possessed, and the preparation it led him to make in constructing and entering into the ark. It was because he held and exercised such faith, that the deluge brought salvation to Noah, while it overwhelmed others in destruction. So is it in baptism, when

received in a spirit of faith. There is in this also the putting off of the old man of corruption—crucifying it together with Christ, and at the same time a rising through the resurrection of Christ to the new and heavenly life, which satisfies the demands of a pure and enlightened conscience. So that the really baptised soul is one in which there has been a killing and a making alive, a breaking up and destroying of the root of corrupt nature, and planting in its stead the seed of a divine nature, to spring, and grow, and bring forth fruit to perfection. In the microcosm of the individual believer, there is the perishing of an old world of sin and death, and the establishment of a new world of righteousness and life everlasting.

Such is the proper idea of Christian baptism, and such would be the practical result were the idea fully realized in the experience of the baptised. But this is so far from being the case, that even the idea is apt to suffer in people's minds from the conscious imperfections of their experience. And it might help to check such a tendency—it might, at least, be of service in enabling them to keep themselves well informed as to what *should* be, if they looked occasionally to what actually was, in the outward pattern of these spiritual things, given in the times of Noah. Are you disinclined, we might say to them, to have the axe so unsparingly applied to the old man of corruption? Think, for your warning, how God spared not the old world, but sent its mass of impurity headlong into the gulph of perdition. Seems it a task too formidable, and likely to prove hopeless in the accomplishment, to maintain your ground against the powers of evil in the world? Think again, for your encouragement, how impotent the giants of wickedness were of old to defeat the counsels of God, or prevail over those who held fast their confidence in his word; with all their numbers and their might, they sunk like lead in the waters, while the little household of faith rode secure in the midst of them. Or, does it appear strange, at times perhaps incredible, to your mind, that *you* should be made the subject of a work which requires for its accomplishment the peculiar perfections of Godhead, while others are left entire strangers to it, and even find the Word of God—the chosen instrument for effecting it—the occasion of wrath and condemnation to their souls? Remember “the few, the eight souls” of Noah's family,

alone preserved amid the wreck and desolation of a whole world—preserved, too, by faith in a word of God, which carried in its bosom the doom of myriads of their fellow-creatures, and so, finding that, which was to others a minister of condemnation, a source of peace and safety to them. Rest assured, that as God himself remains the same through all generations, so his work for the good of men is essentially the same also ; and it ever must be his design and purpose, that Noah's faith and salvation should be perpetually renewing themselves in the hidden life and experience of those who are preparing for the habitations of glory.

SECTION THIRD.

THE NEW WORLD AND ITS INHERITORS—THE MEN OF FAITH.

IN one respect the world seemed to have suffered material loss by the visitation of the deluge. Along with the agents and instruments of evil, there had also been swept away by it the emblems of grace and hope—paradise with its tree of life and its cherubim of glory. We can conceive Noah and his household, when they first left the ark, looking around with melancholy feelings on the position they now occupied, not only as being the sole survivors of a numerous offspring, but also as being themselves bereft of the sacred memorials which bore evidence of a happy past, and exhibited the pledge of a still happier future. An important link of communion with heaven, it might well have seemed, was broken by the change thus brought through the deluge on the world. But the loss was soon fully compensated, and, we may even say, more than compensated, by the advantages conferred on Noah and his seed from the higher relation to which they were now raised, in respect to God and the world. There are three points that here, in particular, call for attention.

1. The first is, the new condition of the earth itself, which immediately appears in the freedom allowed and practised in regard to the external worship of God. This was no longer confined to any single region, as seems to have been the case in the age subsequent to the fall. The cherubim were located in a particular spot, on the east of the garden of Eden; and as the symbols of God's presence were there, it was only natural that the celebration of divine worship should there also have found its common centre. Hence, the two sons of Adam are said to have "*brought* their offerings unto the Lord"—which can scarcely be understood otherwise than as pointing to that particular locality which was hallowed by visible symbols of the Lord's presence, and in the

neighbourhood of which life and blessing still lingered. In like manner, it is said of Cain, after he had assumed the attitude of rebellion, that "he went out from the presence of the Lord," obviously implying that there was a certain region with which the divine presence was considered to be more peculiarly connected, and which can be thought of nowhere else than in that sanctuary on the east of Eden. But with the flood the reason for any such restriction vanished. Noah, therefore, reared his altar, and presented his sacrifice to the Lord where the ark rested. There immediately he got the blessing, and entered into covenant with God—proving that, in a sense, old things had passed away, and all had become new. The earth had risen in the divine reckoning to a higher condition; it had passed through the baptism of water, and was now, in a manner, cleansed from defilement; so that every place had become sacred, and might be regarded as suitable for the most solemn acts of worship.¹

This more sacred and elevated position of the earth after the deluge appears, farther, in the express repeal of the curse originally laid upon the ground for the sin of Adam: "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake" (Gen. viii. 21), was the word of God to Noah, on accepting the first offering presented to him in the purified earth. It is, no doubt, to be understood relatively—not as indicating a *total* repeal of the evil, but only a mitigation of it; yet such a mitigation as would render the earth a much less afflicted and more fertile region than it had been before. But this again indicated that, in the estimation of

¹ If we are right as to the centralization of the primitive worship of mankind (and it seems to be only the natural inference from the notices referred to), then the antediluvian population cannot well be supposed to have been of vast extent, or to have wandered to a very great distance from the original centre. The employment also of a special agency after the flood to disperse the descendants of Noah, and scatter them over the earth, seems to indicate, that an indisposition to go to a distance, a tendency to crowd too much about one locality, was one of the sources of evil in the first stage of the world's history, the recurrence of which well deserved to be prevented, even by miraculous interference; and it is perfectly conceivable, indeed most likely, that the tower of Babel, in connection with which this interference took place, was not intended to be a palladium of idolatry, or a mere freak of ambitious folly, but rather a sort of substitution for the loss of the Edenic symbols, and, as such, a centre of union for the human family. It follows, of course, from the same considerations, that the deluge might not absolutely require, so far as the race of man was concerned, to extend over more than a comparatively limited portion of the earth. But its actual compass is not thereby determined.

Heaven, the earth had now assumed a new position ; that by the action of God's judgment upon it, it had become hallowed in his sight, and was in a condition to receive tokens of the divine beneficence, which had formerly been withheld from it.

2. The second point to be noticed here, is the heirship given of this new world to Noah and his seed—given to them expressly as the children of faith.

Adam, at his creation, was constituted the lord of this world, and had kingly power and authority given him to subdue it and rule over it. But, on the occasion of his fall, this grant, though not formally recalled, suffered a capital abridgment ; since he was sent forth from Eden as a discrowned monarch, to do the part simply of a labourer on the surface of the earth, and with the discouraging assurance, that it should reluctantly yield to him of its fruitfulness. Nor, when he afterwards so distinctly identified himself with God's promise and purpose of grace, by appearing as the head only of that portion of his seed who had faith in God, did there seem any alleviation of the evil ; the curse that rested on the ground rested on it still, even for the seed of blessing (Gen. v. 29), and not they, but the ungodly Cainites, acquired in it the ascendancy of physical force and political dominion.

A change, however, appears in the relative position of things, when the flood had swept with its purifying waters over the earth. Man now rises, in the person of Noah, to a higher place in the world ; yet not simply as man, but as a child of God, standing in faith. His faith has saved him, amid the general wreck of the old world, to become in the new a second head of mankind, and an inheritor of earth's domain, as now purged and rescued from the pollution of evil. "He is made heir," as it is written in Hebrews, "of the righteousness which is by faith,"—heir, that is, of all that properly belongs to such righteousness, not merely of the righteousness itself, but also of the world, which in the divine purpose it was destined to possess and occupy. Hence, as if there had been a new creation, and a new head brought in to exercise over it the right of sovereignty, the original blessing and grant to Adam are substantially renewed to Noah and his family : "And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you, and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon

every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea ; into your hand are they delivered." Here, then, the righteousness of faith received direct from the grace of God the dowry that had been originally bestowed upon the righteousness of nature—not a blessing merely, but a blessing coupled with the heirship and dominion of the world.

There was nothing strange or arbitrary in such a proceeding ; it was in perfect accordance with the great principles of the divine administration. Adam was too closely connected with the sin that destroyed the world, to be invested, even when he had become through faith a partaker of grace, with the restored heirship of the world. Nor had the world itself passed through such an ordeal of purification, as to fit it, in the personal lifetime of Adam, or of his more immediate offspring, for being at all represented in the light of an inheritance of blessing. The renewed title to the heirship of its fulness was properly reserved to the time when, by the great act of divine judgment at the deluge, it had passed into a new condition ; and when one was found of the woman's seed, who had attained in a peculiar degree to the righteousness of faith, and along with the world had undergone a process of salvation. It was precisely such a person that should have been chosen as the first type of the righteousness of faith, in respect to its world-wide heritage of blessing. And having been raised to this higher position, an additional sacredness was thrown around him and his seed :—the fear of them was to be put into the inferior creatures ; their life was to be avenged of every one that should wrongfully take it ; even the life-blood of irrational animals was to be held sacred, because of its having something in common with man's, while their flesh was now freely surrendered to their use :—the whole evidently fitted, and, we cannot doubt, also intended to convey the idea, that man had by the special gift of God's grace been again constituted heir and lord of the world, that, in the words of the Psalmist, "the earth had been given to the children of men," and given in a larger and fuller sense than had been done since the period of the fall.¹

¹ It presents no contrariety to this, when rightly considered, that the Lord should also have connected his purpose of preserving the earth in future with the corruption of man : "And the Lord smelled a sweet savour (viz. from Noah's sacrifice), and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, for the

3. The remaining point to be noticed in respect to this new order of things, is the pledge of continuance, notwithstanding all appearances or threatenings to the contrary, given in the covenant made with Noah, and confirmed by a fixed sign in the heavens. "And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you; from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth. And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant" (more exactly: my bow I have set in the cloud, and it shall be for a covenant-sign,) "between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: and I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh." (Gen. ix. 8-15.)

There can be no doubt, that the natural impression produced by this passage in respect to the sign of the covenant, is, that it now for the first time appeared in the lower heavens. The Lord might, no doubt, then, or at any future time, have taken an existing phenomenon in nature, and by a special appointment made it the instrument of conveying some new and higher meaning to the subjects of his revelation. But, in a matter like the present, when the specific object contemplated was to allay men's fears of the possible recurrence of the deluge, and give them a kind of visible pledge in nature for the permanence of her existing order

imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. viii. 21.) The meaning is, that God delighted so much more in the offerings of righteousness than in the inflictions of judgment, that he would now direct his providence, so as more effectually to secure the former—would not allow the imaginations of man's evil heart to get such scope as they had done before, but perceiving and remembering their native existence in the heart, would bring such remedial influences to work that the extremity of the past should not again return.

and constitution, one cannot perceive how a natural phenomenon, common alike to the antediluvian and the postdiluvian world, could have fitly served the purpose. In that case, so far as the external sign was concerned, matters stood precisely where they were; and it was not properly the sign, but the covenant itself, which formed the guarantee of safety for the future. We incline, therefore, to the opinion that, in the announcement here made, intimation is given of a change in the physical relations or temperature of, at least, that portion of the earth where the original inhabitants had their abode; by reason of which the descent of moisture in showers of rain came to take the place of distillation by dew, or other modes of operation different from the present. The supposition is favoured by the mention only of dew before in connection with the moistening of the ground (Gen. ii. 6); and when rain does come to be mentioned, it is rain in such flowing torrents as seems rather to betoken the outpouring of a continuous stream, than the gentle dropping which we are wont to understand by the term, and to associate with the rainbow.

The fitness of the rainbow in other respects to serve as a sign of the covenant made with Noah, is all that could be desired. There is an exact correspondence between the natural phenomenon it presents, and the moral use to which it is applied. The promise in the covenant was not that there should be no future visitations of judgment upon the earth, but that they should not proceed to the extent of again destroying the world. In the moral, as in the natural sphere, there might still be congregating vapours and descending torrents; indeed, the terms of the covenant imply, that there should be such, and that by means of them God would not fail to testify his displeasure against sin, and keep in awe the workers of iniquity. But there should be no second deluge to diffuse universal ruin; mercy should always so far rejoice against judgment. And so precisely it is in nature with the rainbow, which is formed by the lustre of the sun's rays shining on the dark cloud as it recedes; so that it may fitly be called, in the somewhat poetical language of Lange, "the sun's triumph over the floods; the glitter of his beams imprinted on the rain-cloud as a mark of subjection." How appropriate an emblem of the action of divine grace always returning after wrath! Grace still sparing and preserving even when clouds of judgment have been threat-

ening to desolate and destroy! And as the rainbow throws its radiant arch over the expanse between heaven and earth, and as with a wreath of beauty unites the two together again, after they have been engaged in an elemental war, it strikingly images to the thoughtful eye the essential harmony that is still to subsist between the higher and the lower spheres. Such undoubtedly is its symbolic import, as the sign peculiarly connected with the Noachic covenant; it holds out, by means of its very form and nature, an assurance of God's mercy, as engaged to keep perpetually in check the floods of deserved wrath, and continue to the world the manifestation of his grace and goodness. Such also is the import attached to it, when forming a part of prophetic imagery, in the visions of Ezekiel (ch. i. 28), and of St John (Rev. iv. 3); it is the symbol of grace, as ever ready to return after judgment, and to stay the evil from proceeding so far as to accomplish a complete destruction.

¹ Far too general is the explanation often given of the symbolic import of the rainbow by writers on such topics—as when it is described to be “in general a symbol of God's willingness to receive men into favour again” (Wemyss' *Clavis Symbolica*), or that “it indicates the faithfulness of the Almighty in fulfilling the promises that he has made to his people” (Mill's *Sacred Symbology*). Sound Christian feeling, with something of a poetic eye for the imagery of nature, finds its way better to the meaning—as in the following simple lines of John Newton:—

“ When the sun with cheerful beams
Smiles upon a low'ring sky,
Soon its aspect softened seems,
And a rainbow meets the eye;
While the sky remains serene,
This bright arch is never seen.

Thus the Lord's supporting power
Brightest to his saints appears,
When affliction's threat'ning hour
Fills their sky with clouds and fears;
He can wonders then perform,
Paint a rainbow on the storm.

Favoured John a rainbow saw
Circling round the throne above;
Hence the saints a pledge may draw
Of unchanging covenant-love:
Clouds awhile may intervene,
But the bow shall still be seen.

Yet gracious as this covenant with Noah was, and appropriate and beautiful the sign that ratified it, all bore on it still the stamp of imperfection ; there was an indication and a prelude of the better things needed to make man truly and permanently blessed, not these things themselves. For, what was this new world, which had its perpetuity secured, and over which Noah was set to reign, as heir of the righteousness that is by faith ? To Noah himself, and each one in succession of his seed, it was still a region of corruption and death. It had been sanctified, indeed, by the judgment of God, and as thus sanctified it was not to perish again as it had done before. But this sanctification was only by water—enough to sweep away into the gulf of perdition the mass of impurity that festered on its surface, but not penetrating inwards, to the elements of evil which were bound up with its very framework. Another agency, more thoroughly pervasive in its nature, and in its effects more nobly sublimating, the agency of fire, is required to purge out the dross of its earthliness, and render it a home and an inheritance fit for those who are made like to the Son of God (2 Pet. iii. 7–13). And Noah himself, though acknowledged heir of the righteousness by faith, and receiving on it the seal of heaven, in the salvation granted to him and his household, yet how far from being perfect in that righteousness, or by this salvation placed beyond the reach of evil ! How mournfully did he afterwards fall under the power of temptation ! and how much of the serpent's seed still lurked in the members of his household ! High, therefore, as Noah stood compared with those who had gone before him, he was after all but the representative of an imperfect righteousness, and the heir of a corruptible and transitory inheritance. He was the type, but no more than the type, of Him who was to come—in whom the righteousness of God should be perfected, salvation should rise to its higher sphere, and all, both in the heirs of glory, and the inheritance they are to occupy, should by the baptism of fire be rendered incorruptible and undefiled, and fading not away.

SECTION FOURTH.

THE CHANGE IN THE DIVINE CALL FROM THE GENERAL TO THE PARTICULAR
—SHEM, ABRAHAM.

THE obvious imperfections just noticed, both in the righteousness of the new head of the human family, and in the constitution of the world over which he was placed, clearly enough indicated, that the divine plan had only advanced a stage in its progress, but had by no means reached its perfection. As the world, however, in its altered condition, had become *naturally* superior to its former state, so—in necessary and causal connection with this—it was to stand superior to it also in a *spiritual* respect: secured against the return of a general perdition, it was also secured against the return of universal apostacy and corruption. The cause of righteousness was not to be trodden down as it had been before, nay, was to hold on its way and ultimately rise to the ascendant in the affairs of men.

Not only was this pre-supposed in the covenant of perpetuity established for the world, as the internal ground on which it rested, but it was also distinctly announced by the father of the new world, in the prophetic intimation he gave of the future destinies of his children. It was a melancholy occasion which drew this prophecy forth, as it was alike connected with the mournful backsliding of Noah himself, and the wanton indecency of his youngest son. When Noah recovered from his sin, and understood how this son had exposed, while the other two had covered his nakedness, he said, “Cursed is Canaan; a servant of servants (*i. e.* a servant of the lowest grade) shall he be to his brethren. And he said, Blessed is the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in

the tents of Shem ; and Canaan shall be his servant" (Gen. ix. 25-27).

There are various points of interest connected with this prophecy, and the occurrence that gave rise to it, which it does not fall within our province to notice. But the leading scope of it, as bearing on the prospective destinies of mankind, is manifestly of a hopeful description ; and in that respect it differs materially from the first historical incident, that revealed the conflict of nature and grace in the family of Adam. The triumph of Cain over righteous Abel, and his stout-hearted resistance to the voice of God, gave ominous indication of the bad pre-eminence which sin was to acquire, and the fearful results which it was to achieve in the old world. But the milder form of this outbreak of evil in the family of Noah, the immediate discouragement it meets with from the older members of the family, the strong denunciation it draws down from the venerable parent, above all, the clear and emphatic prediction it elicits of the ascendancy of the good over the evil in these seminal divisions of the human family, one and all perfectly accorded with the better state to which the world had now risen ; they bespoke the cheering fact, that righteousness should now hold its ground in the world, and that the dominant powers and races should be in league with it, while servility and degradation should rest upon its adversaries.

This, any one may see at a glance, is the general tendency and design of what was uttered on the occasion ; but there is a marked peculiarity in the form given to it, such as plainly intimates the commencement of a change in the divine economy. There is a striking particularism in the prophetic announcement. It does not, as previously, give forth broad principles, or foretel merely general results of evil and of good ; but it explicitly announces—though still, no doubt, in wide and comprehensive terms—the characteristic outlines of the future state and relative positions of Noah's descendants. Such is the decided tendency here to the particular, that in the dark side of the picture, it is not Ham, the offending son and the general head of the worse portion of the postdiluvian family, who is selected as the special object of vengeance, nor the sons of Ham generally, but specifically Canaan, who, it seems all but certain, was the youngest son (Gen. x. 6). Why this son, rather than the offending father, should have been

singled out for denunciation, has been ascribed to various reasons ; and resort has not unfrequently been had to conjecture, by supposing that this son may probably have been present with the father, or some way participated with him in the offence. Even, however, if we had been certified of this participation, it could at most have accounted for the introduction of the name of Canaan, but not for that being substituted in the room of the father's. Nor can we allow much more weight to another supposition, that the omission of the name of Ham may have been intended for the very purpose of proving the absence of all vindictive feeling, and shewing that these were the words, not of a justly indignant parent giving vent to the emotions of the passing moment, but of a divinely inspired prophet calmly anticipating the events of a remote futurity. Undoubtedly such is their character ; but no extenuating consideration of this kind is needed to prove it, if we only keep in view the judicial nature of this part of the prophecy. The curse pronounced is not an ebullition of wrathful feeling, not a wish for the infliction of evil, but the announcement of a doom, or punishment for a particular offence ; and one that was to take, as so often happens in divine chastisements, the specific form of the offence committed. Noah's affliction from the conduct of Ham was in the most peculiar manner to find its parallel in the case of Ham himself : He, the youngest son of Noah,¹ had proved a vexation and disgrace to his father, and in meet retaliation his own youngest son was to have his name in history coupled with the most humiliating and abject degradation.

It was, therefore, in the first instance at least, for the purpose of marking more distinctly the connection between the sin and its punishment, that Canaan only was mentioned in the curse. Viewed as spoken to Ham, the word virtually said, I am pained to the heart on account of you, my youngest son, and you in turn, shall have good cause to be pained on account of your youngest son—your own measure shall be meted back with increase to

¹ Gen. ix. 24. The expression in the original is בְּנֵי יָחִיד, and is the same that is applied to David in 1 Sam. xvii. 14. There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that it means youngest, and not tender or dear, as some would take it. It is not so expressly said, that Canaan was Ham's youngest son, but the inference that he was such is fair and natural, as he is mentioned last in the genealogy, ch. x. 6, where no sufficient reason can be thought of for deviating from the natural order.

yourself. It may be true—as Hävernäck states in his Introduction to the Pentateuch—that the curse, properly belonging to Ham, was to concentrate itself in the line of Canaan; and, beyond doubt, it is more especially in connection with that line that Scripture itself traces the execution of the curse. But these are somewhat remote and incidental considerations; the more natural and direct is the one already given—which Hofmann, we believe, was the first to suggest.¹ And as the word took the precise form it did, for the purpose more particularly of marking the connection between the sin and the punishment, it plainly indicated, that the evil could not be confined to the line of Ham's descendants by Canaan; the same polluted fountain could not fail to send forth its bitter streams also in other directions. The connection is entirely a moral one. Even in the case of Canaan there was no arbitrary and hapless appointment to inevitable degradation and slavery; as is clearly proved by the long forbearance and delay in the execution of the threatened doom, expressly on the ground of the iniquity of the people not having become full, and also from the examples of individual Canaanites, who rose even to distinguished favour and blessing, such as Melchizedec and Rahab in earlier, and the Syrophenician woman in later times. Noah, however, saw with prophetic insight, that in a general point of view the principle should here hold, like father like child; and that the irreverent and wanton spirit, which so strikingly betrayed itself in the conduct of the progenitor, should infallibly give rise to an offspring, whose dissolute and profligate manners would in due time bring upon them a doom of degradation and servitude. Such a posterity, with such a doom, beyond all question were the Canaanites, to whom we may add also the Tyrians and Sidonians, with their descendants the Carthaginians. The connection of sin and punishment might be traced to other sections besides, but it is not necessary that we pursue the subject farther.

Our course of inquiry rather leads us to notice the turn the prophecy takes in regard to the other side of the representation, and to mark the signs it contains of a tendency toward the particular, in connection with the future developement of the scheme

¹ Weissagung und Erfüllung, i. p. 89.

of grace. This comes out first and pre-eminently in the case of Shem: "And he said, Blessed is (or be) Jehovah, the God of Shem,"—a blessing not directly upon Shem, but upon Jehovah as his God! Why such a peculiarity as this? No doubt, in the first instance, to make the contrast more palpable between this case and the preceding; the connection with God, which was utterly wanting in the one, presenting itself as everything, in a manner, in the other. Then, it proclaims the identity as to spiritual state between Noah and Shem, and designates this son as in the full sense the heir of blessing: "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem." My God is also the God of my son; I adore him for himself; and now, before I leave the world, declare him to be the covenant God of Shem. Nor of Shem only as an individual, but as the head of a certain portion of the world's inhabitants. It was with this portion that God was to stand in the nearest relation. Here he was to find his peculiar representatives, and his select instruments of working among men—here emphatically were to be the priestly people. A spiritual distinction, therefore—the highest spiritual distinction, a state of blessed nearness to God, and special interest in his fulness—is what is predicated of the line of Shem. And in the same sense, namely, as denoting a fellowship in this *spiritual* distinction, should that part of the prophecy on Japheth also be understood, which points to a connection with Shem: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem." It obviously, indeed, designates his stock generally as the most spreading and energetic of the three—pre-eminently, so far as concerns diffusive operations and active labour in occupying the lands and carrying forward the business of the world—and thus naturally tending, as the event has proved, to push their way, even in a civil and territorial respect, into the tents of Shem. This last thought may therefore not unfairly be included in the compass of the prediction, but it can at most be regarded as the subordinate idea. The prospect, as described from the sacred heights of prophecy, of dwelling in the tents of Shem, must have been eyed, not as an intrusive conquest on the part of Japheth, subjecting Shem in a measure to the degrading lot of Canaan, but rather as a sacred privilege—an admission of this less honoured race under the shelter of the same divine protection, and into the partnership of the same ennobling benefits with him-

self. In a word, it was through the line of Shem that the gifts of grace and the blessings of salvation were more immediately to flow—the Shemites were to have them at first hand ; but the descendants of Japheth were also to participate largely in the good. And by reason of their more extensive ramifications and more active energies, were to be mainly instrumental in working upon the condition of the world.

It is evident, even from this general intimation of the divine purposes, that the more particular direction which was now to be given to the call of God, was not to be particular in the sense of *exclusive*, but particular only for the sake of a more efficient working and a more expansive result. The exaltation of Shem's progeny into the nearest relationship to God, was not that they might keep the privilege to themselves, but that first getting it, they should admit the sons of Japheth, the inhabitants of the isles, to share with them in the boon, and spread it as wide as their scattered race should extend. The principle announced was *an immediate particularism for the sake of an ultimate universalism*. And this change in the manner of working was not introduced arbitrarily, but in consequence of the proved inadequacy of the other, and, as we may say, more natural course that had hitherto been pursued. Formally considered, the earlier revelations of God made no difference between one person and another, or even between one stem and another. They spoke the same language, and held out the same invitations to all. The weekly call to enter into God's rest—the promise of victory to the woman's seed—the exhibition of grace and hope in the symbols at the east of Eden—the instituted means of access to God in sacrificial worship—even the more specific promises and pledges of the Noachic covenant, were offered and addressed to men without distinction. Practically, however, they narrowed themselves ; and when the effect is looked to, it is found that there was only a portion, an elect seed, that really had faith in the divine testimony, and entered into possession of the offered good. Not only so, but there was a downward tendency in the process. The elect seed did not grow as time advanced, but proportionally decreased ; the cause and party that flourished was the one opposed to God's. And the same result was beginning to take place after the flood, as is evident from what occurred in the family of Noah itself, and from other notices

of the early appearance of corruption. The tendency in this direction was too strong to be effectually met by such general revelations and overtures of mercy. The plan was too vague and indeterminate. A more specific line of operations was needed—from the particular to the general; so that a certain amount of good, within a definite range, might in the first instance be secured; and that from this, as a fixed position, other advantages might be gained, and more extensive results achieved.

It is carefully to be noted, then, that a comprehensive object was as much contemplated in this new plan as in the other; it differed only in the mode of reaching the end in view. The earth was to be possessed and peopled by the three sons of Noah; and of the three Shem is the one who was selected as the peculiar channel of divine gifts and communications—but not for his own exclusive benefit; rather to the end that others might share with him in the blessing. The real nature and bearing of the plan, however, became more clearly manifest, when it began to be actually carried into execution. Its proper commencement dates from the call of Abraham, who was of the line of Shem, and in whom, as an individual, the purpose of God began practically to take effect. Why the divine choice should have fixed specially upon him as the first individual link in this grand chain of providences, is not stated; and from the references subsequently made to it, we are plainly instructed to regard it as an example of the absolutely free grace and sovereign election of God (Josh. xxiv. 2; Neh. ix. 7.) That he had nothing whereof to boast in respect to it, we are expressly told; and yet we may not doubt, that in the line of Shem's posterity, to which he belonged, there was more knowledge of God, and less corruption in his worship, than among other branches of the same stem. Hence, perhaps, as being addressed to one, who was perfectly cognizant of what had taken place in the history of his progenitors, the revelation made to him takes a form, which bears evident respect to the blessing pronounced on Shem, and appears only, indeed, as the giving of a more specific direction to Shem's high calling, or chalking out a definite way for its accomplishment. Jehovah was the God of Shem—that in the word of Noah was declared to be his peculiar distinction. In like manner Jehovah from the first made himself known to Abraham as his God, nay even took the name of "God

of Abraham" as a distinctive epithet, and made the promise, "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee," a leading article in the covenant established with him. And as the peculiar blessing of Shem was to be held with no exclusive design, but that the sons of Japheth far and wide might share in it, so Abraham is called, not only to be himself blessed, but also that he might be a blessing; a blessing to such an extent, that those should be blessed who blessed him, and in him all the families of the earth should be blessed. Yet with this general similarity between the earlier and the later announcement, what a striking advance does the divine plan now make in breadth of meaning and explicitness of purpose? How wonderfully does it combine together the little and the great, the individual and the universal? Its *terminus a quo* the son of a Mesopotamian shepherd; and its *terminus ad quem* the entire brotherhood of humanity, and the round circumference of the globe! What a divine-like grasp and expansiveness! The very projection of such a scheme bespoke the infinite understanding of Godhead; and minds altogether the reverse of narrow and exclusive, minds attuned to noble aims and inspired by generous feeling, alone could carry it into execution.

By this call Abraham was raised to a very singular pre-eminence, and constituted in a manner the root and centre of the world's future history, as concerns the attainment of real blessing. Still, even in that respect not exclusively. The blessing was to come chiefly to Abraham and through him; but, as already indicated also in the prophecy on Shem, others were to stand, though in a subordinate rank, on the same line; since those also were to be blessed who blessed him; that is, who held substantially the same faith, and occupied the same friendly relation to God. The cases of such persons in the patriarch's own day, as his kinsman Lot, who was not formally admitted into Abraham's covenant, and still more of Melchizedec, who was not even of Abraham's line, and yet individually stood in some sense higher than Abraham himself, clearly shewed, and were no doubt partly provided for the express purpose of shewing, that there was nothing arbitrary in Abraham's position, and that the ground he occupied was to a certain extent common to believers generally. The peculiar honour conceded to him was, that the great trunk of blessing was to be of him, while only some isolated twigs or scattered

branches were to be found elsewhere ; and even these could only be found, by persons coming, in a manner, to make common cause with him. In regard to himself, however, the large dowry of good conveyed to him in the divine promise could manifestly not be realised through himself personally. There could at the most be but a beginning made in his own experience and history ; and the widening of the circle of blessing to other kindreds and regions, till it reached the most distant families of the earth, could only be effected by means of those who were to spring from him. Hence, the original word of promise, which was “ in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed,” was afterwards changed into this, “ in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed” (Gen. xxii. 18.)

Yet the original expression is not without an important meaning, and it takes the two, the earlier as well as the later form, to bring out the full design of God in the calling of Abraham. From the very nature of the case, first, as having respect to so extensive a field to be operated on, and then from the explicit mention of the patriarch's seed in the promise, no doubt whatever could be entertained, that the good in its larger sense was to be wrought out, not by himself individually and directly, but by him in connection with the seed to be given to him. And when the high character, as well as the comprehensive reach of the good was taken into account, it might well have seemed, as if even that seed were somehow going to have qualities associated with it, which he could not perceive in himself—as if another and higher connection with the heavenly and divine should in due time be given to it, than any he was conscious of enjoying in his state of noblest elevation. We, at least, know from the better light we possess, that such actually was the case ; that the good promised neither did, nor could have come into realization but by a personal commingling of the divine with the human ; and that it has become capable of reaching to the most exalted height, and of diffusing itself through the widest bounds, simply by reason of this union in Christ. He, therefore, is the essential kernel of the promise ; and the seed of Abraham, rather than Abraham himself, was to have the honour of blessing all the families of the earth. This, however, by no means makes void the *in thee* of the original promise ; for by so expressly connect-

ing the good with Abraham, as well as with his seed, the organic connection was marked between the one and the other, and the things that belonged to him were made known as the beginning of the end. The blessing to be brought to the world through his line had even in his time a present though small realization—precisely as the kingdom of Christ had its commencement in that of David, and the one ultimately merged into the other. And so, in Abraham as the living root of all that was to follow, the whole and every part may be said to take its rise; and not only was Christ after the flesh of the seed of Abraham, but each believer in Christ is a son of Abraham, and the entire company of the redeemed shall have their place and their portion with Abraham in the kingdom of God.

Such being the case with the call of Abraham—in its objects so high, and its results so grand and comprehensive,—it is manifest, that the immediate limitations connected with it, in regard to a fleshly offspring and a worldly inheritance, must only have been intended to serve as temporary expedients and fit stepping-stones for the ulterior purposes in view. And such statements regarding the covenant with Abraham, as that it merely secured to Abraham a posterity, and to that posterity the possession of the land of Canaan for an inheritance, on the condition of their acknowledging Jehovah as their God, is to read the terms of the covenant with a microscope—magnifying the little, and leaving utterly unnoticed the great—in the preliminary means losing sight of the prospective end.¹ Another thing also, and one more closely connected with our present subject, is equally manifest; which is, that since the entire scheme of blessing had its root in Abraham, it must also have had its representation in him—he, in his position and character and fortunes must have been the type of that which was to come. Such uniformly is God's plan, in respect to those whom it constitutes heads of a class, or founders of a particular dispensation. It was so, first of all, with Adam,

¹ This is precisely what is done in a late volume, *Israel after the Flesh*, by Mr William H. Johnstone—p. 7, 8. He appears also to slump together the covenant with Abraham and the covenant at Sinai, as if the one were simply a renewal of the other. And this notwithstanding the distinction drawn so pointedly between them in the epistle to the Galatians, and while the author, too, professes to have gone to work with the thorough determination to be guided only by Scripture!

in whom humanity itself was imaged. It was so again in a measure with the three sons of Noah, whose respective states and procedure gave prophetic indication of the more prominent characteristics that should distinguish their offspring. Such, too, at a future period, and much more remarkably, was the case with David, in whom, as the beginning and root of the everlasting kingdom, there was presented the foreshadowing type of all that should essentially belong to the kingdom, when represented by its divine head, and set up in its proper dimensions. Nor could it now be properly otherwise with Abraham. The very terms of the call, which singled him out from the mass of the world, and set him on high, constrain us to regard him as in the strictest sense a representative man—in himself and the things belonging to his immediate heirs, the type at once of the subjective and the objective design of the covenant, or, in other words, of the kind of persons who were to be the subjects and channels of blessing; and of the kind of inheritance with which they were to be blessed. It is for the purpose of exhibiting this clearly and distinctly, and thereby rendering the things written of Abraham and his immediate offspring a revelation, in the strictest sense, of God's mind and will regarding the more distant future, that this portion of patriarchal history was constructed. Abraham himself, in the first instance, was the covenant head and the type of what was to come; but as the family of the Israelites were to be the collective bearers and representatives of the covenant, so, not Abraham alone, but the whole of their immediate progenitors, who were alike heads of the covenant-people,—besides Abraham, Isaac also, and Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs, possess a typical character. It shall be our object, therefore, in the two remaining sections—which must necessarily be rather long ones—to present the more prominent features of the instruction intended to be conveyed in both of the respects now mentioned—first in regard to the subjects and channels of blessing, and then in regard to the inheritance destined for their possession.

SECTION FIFTH.

THE SUBJECTS AND CHANNELS OF BLESSING—ABRAHAM AND ISAAC,
JACOB AND THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

WHILE we class the whole of these together, on account of their being alike covenant heads to the children of Israel, who became in due time the covenant-people, we are not to lose sight of the fact, that Abraham was more especially the person in whom the covenant had its original root and representation. It is in his case, accordingly, that we might expect to find, and that we actually have, the most specific and varied information respecting the nature of the covenant, and the manner in which it was to reach its higher ends. We shall therefore look, in the first instance, to what is written of him, coupling Isaac, however, with him ; since what is chiefly interesting and important about Isaac concerns him as the seed, for which Abraham was immediately called to look and wait ; so that, as to the greater lines of instruction, which are all we can at present notice, the lives of the two are knit inseparably together. And the same is, to a considerable extent, the case also with Jacob and the twelve patriarchs. The whole may be said to be of one piece, viewed as a special instruction for the covenant-people, and through them for the church at large, in respect to her calling and position in the world.

I. Abraham, then, is called to be in a peculiar sense the possessor and dispenser of blessing ; to be himself blessed, and through the seed that is to spring from him, to be a blessing to the whole race of mankind. A divine-like calling and destiny ! for it is God alone who is properly the source and giver of blessing. Abraham, therefore, by his very appointment, is raised into a supra-natural relationship to God ; he is to be in direct communication with heaven, and to receive all from above ; God is to work,

in a special manner, for him and by him ; and the people that are to spring out of him, for a blessing to other peoples, are to arise, not in the ordinary course of nature, but above and beyond it, as the benefits also they should be called to diffuse belong to a higher region than that of nature. As a necessary counterpart to this, as the indispensable condition of its accomplishment, there must be in Abraham a principle of faith, such as might qualify him for transacting with God, in regard to the higher things of the covenant. These were not seen or present, and were also strange, supernatural, to the eye of flesh unlikely or even impossible—yet were not the less to be anticipated as certain on the testimony of God, and looked, waited, or, if need be, also striven and suffered for. This principle of faith must evidently be the fundamental and formative power in Abraham's bosom—the very root of his new being, the life of his life—at once making him properly receptive of the divine goodness, and readily obedient to the divine will—in the one respect giving scope for the display of God's wonders in his behalf, and in the other prompting him to act in accordance with God's righteous ends and purposes. So it actually was. Abraham was pre-eminently a man of faith—so pre-eminently as to gain the title of the Father of the Faithful. And faith in him proved not only a handle to receive, but a hand also to work ; and is scarcely less remarkable for what it brought to his experience from the grace and power of God, as for the sustaining, elevating, and sanctifying influence which it shed over his life and conduct. There are particularly three stages, each rising in succession above the other, in which it is important for us to mark this.

1. The first is that of the divine call itself, which came to Abraham while still living among his kindred in the land of Mesopotamia. (Gen. xii. 1-3.) Even in this original form of the divine purpose concerning him, the supernatural element is conspicuous. To say nothing of its more general provisions, that he, a Mesopotamian shepherd, should be made surpassingly great, and should even be a source of blessing to all the families of the earth—to say nothing of these, which might appear incredible only from their indefinite vastness and comprehension, the two specific promises in the call, that a great nation should be made of him, and that another land—presently afterwards determined to be the

land of Canaan—should be given him for an inheritance, both lay beyond the bounds of the natural and the probable. At the time the call was addressed to Abraham, he was already seventy-five years old, and his wife Sarah, being only ten years younger, must have been sixty-five. (Gen. xii. 5, xvii. 17.) For such persons to be constituted parents, and parents of an offspring that should become a great nation, involved at the very outset a natural impossibility, and could only be made good by a supernatural exercise of divine omnipotence—a miracle. Nor was it materially different in regard to the other part of the promise; for it is expressly stated, when the precise land to be given was pointed out to him, that the Canaanite was then in the land. (Gen. xii. 6.) It was even then an inhabited territory, and by no ordinary concurrence of events could be expected to become the heritage of the yet unborn posterity of Abraham. It could only be looked for as the result of God's direct and special interposition in their behalf.

Yet, incredible as the promise seemed in both of its departments, Abraham believed the word spoken to him; he had faith to accredit the divine testimony, and to take the part which it assigned him. Both were required—a receiving of the promise first, and then an acting with a view to it; for, on the ground of such great things being destined for him, he was commanded to leave his natural home and kindred, and go forth under the divine guidance to the new territory to be assigned him. In this command was discovered the inseparable connection between faith and holiness; or between the call of Abraham to receive distinguishing and supernatural blessing, and his call to lead a life of supernatural and distinguishing holiness. He was singled out from the world's inhabitants to begin a new order of things, which were to bear throughout the impress of God's special grace and almighty power; and he must separate himself from the old things of nature, to be in his life the representative of God's holiness, as in his destiny he was to be the monument of God's power and goodness.

It is this exercise of faith in Abraham which is first exhibited in the epistle to the Hebrews, as bespeaking a mighty energy in its working; the more especially as the exchange in the case of

Abraham and his immediate descendants did not prove by any means agreeable to nature. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place, which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise." It may seem, indeed, at this distance of place and time, as if there were no great difference in the condition of Abraham and his household, in the one place as compared with the other. But it was quite otherwise in reality. They had, first of all, to break asunder the ties of home and kindred, which nature always feels painful, especially in mature age, even though it may have the prospect before it of a comfortable settlement in another region. This sacrifice they had to make in the fullest sense; it was in *their* case a strictly final separation; they were to be absolutely done with the old and its endearments, and to cleave henceforth to the new. Nor only so, but their immediate position in the new was not like that which they had before in the old; settled possessions in the one, but none in the other; in their stead mere lodging-room among strangers, and a life on providence. Nature does not love a change like that, and can only regard it as quitting the certainties of sight for the seeming *uncertainties* of faith and hope. These, however, were still but the smaller trials which Abraham's faith had to encounter; for, along with the change in his outward condition, there came responsibilities and duties altogether alien to nature's feelings, and contrary to its spirit. In his old country he followed his own way, and walked after the course of the world, having no special work to do, nor any calling of a more solemn kind to fulfil. But now, by obeying the call of heaven, he was brought into immediate connection with a spiritual and holy God, became charged, in a manner, with his interest in the world, and bound, in the face of surrounding enmity or scorn, faithfully to maintain his cause, and promote the glory of his name. To do this was in truth to renounce nature, and rise superior to it. And it *was* done, let it be remembered, out of regard to prospects which could only be realized, if the power of God should forsake its wonted channels of working, and perform what the carnal mind would have deemed

it infatuation to look for. Even in that first stage of the patriarch's course, there was a noble triumph of faith, and the earnest of a life replenished with the fruits of righteousness.

It is true, the promise thus given at the commencement was not uniformly sustained ; and Abraham was not long in Canaan till there *seemed* to be a failure on the part of God toward him, and there actually *was* a failure on his part toward God. The occurrence of a famine leads him to take refuge for a time in Egypt, which was even then the granary of that portion of the east, and he is tempted, through fear for his personal safety, to equivocate regarding Sarah, and call her his sister. The equivocation is certainly not to be justified, either on this or on the future occasion on which it was again resorted to ; for, though it contained a half truth, this was so employed as to render "the half truth a whole lie." We are rather to refer both circumstances—his repairing to Egypt, and when there betaking to such a worldly expedient for safety—as betraying the imperfection of his faith, which had strength to enable him to enter on his new course of separation from the world and devotedness to God, but still wanted clearness of discernment and implicitness of trust, sufficient to meet the unexpected difficulties that so early presented themselves in the way. Strange indeed had it been otherwise. It was necessary that the faith of Abraham, like that of believers generally, should learn by experience, and even grow by its temporary defeats. The first failure on the present occasion stood in his seeking relief from the emergency that arose by withdrawing, without the divine sanction, to another country than that into which he had been conducted by the special providence of God. Instead of looking up for direction and support, he betook to worldly shifts and expedients, and thus became entangled in difficulties, out of which the immediate interposition of God alone could have rescued him. In this way, however, the result proved beneficial. Abraham was made to feel, in the first instance, that his backsliding had reprovved him ; and then the merciful interposition of Heaven, rebuking even a king for his sake, taught him the lesson, that with the God of heaven upon his side, he had no need to be afraid for the outward evils that might beset him in his course. He had but to look up in faith, and get the direction or support that he needed.

The conduct of Abraham, immediately after his return to Canaan, gave ample evidence of the general steadfastness and elevated purity of his course. Though travelling about as a stranger in the land, he makes all around him feel, that it is a blessed thing to be connected with him, and that it would be well for them if the land really were in his possession. The quarrel that presently arose between Lot's herdsmen and his own, merely furnished the occasion for his disinterested generosity, in waiving his own rights, and allowing to his kinsman the priority and freedom of choice. And another quarrel of a graver kind, that of the war between the four kings in higher Asia, and of the five small dependent sovereigns in the south of Canaan, drew forth still nobler manifestations of the large and self-sacrificing spirit that filled his bosom. Regarding the unjust capture of Lot as an adequate reason for taking part in the conflict, he went courageously forth with his little band of trained servants, overthrew the conquerors, and recovered all that had been lost. Yet, at the very moment he displayed the victorious energy of his faith, by discomfiting this mighty army, how strikingly did he, at the same time, exhibit its patience in declining to use the advantage he then gained to hasten forward the purposes of God concerning his possession of the land, and its moderation of spirit, its commanding superiority to merely worldly ends and objects, in refusing to take even the smallest portion of the goods of the king of Sodom ! Nay, so far from seeking to exalt self by pressing outward advantages and worldly resources, his spirit of faith, leading him to recognise the hand of God in the success that had been won, causes him to bow down in humility, and do homage to the Most High God in the person of his priest Melchizedec. He gave this Melchizedec tithes of all, and as himself the less, received blessing from Melchizedec as the greater.

Viewed thus merely as a mark of the humble and reverent spirit of Abraham, the offspring of his faith in God, this notice of his relation to Melchizedec is interesting. But other things of a profounder nature were wrapt up in the transaction, which the pen of inspiration did not fail afterwards to notice (Ps. cx. 4 ; Heb. vii.), and which it is proper to glance at before we pass on to another stage of the patriarch's history. The extraordinary circumstance of such a person as a priest of the Most High God,

whom even Abraham acknowledged to be such, starting up all at once in the devoted land of Canaan, and vanishing out of sight almost as soon as he appeared, has given rise, from the earliest times, to numberless conjectures. Ham, Shem, Noah, Enoch, an angel, Christ, the Holy Spirit, have each, in the hands of different persons, been identified with this Melchizedec; but the view now almost universally acquiesced in is, that he was simply a Canaanite sovereign, who combined with his royal dignity as king of Salem¹ the office of a true priest of God. No other supposition, indeed, affords a satisfactory explanation of the narrative. The very silence observed regarding his origin, and the manner of his appointment to the priesthood, was intentional, and served to draw more particular attention to the facts of the case, as also to admit of a closer correspondence with the ultimate realities. The more remarkable peculiarity was, that to this person, simply because he was a righteous king and priest of the Most High God, Abraham, the elect of God, the possessor of the promises, paid tithes, and received from him a blessing—and did it, too, at the very time he stood so high in honour, and kept himself so carefully aloof from another king then present—the king of Sodom. He placed himself as conspicuously below the one personage as he raised himself above the other. Why should he have done so? Because Melchizedec already in a measure possessed what Abraham still only hoped for—he reigned where Abraham's seed were destined to reign, and exercised a priesthood which in future generations was to be committed to them. The union of the two in Melchizedec was in itself a great thing—greater than the separate offices of king and priest in the houses respectively of David and Aaron; but it was an expiring

¹ No stress is laid on the particular place of which he was king, excepting that in the epistle to the Hebrews, its meaning (Peace) is viewed as emphatic;—only, however, for the purpose of bringing out the idea, that this singular person was really what his name and the name of his place imported. He was in reality a righteous king, and a prince of peace. But there seems good reason to believe the Jewish tradition well-founded, that it is but the abbreviated name of Jerusalem. Hence the name Salem is also applied to it in Ps. lxxvi. 3. And the correctness of the opinion is confirmed by the mention of the king's dale, in Gen. xiv. 17, which from 2 Sam. xviii. 18 can scarcely be supposed to have been far from Jerusalem. The name also of Adonizedec, synonymous with Melchizedec, as that of the king of Jerusalem in Joshua's time (Jos. x. 3), is a still farther confirmation.

greatness ; it was like the last blossom on the old rod of Noah, which thenceforth became as a dry tree. In Abraham, on the other hand, was the germ of a new and higher order of things ; the promise, though still only the budding promise, of a better inheritance of blessing ; and when the seed should come, in whom the promise was more especially to stand, then the more general and comprehensive aspect of the Melchizedec order was to re-appear—and reappear in one who could at once place it on firmer ground, and carry it to unspeakably higher results. Here, then, was a sacred enigma for the heart of faith to ponder, and for the spirit of truth gradually to unfold : Abraham, in one respect, relatively great, and in another relatively little ; personally inferior to Melchizedec, and yet the root of a seed that was to do for the world incomparably more than Melchizedec had done ; himself the type of a higher than Melchizedec, and yet Melchizedec a more peculiar type than he ! It was a mystery that could be disclosed only in partial glimpses beforehand, but which now has become comparatively plain by the person and work of Immanuel. What but the wonder-working finger of God could have so admirably fitted the past to be such a singular image of the future !

There are points connected with this subject that will naturally fall to be noticed at a later period, when we come to treat of the Aaronic priesthood, and other points also, though of a minor kind, belonging to this earlier portion of Abraham's history, which we cannot particularly notice. We proceed to the second stage in the developement of his spiritual life.

2. This consisted in the establishment of the covenant between him and God ; which falls, however, into two parts—one earlier in point of time, and in its own nature incomplete ; the other, both the later and the more perfect form.

It would seem, as if after the stirring transactions connected with the victory over Chedorlaomer and his associates, and the interview with Melchizedec, the spirit of Abraham had sunk into depression and fear ; for the next notice we have respecting him represents God as appearing to him in vision, and bidding him not to be afraid, since God himself was his shield and his exceeding great reward. It is not improbable that some apprehension of a revenge on the part of Chedorlaomer might haunt his

bosom, and that he might begin to dread the result of such an unequal contest as he had entered on with the powers of the world. But it is clear also, from the sequel, that another thing preyed upon his spirits, and that he was filled with concern on account of the long delay that was allowed to intervene before the appearance of the promised seed. He still went about childless; and the thought could not but press upon his mind, of what use were other things to him, even of the most honourable kind, if the great thing, on which all his hopes for the future turned, were still withheld? The Lord graciously met this natural misgiving by the assurance, that, not any son by adoption merely, but one from his own loins, should be given him for an heir. And to make the matter more palpable to his mind, and take external nature, as it were, to witness, for the fulfilment of the word, the Lord brought him forth, and, pointing to the stars of heaven, declared to him, "So shall thy seed be." "And he believed in the Lord," it is said, "and he counted it to him for righteousness."

This historical statement regarding Abraham's faith is remarkable, as it is the one so strenuously urged by the apostle Paul in his argument for justification by faith alone in the righteousness of Christ (Rom. iv. 18-22). And the question has been keenly debated, whether it was the faith itself which was in God's account taken for righteousness, or the righteousness of God in Christ, which that faith prospectively laid hold of. Our wisdom here, however, and in all similar cases, is not to press the statements of Old Testament Scripture so as to render them explicit categorical deliverances on Christian doctrine—in which case violence must inevitably be done to them—but rather to catch the general principle embodied in them, and give it a fair application to the more distinct revelations of the Gospel. This is precisely what is done by St Paul. He does not say a word about the specific manifestation of the righteousness of God in Christ, when arguing from the statement respecting the righteousness of faith in Abraham. He lays stress simply upon the natural impossibilities that stood in the way of God's promise of a numerous offspring to Abraham being fulfilled—the comparative deadness both of his own body and of Sarah's—and on the implicit confidence Abraham had, notwithstanding, in the power and faithfulness of

God, that he would perform what he had promised. "Therefore," adds the apostle, "it was imputed to him for righteousness." *Therefore*—namely, because through faith he so completely lost sight of nature and self, and realised with undoubting confidence the sufficiency of the divine arm, and the certainty of its working. His faith was nothing more, nothing else than the renunciation of all virtue and strength in himself, and a hanging in childlike trust upon God for what he was able and willing to do. Not, therefore, a mere substitute for a righteousness that was wanting, an acceptance of something that could be had for something better that failed, but rather the vital principle of a righteousness in God—the beating of a soul in unison with the mind of God, and finding its life, its hope, its all in him. Transfer such a faith to the field of the New Testament—bring it into contact with the manifestation of God in the person and work of Christ for the salvation of the world, and what would or could be its language but that of the apostle, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ,"—"not my own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is of God through faith!"

To return to Abraham—when he had attained to such confident faith in the divine word respecting the promised seed, the Lord gave him an equally distinct assurance respecting the promised land; and in answer to Abraham's question, "Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it," the Lord "made a covenant with him" respecting it, by means of a symbolical sacrificial action. It was a covenant by sacrifice; for in the very act of establishing the union, there must be a reference to the guilt of man, and a provision for purging it away. The very materials of the sacrifice have here a specific meaning; the greater sacrifices, those of the heifer, the goat, and the ram, being expressly fixed to be of three years old—pointing to the three generations which Abraham's posterity were to pass in Egypt; and these, together with the turtle-dove and the young pigeon, comprising a full representation of the animals afterwards offered in sacrifice under the law. As the materials, so also the form of the sacrifice was symbolical—the animals being divided asunder, and one piece laid over against another; for the purpose of more distinctly representing the two parties in the transaction—two, and yet one—meeting and acting together in one solemn offering. Recognising

Jehovah as the chief party in what was taking place, Abraham waits for the divine manifestation, and contents himself with meanwhile driving away the ill-omened birds of prey that flocked around the sacrifice. At last, when the shades of night had fallen, "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between those pieces"—the glory of the Lord himself, as so often afterwards, in a pillar of cloud and fire. Passing under this emblem through the divided sacrifice, he formally accepted it, and struck the covenant with his servant (Jer. xxxiv. 18-19). At the same time also, a profound sleep had fallen upon Abraham, and a horror of great darkness—symbolical of the outward humiliations and sufferings through which the covenant was to reach its accomplishment; and in explanation the announcement was expressly made to him, that his posterity should be in bondage and affliction four hundred years in a foreign land, and should then, in the fourth generation, be brought up to it with great substance.¹ In justification also of the long delay, the specific reason was given, that "the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full,"—plainly importing, that this part of the divine procedure had a moral aim, and could only be carried into effect in accordance with the great principles of the divine righteousness.

The covenant was thus established in both its branches, yet only in an imperfect manner, if respect were had to the coming future, and even to the full bearing and import of the covenant itself. Abraham had got a present sign of God's formally entering into covenant with him for the possession of the land of Canaan; but it came and went like a troubled vision of the

¹ The notes of time here given for the period of the sojourn in Egypt are somewhat indefinite. The 400 years is plainly mentioned as a round sum; it was afterwards more precisely and historically defined as 430 (Ex. xii. 40-41). From the juxtaposition of the 400 years and the fourth generation in the words to Abraham, the one must be understood as nearly equivalent to the other, and the period must consequently be regarded as that of the actual residence of the children of Israel in Egypt, from the descent of Jacob—not, as many after the Septuagint, from the time of Abraham. For the shortest genealogies exhibit four generations between that period and the exodus. Looking at the genealogical table of Levi (Ex. vi. 16, sq.), 120 years might not unfairly be taken as an average lifetime or generation; so that three of these complete, and a part of a fourth, would easily make 430. In Gal. iii. 17, the law is spoken of as only 430 years after the covenant with Abraham; but the apostle merely refers to the known historical period, and regards the first formation of the covenant with Abraham as all one with its final ratification with Jacob.

night. There was needed something of a more tangible and permanent kind, an abiding, sacramental covenant-signature, which by its formal institution on God's part, and its regular observance on the part of Abraham and his seed, might serve as a mutual sign of covenant-engagements. This was the more necessary, as the next step in Abraham's procedure but too clearly manifested, that he still wanted light regarding the nature of the covenant, and in particular regarding the supernatural, the essentially divine character of its provisions. From the prolonged barrenness of Sarah, and her now advanced age, it began to be imagined, that Sarah possibly might not be included in the promise, the rather so as no express mention had been made of her in the previous intimations of the divine purpose; and so despairing of having herself any share in the fulfilment of the promised word, she suggested, and Abraham fell in with the suggestion, that the fulfilment should be sought by the substitution of her bondmaid Hagar. This was again resorting to an expedient of the flesh to get over a present difficulty, and it was soon followed by its meet retribution in providence—domestic troubles and vexations. The bondmaid had been raised out of her proper place, and began to treat Sarah, the legitimate spouse of Abraham, with contempt. And had she even repressed her improper feelings, and brought forth a child in the midst of domestic peace and harmony, yet a son so born—after the ordinary course of nature, and in compliance with one of her corrupter usages—could not have been allowed to stand as the representative of that seed, through which blessing was to come to the world.

On both accounts, therefore—first, to give more explicit information regarding the son to be born, and then to provide a significant and lasting signature of the covenant, another and more perfect ratification of it took place. The word, which introduced this new scene, expressed the substance and design of the whole transaction: "I am God Almighty, walk before me, and be thou perfect" (Gen. xvii. 1):—On my part there is power amply sufficient to accomplish what I have promised, whatever natural difficulties may stand in the way—the whole shall assuredly be done; only see, that on your part there be a habitual recognition of my presence, and a steadfast adherence to the path of rectitude and purity. What follows is simply a filling up of this general out-

line—a more particular announcement of what God on his part should do, and then of what Abraham and his posterity were to do on the other. “As for me,” (literally, I—*i. e.* on my part,) “behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.” This was God’s part in the covenant, to which he immediately subjoined, by way of explanation, that the seed more especially meant in the promise was to be of Sarah, as well as Abraham; that she was to renew her youth, and have a son, and that her name also was to be changed in accordance with her new position. Then follows what was expected and required on the other side: “And God said unto Abraham, And thou,” (this now is thy part) “my covenant shalt thou keep, thou and thy seed after thee: Every male among you shall be circumcised; and ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be for a covenant-sign betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised to you, every male in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger that is not of thy seed. . . . And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And uncircumcision” (*i. e.* pollution, abomination,) “is the male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin; and cut off is that soul from his people; he has broken my covenant.”

There is no need for going into the question, whether this ordinance of circumcision was now for the first time introduced among men; or whether it already existed as a practice to some extent, and was simply adopted by God as a fit and significant token of his covenant. It is comparatively of little moment how such a question may be decided. The same principle *may* have been acted on here, which undoubtedly had a place in the modelling of the Mosaic institutions, and which shall be discussed and

vindicated, when we come to consider the influence exercised by the learning of Moses on his subsequent legislation—the principle, namely, of taking from the province of religion generally a symbolical sign or action, that was capable, when associated with the true religion, of fitly expressing its higher truths and principles. The probability is, that this principle was recognised and acted on here. Circumcision has been practised among classes of people and nations, who cannot reasonably be supposed to have derived it from the family of Abraham—among the ancients, for example, by the Egyptian priesthood, and among the moderns by native tribes in America and the islands of the Pacific. Its extensive prevalence and long continuance can only be accounted for on the ground, that it has a foundation in the feelings of the natural conscience, which, like the distinctions into clean and unclean, or the payment of tithes, may have led to its employment before the time of Abraham, and also fitted it afterwards for serving as the peculiar sign of God's covenant with him. At the same time, as it was henceforth intended to be a distinctive badge of covenant-relationship, it could not have been *generally* practised in the region where the chosen family were called to live and act. From the purpose to which it was applied, we may certainly infer, that it formed at once an appropriate and an easily-recognised distinction between the race of Abraham and the families and nations by whom they were more immediately surrounded.

Among the race of Abraham, however, it had the widest application given to it. While God so far identified it with his covenant, as to suspend men's interest in the one upon their observance of the other, it was with his covenant in its wider aspect and bearing—not simply as securing, either an offspring after the flesh, or the inheritance for that offspring of the land of Canaan. It was comparatively but a limited portion of Abraham's actual offspring, who were destined to grow into a separate nation, and occupy as their home the territory of Canaan. At the very outset Ishmael was excluded, though constituted the head of a great nation. And yet not only he, but all the members of Abraham's household, were alike ordered to receive the covenant-signature. Nay, even in later times, when the children of Israel had grown into a distinct people, and everything was placed under the strict

administration of law, it was always left open to people of other lands and tribes to enter into the bonds of the covenant through the rite of circumcision. This rite, therefore, must have had a significance for them, as well as for the more favoured seed of Jacob. It spoke also to *their* hearts and consciences, and virtually declared that the covenant, which it symbolized, had nothing in its main design of an exclusive and contracted spirit; that its greater things lay open to all who were willing to seek them in the appointed way; and that if at first there were individual persons, and afterwards a single people, who were more especially identified with the covenant, it was only to mark them out as the chosen representatives of its nature and objects, and to constitute them lights for the instruction and benefit of others. There never was a more evident misreading of the palpable facts of history, than in the disposition so often manifested to limit the rite of circumcision to one line merely of Abraham's posterity, and to regard it as the mere outward badge of an external national distinction.

It is to be held, then, as certain in regard to the sign of the covenant, as in regard to the covenant itself, that its more special and marked connection with individuals was only for the sake of more effectually helping forward its general objects. And not less firmly is it to be held, that the outwardness in the rite was for the sake of the inward and spiritual truths it symbolized. It was appointed as the distinctive badge of the covenant, because it was peculiarly fitted for symbolically expressing the spiritual character and design of the covenant. It marked the condition of every one who received it, as having to do both with higher powers and higher objects than those of corrupt nature, as the condition of one brought into blessed fellowship with God, and therefore called to walk before him and be perfect. There would be no difficulty in perceiving this, nor any material difference of opinion upon the subject, if people would but look beneath the surface, and in the true spirit of the ancient religion, would contemplate the outward as an image of the inward. The general purport of the covenant was, that from Abraham as an individual there was to be generated a seed of blessing, in which all real blessing was to centre, and from which it was to flow to the ends of the earth. There could not, therefore, be a more appropriate sign of the

covenant, than such a rite as circumcision—so directly connected with the generation of offspring, and so distinctly marking the necessary purification of nature—the removal of the filth of the flesh—that the offspring might be such as really to constitute a seed of blessing. It is through ordinary generation that the corruption incident on the fall is propagated; and hence, under the law, which contained a regular system of symbolical teaching, there were so many occasions of defilement traced to this source, and so many means of purification appointed for them. Now, therefore, when God was establishing a covenant, the great object of which was, to reverse the propagation of evil, to secure for the world a blessed and a blessed-making seed, he affixed to it this symbolical rite—to shew, that the end was to be reached, not as the result of nature's ordinary productiveness, but of nature purged from its uncleanness—nature raised above itself, in league with the grace of God, and bearing on it the distinctive impress of his character and working. It said to the circumcised man, that he had Jehovah for his bridegroom, to whom he had become espoused, as it were, by blood (Ex. iv. 25), and that he must no longer follow the unregulated will and impulse of nature, but live in accordance with the high relation he occupied, and the sacred calling he had received.¹

Most truly, therefore, does the apostle say, that Abraham received circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had (Rom. iv. 11)—a divine token in his own case that he had attained through faith to such fellowship with God, and righteousness in him—and a token for every child that should afterwards receive it, not indeed that he actually possessed the same, but that he was called to possess it, and had a right to the privileges and hopes, which might enable him to attain to the possession. Most truly also does the apostle say in another place (Rom. ii. 28, 29)

¹ It may also be noted, that by this quite natural and fundamental view of the ordinance, subordinate peculiarities admit of an easy explanation. For example, the limitation of the sign to males—which in the circumstances could not be otherwise; though the special purifications under the law for women might justly be regarded as providing for them a sort of counterpart. Then, the fixing on the eighth day as the proper one for the rite—that being the first day after the revolution of an entire week of separation from the mother, and when fully withdrawn from connection with the parent's blood, it began to live and breathe in its own impurity.

“He is not a Jew which is one outwardly (*i. e.* not a Jew in the right sense, not such an one as God would recognise and own), neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.” The very design of the covenant was to secure a seed with these inward and spiritual characteristics, and the sign of the covenant, the outward impression in the flesh, was worthless, a mere external concision—as the apostle calls it, when it came to be alone, Phil. iii. 2—excepting in so far as it was the expression of the corresponding reality. Isaac, the first child of promise, was the fitting type of such a covenant. In the very manner and time of his production he was a sign to all coming ages of what the covenant required and sought;—not begotten till Abraham himself bore the symbol of nature’s purification, nor born till it was evident the powers of nature must have been miraculously vivified for the purpose; so that in his very being and birth Isaac was emphatically a child of God. But in being so he was the exact type of what the covenant properly aimed at, and what its expressive symbol betokened, *viz.* a spiritual seed, in which the divine and human, grace and nature, should meet together in producing true subjects and channels of blessing. But its actual representation—the one complete and perfect embodiment of all it symbolized and sought—was the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom the divine and human met from the first, not in co-operative merely, but in organic union, and consequently the result produced was a Being free from all taint of corruption, holy, harmless, undefiled, the express image of the Father, the very righteousness of God. He alone fully realized the conditions of blessing exhibited in the covenant, and was qualified to be in the largest sense the seed-corn of a harvest of blessing for the whole field of humanity.

It is true—and those who take their notions of realities from appearances alone, will doubtless reckon it a sufficient reply to what has been said—that the portion of Abraham’s seed, who afterwards became distinctively the covenant people—Israel after the flesh—were by no means such subjects and channels of blessing as we have described, but were to a large extent carnal, having only that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. What

then ? Had they still a title to be recognised as the children of the covenant, and a right, as such, to the temporal inheritance connected with it ? By no means. This were substantially to make void God's ordinance, which could not, any more than his other ordinances, be *merely* outward. It arises from his essential nature, as the spiritual and holy God, that he should ever require from his people what is accordant with his own character, and that when he appoints outward signs and ordinances, it is only with a view to spiritual and moral ends. Where the outward alone exists, he cannot own its validity. Christ certainly did not. For, when arguing with Jews of his own day, he denied on this very ground that their circumcision made them the children of Abraham ; they were not of his spirit, and did not perform his works ; and so, in Christ's account, their natural connection both with Abraham and with the covenant went for nothing (John viii. 34-44.) Their circumcision was a sign without any signification. And if so, then it must equally have been so in former times. The children of Israel had no right to the benefits of the covenant merely because they had been outwardly circumcised ; nor were any promises made to them simply as the natural seed of Abraham. Both elements had to meet in their condition, the natural and the spiritual ; the spiritual, however, more especially, and the natural only as connected with the spiritual, and a means for securing it. Hence Moses urged them so earnestly to circumcise their *hearts*, as absolutely necessary to their getting the fulfilment of what was promised (Deut. x. 16) ; and when the people as a whole had manifestly not done this, circumcision itself, the sign of the covenant, was suspended for a season, and the promises of the covenant were held in abeyance, till they should come to learn aright the real nature of their calling (Josh. v. 3-9.) Throughout, it was the election, within the election, who really had the promises and the covenants ; and none but those in whom, through the special working of God's grace, nature was sanctified and raised to another position than itself could ever have attained, were entitled to the blessing. If in the land of Canaan, they existed by sufferance merely, and not by right.

The bearing of all this on the ordinance of Christian baptism cannot be overlooked, but it may still be mistaken. The relation between circumcision and baptism is not properly that of type

and antitype; the one is a symbolical ordinance as well as the other, and both alike have an outward form and an inward reality. It is precisely in such ordinances that the Old and the New dispensations approach nearest to each other, and, we might almost say, stand formally upon the same level. The difference does not so much lie in the ordinances themselves, as in the comparative amount of grace and truth respectively exhibited in them—necessarily less in the earlier, and more in the later. The difference in external form was in each case conditioned by the circumstances of the time. In circumcision it bore respect to the propagation of offspring, as it was through the production of a seed of blessing that the covenant, in its preparatory form, was to attain its realisation. But when the seed in that respect had reached its culminating point in Christ, and the objects of the covenant were no longer dependent on natural propagation of seed, but were to be carried forward by spiritual means and influences used in connection with the faith of Christ, the external ordinance was fitly altered, so as to express simply a change of nature and state in the individual that received it. Undoubtedly the New Testament form less distinctly recognises the connection between parent and child—we should rather say, does not of itself recognise that connection at all: so much ought to be frankly conceded to those who disapprove of the practice of infant baptism, and *will* be conceded by all whose object is to ascertain the truth rather than contend for an opinion.

On the other hand, however, if we look, not to the form, but to the substance, which ought here, as in other things, to be chiefly regarded, we perceive an essential agreement—such as is, indeed, marked by the Apostle, when, with reference to the spiritual import of baptism, he calls it “the circumcision of Christ” (Col. ii. 11.) So far from being less indicative of a change of nature in the proper subjects of it, circumcision was even more so; in a more obvious and palpable manner it bespoke the necessity of a deliverance from the native corruption of the soul in those who should become the true possessors of blessing. Hence the Apostle makes use of the earlier rite to explain the symbolical import of the later, and describes the spiritual change indicated and required by it, as “a putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ,” and “having the uncircumcision of

the flesh quickened together with Christ." It would have been travelling entirely in the wrong direction, to use such language for purposes of explanation in Christian times—if the ordinance of circumcision had not shadowed forth this spiritual quickening and purification even more palpably and impressively than baptism itself—and shadowed it forth, not prospectively merely for future times, but immediately and personally for the members of the old covenant. For, by the terms of the covenant, these were ordained to be, not *types* of blessing only, but also *partakers* of blessing. The good contemplated in the covenant was to have its present commencement in their experience, as well as in the future a deeper foundation and a more enlarged development. And the outward putting away of the filth of the flesh in circumcision could never have symbolized a corresponding inward purification for the members of the new covenant, if it had not first done this for the members of the old. The shadow must have a substance in the one case as well as in the other.

Such being the case as to the essential agreement between the two ordinances, an important element for deciding in regard to the propriety of infant baptism, may still be derived from the practice established in the rite of circumcision. The grand principle of connecting parent and child together for the attainment of spiritual objects, and marking the connection by an impressive signature, was there most distinctly and broadly sanctioned. And if the parental bond and its attendant obligations be not weakened, but rather elevated and strengthened, by the higher revelations of the Gospel, it would be strange indeed if the liberty, at least the propriety and right, if not the actual obligation, to have their children brought by an initiatory ordinance under the bond of the covenant, did not belong to parents under the Gospel. The one ordinance no more than the other insures the actual transmission of the grace necessary to effect the requisite change; but it exhibits that grace—on the part of God pledges it—and takes the subject of the ordinance bound to use it for the accomplishment of the proper end. Baptism does this now, as circumcision did of old; and if it was done in the one case through the medium of the parent to the child, one does not see why it may not be done now, unless positively prohibited, in the other. But since this is matter of inference rather than of positive enactment, those who

do not feel warranted to make such an application of the principle of the Old Testament ordinance to the New, should unquestionably be allowed their liberty of thought and action—if only, in the vindication of that liberty, they do not seek to degrade circumcision to a mere outward and political distinction, and thereby break the continuity of the church through successive dispensations.¹

¹ It is not necessary to do more than notice the statements of Coleridge regarding circumcision (*Aids to Reflection*, I. p. 296), in which, as in some others on purely theological subjects in his writings, one is even more struck with the unaccountable ignoring of fact displayed in the deliverance given, than with the tone of assurance in which it is announced. "Circumcision was no sacrament at all, but the means and mark of national distinction. . . Nor was it ever pretended that any grace was conferred with it, or that the rite was significant of any inward or spiritual operation." Delitzsch, however, so far coincides with this view, as to deny (*Genesis Ausgelegt*, p. 281) the sacramental character of circumcision. But he does so on grounds that, in regard to circumcision, will not stand examination; and, in regard to baptism, evidently proceed on the high Lutheran view of the sacraments. He says, that while circumcision had a moral and mystical meaning, and was intended ever to remind the subject of it of his near relation to Jehovah, and his obligation to walk worthy of this, still it was "no vehicle of heavenly grace, of divine sanctifying power," "in itself a mere sign without substance,"—as if it were ever designed to be *by itself!* or, as if baptism with water by itself were anything more than a mere sign! Circumcision being stamped upon Abraham and his seed as the sign of the covenant, and so far identified with the covenant, in the appointment of God, must have been a sign on God's part as well as theirs—it could not otherwise have been the sign of a covenant, or mutual compact; it must, therefore, have borne respect to what God promised to be to his people, not less than what his people were to be to him. This is manifestly what the apostle means, when he calls it a seal which Abraham received—a pledge from God of the ratification of the covenant, and consequently of all the grace that covenant promised. It had otherwise been no privilege to be circumcised; since to be bound to do righteously, without being entitled to look for grace corresponding, is simply to be placed under an intolerable yoke.—We regret to find Mr Litton, in his recent, and, as a whole, admirable work on the Church of Christ, espousing the same view regarding circumcision, and disavowing any proper connection between it and baptism. He thinks "the parallel holds good only in the accidental, and fails in the essential properties of the ordinances. Baptism is a means of grace, circumcision was not; baptism is the rite of admission to the privileges connected with incorporation in Christ, circumcision was not to the Jewish infant an analogous ordinance" (p. 704). He means, that circumcision was not to the Jew, as baptism is to the Christian, a properly initiatory ordinance, and that it was rather for securing his continuance in the possession of the blessings of the covenant, than the rite of admission to them. And distinguishing between the two ordinances in this respect, he says: "Whatever part we assign to the Word in the work of regeneration, no one would maintain that a believer is, by virtue of his faith merely, in Christ" (p. 704). Why, no one has said this more expressly than Mr Litton himself. At p. 226 he says,

3. But we must now hasten to the third stage of Abraham's career, which presents him on a still higher moral elevation than he has yet reached, and view him as connected with the sacrifice of Isaac. Between the establishment of the covenant by the rite of circumcision, and this last stage of development, there were not wanting occasions fitted to bring out the pre-eminently holy character of his calling, and the dependence on his maintaining this toward God of what God should be and do toward him. This appears in the order he received from God to cast Ishmael out of his house, when the envious, mocking spirit of the youth too clearly shewed, that he had not the heart of a true child of the covenant, and would not submit aright to the arrangements of God concerning it. It appears also, in the free and familiar fellowship to which Abraham was admitted with the three heavenly visitants, whom he entertained in his tent on the plains of Mamre, and the disclosure that was made to him of the divine counsel respecting Sodom and Gomorrah, expressly on the ground that the Lord "knew he would command his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." And most of all it appears in the pleading of Abraham for the preservation of the cities of the plain—a pleading based upon the principles of righteousness, that the Judge of all the earth would do right, and would not destroy the righteous with

"If the recorded cases of Scripture are to decide the point, the first occasion of spiritual life to the soul does not come from visible union with the church. The church cannot, in the first instance, introduce him to Christ, who has already come to Christ; for he that believes upon Christ, has come to Christ." It might, therefore, on Mr Litton's own views, be affirmed as well regarding baptism, as regarding circumcision, that it is for confirmation, rather than for initiation, in the gifts and privileges of grace. In truth, it is not in respect to the soul's inward and personal state, that either ordinance can properly be called initiatory (for in that respect blessing might be had initially without the one as well as the other), but in respect to the person's recognised connection with the corporate society of those who are subjects of blessing. This begins now with baptism, and it began of old with circumcision; till the individual was circumcised he was not reckoned as belonging to that society, and if passing the proper time for the ordinance without it, he was to be held as *ipso facto* cut off. Under both covenants there is an inward and an outward bond of connection with the peculiar blessing—the inward, faith in God's word of promise (of old, faith in God, now more specifically, faith in Christ); the outward, circumcision formerly, now baptism. Yet the two in neither case should be viewed as altogether apart, but the one should rather be held as the formal expression and seal of the other.

the wicked—and a pleading that proved in vain only from there not being found the ten righteous persons in the place mentioned in the patriarch's last supposition. So that the awful scene of desolation which the region of those cities afterwards presented on the very borders of the land of Canaan, stood perpetually before the Jewish people, not only as a monument of the divine indignation against sin, but also as a witness that the father of their nation would have sought their preservation from a like judgment only on the principles of righteousness, and would have even ceased to plead in their behalf, if righteousness should sink as low among them as he ultimately supposed it might have come in Sodom.

But the topstone of Abraham's history as the spiritual head of a seed of blessing, is only reached in the divine command to offer up Isaac, and the obedience which the patriarch rendered to it. "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah ; and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains, which I will tell thee of." That Abraham understood this command rightly, when he supposed it to mean a literal offering of his son upon the altar, and not as Hengstenberg and Langé have contended, a simple dedication to a religious life, needs no particular proof. Had anything but a literal surrender been meant, the mention of a burnt-offering as the character in which Isaac was to be offered to God, and of a mountain in Moriah as the particular spot where the offering was to be presented, would have been entirely out of place. But why should such a demand have been made of Abraham ? And what precisely were the lessons it was intended to convey to his posterity, or its typical bearing on future times ?

In the form given to the required act, special emphasis is laid on the endeared nature of the object demanded : thine *only* son, and the son whom thou *lovest*. It was, therefore, a trial in the strongest sense, a trial of Abraham's faith, whether it was capable of such implicit confidence in God—such profound regard to his will, and such self-denial in his service, as at the divine bidding to give up the best and dearest—what in the circumstances must even have been dearer to him than his own life. Not that God really intended the surrender of Isaac to death, but only the proof of such a surrender in the heart of his servant ; and such a proof

could only have been found in an unconditional command to sacrifice, and an unresisting compliance with the command up to the final step in the process. This, however, was not all. In the command to perform such a sacrifice, there was a *tempting* as well as a *trying* of Abraham ; since the thing required at his hands seemed to be an enacting of the most revolting rite of heathenism ; and, at the same time, to war with the oracle already given concerning Isaac, " In Isaac shall thy seed be called." According to this word, God's purpose to bless was destined to have its accomplishment especially and peculiarly through Isaac ; so that to slay such a son appeared like slaying the very word of God, and extinguishing the hope of the world. And yet, in heart and purpose at least, it must be done. It was no freak of arbitrary power to command the sacrifice, nor for the purpose merely of raising the patriarch to a kind of romantic moral elevation. It was for the purpose of exhibiting outwardly and palpably the great truth, that God's method of working in the covenant of grace must have its counterpart in man's. The one must be the reflex of the other. God in blessing Abraham triumphs over nature, and Abraham triumphs after the same manner in proportion as he is blessed. He receives a special gift from the grace of God, and he freely surrenders it again to Him who gave it. He is pre-eminently honoured by God's word of promise, and he is ready in turn to hazard all for its honour. And Isaac, the child of promise—the type in his outward history of all who should be proper subjects or channels of blessing—he also must concur in the act—on the altar must sanctify himself to God—as a sign to all who would possess the higher life in God, that it implies and carries along with it a devout surrender of the natural life to the service and glory of God.

We have no account of the workings of Abraham's mind, when going forth to the performance of this extraordinary act of devotedness to God ; and the record of the transaction is, from the very simplicity with which it narrates the facts of the case, the most touching and impressive in Old Testament history. But we are informed on inspired authority, that the principle on which he acted, and which enabled him—as indeed it alone could enable him—to fulfil such a service, was faith : " By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and he that received the pro-

mises offered up his only begotten son ; of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called ; accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead—from whence also he received him in a figure” (Heb. xi. 17–19). His noblest act of obedience was nothing more than the highest exercise and triumph of his faith. It was this which removed the mountains that stood before him, and hewed out a path for him to walk in. Grasping with firm hand that word of promise which assured him of a numerous seed by the line of Isaac, and taught by past experience to trust its faithfulness even in the face of natural impossibilities, his faith enabled him to see light, where all had otherwise been darkness, to hope while in the very act of destroying the great object of his hope. I know—so he must have argued with himself—that the word of God, which commands this sacrifice, is faithfulness and truth ; and though to stretch forth my hand against this child of promise is apparently destructive to my hopes, yet I may safely risk it, since He commands it who gave the promise. It is as easy for the Almighty arm to give me back my son from the domain of death, as it was at first to bring him forth out of the dead womb of Sarah ; and what He *can* do, His declared purpose makes me sure that he *will* and *must* do. Thus nature, even in its best and strongest feelings, was overcome, and the sublimest heights of holiness were reached, simply because faith had struck its roots so deeply within, and had so closely united the soul of the patriarch to the mind and perfections of Jehovah.

This high surrender of the human to the divine, and holy self-consecration to the will and service of God, was beyond all doubt, like the other things recorded in Abraham’s life, of the nature of a revelation. It was not intended to terminate in the patriarch and his son, but in them as the sacred roots of the covenant-people, to shew in outward and corporeal representation, what in spirit ought to be perpetually repeating itself in their individual and collective history. It proclaimed to them through all their generations, that the covenant required of its members lives of unshrinking and devoted application to the service of God—yielding to no weak misgivings or corrupt solicitations of the flesh—staggering at no difficulties presented by the world ; and also that it rendered such a course possible by the ground and scope it

afforded for the exercise of faith in the sustaining grace and might of God. And undoubtedly, as the human here was the reflex of the divine, whence it drew its source and reason, so inversely, and as regards the ulterior objects of the covenant, the divine might justly be regarded as imaged in the human. An organic union between the two was indispensable to the effectual accomplishment of the promised good ; and the seed, in which the blessing of Heaven was to concentrate, and from which it was to flow throughout the families of the earth, must on the one side be as really the Son of God, as on the other he was to be the offspring of Abraham. Since, therefore, the two lines were ultimately to meet in one, and that one, by the joint operation of the divine and human, was once for all to make good the provision of blessing promised in the covenant, it was meet, and it may reasonably be supposed, was one end of the transaction, that they should be seen from the first to coalesce in principle ; that the surrender Abraham made of *his* son, for the world's good, in the line after the flesh, and the consecration willingly made by the son of himself on the altar of God, was designed to foreshadow in the other and higher line the wonderful gift of God in yielding up *his* Son, and the free-will offering and consecration of the Son himself to bring in eternal life for the lost. Here, too, as the things done were in their nature unspeakably higher than in the other, so were they thoroughly and intensely real in their character. The representative in the Old becomes the actual in the New ; and the sacrifice performed there merely in the spirit, passes here into that one full and complete atonement, which for ever perfects them that are sanctified.¹

¹ In my former edition I missed the typical connection between the Old and the New here exhibited ; missed it, from looking too exclusively, on the one hand, to the merely formal resemblances usually pressed by typological writers, and on the other, to the ostensible differences. Presented as it is above, the typical relationship is both quite natural, and easy of apprehension, if only one keeps distinctly in view the necessary connection between the divine and the human for accomplishing the ends of the covenant—a connection influential and co-operative as regards the immediate ends—organic and personal, as regards the ultimate. That the action was, as Warburton represents, a scenical representation of the death and resurrection of Christ, appointed expressly to satisfy the mind of Abraham, who longed to see Christ's day, is to present it in a fanciful and arbitrary light ; and what is actually recorded requires to be supplemented by much that is not. Nor do we need to lay any stress on the precise locality where the offering was appointed to be made. It must always remain somewhat doubtful whether the "land of Moriah"

In the preparatory and typical line, however, Abraham's conduct on this occasion was the perfect exemplar of what should follow; he stood now on the highest elevation of the righteousness of faith; and to shew the weight God attached to that righteousness, and how inseparably it was to be bound up with the provisions of the covenant, the Lord consummated the transaction by a new ratification of the covenant. After the angel of Jehovah had staid the hand of Abraham from slaying Isaac, and provided the ram for a burnt-offering, he again appeared and spake to Abraham, "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord; for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bliss thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed, as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of thine enemies; and in thy seed shall the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." The things promised, it will be observed, are precisely the things which God had already of his own goodness engaged in covenant to bestow upon Abraham: these, indeed, to their largest extent, but still no more, no other than these—a seed numerous as the sand upon the sea-shore, or the stars of heaven, shielded from the malice of enemies, itself blessed, and destined to be the channel of blessing to all nations. But it is also to be observed, that while the same promises of good are renewed, they are now connected with Abraham's surrender to the will of God, and are given as the reward of his obedience. To render this more clear and express, it is announced both at the beginning and the end of the address: "Because thou hast done this...because thou hast obeyed my voice." And even afterwards, when the covenant was established with Isaac, an explicit reference is made to the same thing. The Lord said, he would perform the oath he had sworn to Abraham, "because he obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (Gen. xxvi. 5). What could have more impressively exhi-

was the same with "Mount Moriah," on which the temple was afterwards built, as the one, indeed, is evidently a more general designation than the other. And the minor circumstances, excepting in so far as they indicate the implicit obedience of the father, and the filial submission and devotedness of the son, should be considered as of no moment.

bited the truth, that though the covenant, with all its blessings, was of grace, on the part of God, and to be appropriated by faith on the part of men, yet the good promised should not be actually conferred by Him, unless there appeared in them the righteousness of faith ! Their faith would otherwise be accounted dead, the mere semblance of what it should be. And as if to bind the two more solemnly and conspicuously together, the Lord takes this occasion to superadd his oath to the covenant—not to render the word of promise more sure in itself, but more palpably sure to the heirs of promise—and to imprint it upon their hearts, that nothing should fail of all that had been spoken, if only the future faith and obedience should accord with the present !

II. We must leave to the reflection of our readers the application of this to Christian times and relations, which is indeed so obvious as to need no particular explanation ; and we proceed to take a rapid glance at the leading features of the other branch of the subject—that which concerns Jacob and the twelve patriarchs. This forms the continuation of what took place in the lives of Abraham and Isaac, and a continuation, not only embodying the same great principles, but also carrying them forward with more special adaptation to the prospective condition of the Israelites as a people. Towards the close of the patriarchal period, the covenant, even in its more specific line of operations, began to widen and expand, to rise more from the particular to the general, to embrace a family circle, and that circle the commencement of a future nation. And the dealings of God were all directed to the one great end of shewing, that while this people should stand alike outwardly related to the covenant, yet their real connection with its promises, and their actual possession of its blessings, should infallibly turn upon their being followers in faith and holiness of the first fathers of their race.

Unfortunately, the later part of Isaac's life did not altogether fulfil the promise of the earlier. Knowing little of the trials of faith, he did not reach high in its attainments. And in the more advanced stage of his history he fell into a state of general feebleness and decay, in which the moral but too closely corresponded with the bodily decline. Notwithstanding the very singular and marked exemplification that had been given in his own case of

the pre-eminent respect had in the covenant to something higher than nature, he failed so much in discernment, that he was disposed only to make account of the natural element in judging of the respective states and fortunes of his sons. To the neglect of a divine oracle going before, and the neglect also of the plainest indications afforded by the subsequent behaviour of the sons themselves, he resolved to give the more distinctive blessing of the covenant to Esau, in preference to Jacob, and so to make him the more peculiar type and representative of the covenant. In this, however, he was thwarted by the overruling providence of God—not, indeed, without sin on the part of those who were the immediate agents in accomplishing it—but yet, so as to bring out more clearly and impressively the fact, that mere natural descent and priority of birth was not here the principal, but only the secondary thing, and that higher and more important than any natural advantage was the grace of God manifesting itself in the faith and holiness of men. Jacob, therefore, though the youngest by birth—yet from the first the child of faith, of spiritual desire, of heart-felt longings after the things of God, ultimately the man of deep discernment, ripened experience, prophetic insight, wrestling and victorious energy in the divine life—he must stand first in the purpose of Heaven, and exhibit in his personal career a living representation of the covenant, as to what it properly is, and really requires. Nay, opportunity was taken from his case, as the immediate founder of the Israelitish nation, to begin the covenant history anew ; and starting, as it were, from nothing in his natural position and circumstances, it was shewn how God, by his supernatural grace and sufficiency, could vanquish the difficulties in the way, and more than compensate for the loss of nature's advantages. In reference partly to this instructive portion of Jacob's history, and to deepen upon their minds the lesson it was designed to teach, the children of Israel were appointed to go to the priest in after times with their basket of first-fruits in their hand, and the confession in their mouth, A Syrian ready to perish was my father (Deut. xxvi. 5). It was clear, clear as noon-day, that all Jacob had to distinguish him outwardly from others, the sole foundation and spring of his greatness, was the promise of God in the covenant, received by him in humble faith, and taken as the ground of prayerful and holy striving. As the head of the

covenant-people, he was not less really, though by a different mode of operation, the child of divine grace and power, than his father Isaac. And as his whole life, in its better aspects, was a lesson to his posterity respecting the superiority of the spiritual to the merely natural element in things pertaining to the covenant of God, so when his history drew toward its close, there were lessons of a more special kind, and in the same direction, pressed with singular force and emphasis upon his family.

It was a time when such were peculiarly needed. The covenant was now to assume more of a communal aspect. It was to have a national membership and representation, as the more immediate designs, which God sought to accomplish by means of it, could not be otherwise effected. Jacob was the last separate impersonation of its spirit and character. His family in their collective capacity were henceforth to take this position. But they had first to learn, that they could take it, only if their *natural* relation to the covenant was made the means of forming them to its *spiritual* characteristics, and fitting them for the fulfilment of its righteous ends. They must even learn, that their individual relation to the covenant in these respects, should determine their relative place in the administration of its affairs and interests. And for this end Reuben the first-born, is made to lose his natural pre-eminence, because, like Esau, he *presumed* upon his natural position, and in the lawless impetuosity of nature broke through the restraints of filial piety. Judah, on the other hand, obtains one of the prerogatives Reuben had lost—Judah who became so distinguished for that filial piety as to hazard his own life for the sake of his father. Simeon and Levi, in like manner, are all but excluded from the blessings of the covenant on account of their unrighteous and cruel behaviour:—a curse is solemnly pronounced upon their sin, and a mark of inferiority stamped upon their condition—while, again, at a later period, and for the purpose still of shewing how the spiritual was to rule the natural, rather than the natural the spiritual, the curse in the case of Levi was turned into a blessing. The tribe was, indeed, according to the word of Jacob, scattered in Israel, and was thereby rendered politically weak; but the more immediate reason of the scattering was the zeal and devotedness which the members of that tribe had exhibited in the wilderness, on account of which

they were dispersed as lights among Israel, bearing on them the more peculiar and sacred distinctions of the covenant—and thus became morally strong. Most strikingly, however, does the truth break forth in connection with Joseph, who in the earlier history of the family was the *only* proper representative of the covenant. He was the one child of God in the family, though, with a single exception, the least and youngest of its members. God, therefore, after allowing the contrast between him and the rest to be sharply exhibited, ordered his providence so as to make him pre-eminently the son of blessing. The faith and piety of the youth draw around him the protection and loving-kindness of heaven wherever he goes, and throw a charm around everything he does. At length he rises to the highest position of honour and influence—blessed most remarkably himself, and on the largest scale made a blessing to others—the noblest and most conspicuous personal embodiment of the nature of the covenant, as first rooting itself in the principles of a spiritual life, and then diffusing itself in healthful and blessed energy on all around. At the same time, and as a foil to set off more brightly the better side of the truth represented in him, while he was thus seen riding upon the high places of the earth, his unsanctified brethren were famishing for want; the promised blessing of the covenant has almost dried up in their experience, because they possessed so little of the true character of children of the covenant. And when the needful relief comes, they have to be indebted for it to the hand of him in whom that character is most luminously displayed. Nay, in the very mode of getting it, they are conducted through a train of humiliating and soul-stirring providences, tending to force on them the conviction that they were in the hands of an angry God, and to bring them to repentance of sin and amendment of life. So that, by the time they are raised to a position of honour and comfort, and settled as covenant-patriarchs in Egypt, they present the appearance of men chastened, subdued, brought to the knowledge of God, fitted each to take his place as a head of the future covenant-people, while the double portion, which Reuben lost by his iniquity, descends on him, who was, under God, the instrument of accomplishing so much good for them and for others.

And here, again, we cannot but notice, that when the chosen

family were in the process of assuming the rudimentary form of that people, through whom salvation and blessing were to come to other peoples of the earth, the beginning was rendered prophetic of the end ; the operations both of the evil and the good in the infancy of the nation, were made to image the prospective manifestation that was to be given of them when the things of the divine kingdom should rise to their destined maturity. Especially in the history of Joseph, the representative of the covenant in its earlier stage, was there given a wonderful similitude of him in whom its powers and blessings were to be concentrated in their entire fulness, and who was therefore in all things to obtain the pre-eminence among his brethren. Like Joseph, the Son of Mary, though born among brethren after the flesh, was treated as an alien ; envied and persecuted even from his infancy, and obliged to find a temporary refuge in the very land that shielded Joseph from the fury of his kindred. His supernatural and unblemished righteousness continually provoked the malice of the world, and, at the same time, received the most unequivocal tokens of the divine favour and blessing. That very righteousness, exhibited amid the greatest trials and indignities, in the deepest debasement, and in worse than prison-house affliction, procured his elevation to the right hand of power and glory, from which he was thenceforth to dispense the means of salvation to the world. In the dispensation, too, of these blessings, it was the hardened and cruel enmity of his immediate kindred which opened the door of grace and blessing to the heathen ; and the sold, hated, and crucified One becomes a Prince and Saviour to the nations of the earth, while his famishing brethren reap in bitterness of soul the fruit of their injurious treatment toward him. Nor is there a door of escape to be found for them until they come to acknowledge, in contrition of heart, that they are verily guilty concerning their brother ; but then, looking unto him whom they have pierced, and owning him as by God's appointment the one channel of life and blessing, they shall be repaid with love for hatred, and shall be admitted to share in the inexhaustible fulness that belongs to him.

What a succession, then, of lessons for the children of the covenant in regard to what constituted their greatest danger—lessons stretching through four generations—ever varying in

their precise form, yet always bearing most directly and impressively upon the same point—writing out on the very foundations of their history, and emblazoning on the banner of their covenant the important truth, that the spiritual element was ever to be held the thing of first and most essential moment, and that the natural was only to be regarded as the channel through which the other was chiefly to come, and the safeguard by which it was to be fenced and kept! From the first the call of God made itself known as no merely outward distinction; and the covenant that grew out of it, instead of being but a formal bond of interconnection between its members and God, was framed especially to meet the spiritual evil in the world, and required as an indispensable condition, a sanctified heart, in all who were to experience its blessings and to work out its beneficent results. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? How could the spiritual Jehovah, who has, from the first creation of man upon the earth, been ever manifesting himself as the Holy One, and directing his administration so as to promote the ends of righteousness, enter into a covenant of life and blessing on any other principle? It is impossible—as impossible as it is for the unchangeable God to act contrary to his nature, that the covenant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—the covenant of grace and blessing, which embraces in its bosom Christ himself, and the benefits of his eternal redemption—could ever have contemplated as its real members any but spiritual and righteous persons. And the whole tenor and current of the divine dealings in establishing the covenant seem to have been alike designed and calculated to shut up every thoughtful mind to the conclusion, that none but such could either fulfil its higher purposes, or have an interest in its more essential provisions.

What thus appears to be taught in the historical revelations of God connected with the establishment of the covenant, is also perpetually re-echoed in the later communications of the prophets. Their great aim, in the monitory part of their writings, is to bring home to men's minds the conviction, that the covenant had pre-eminently in view moral ends, and that in so far as the people degenerated from these, they failed in respect to the main design of their calling. Let us point, in proof of this, merely to the last of the prophets, that we may see how the closing witness of the Old Covenant coincides with the testimony delivered at the begin-

ning. In the second chapter of his writings, the prophet Malachi, addressing himself to the corruptions of the time, as appearing first in the priesthood, and then among the people generally, charges both parties expressly with a breach of covenant, and a subversion of the ends for which it was established. In regard to the priests, he points to their ancestral holiness in the personified tribe of Levi, and says, "My covenant was with him of life and peace; and I gave them to him for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity. . . . But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law." In a word, the covenant in this particular branch of it, had been made expressly on moral grounds and for moral ends, and in practically losing sight of these, the priests of that time had made void the covenant, even though externally complying with its appointments, and were consequently visited with chastisement instead of blessing. Then, in regard to the people, a reproof is first of all administered on account of the unfaithfulness, which had become comparatively common, in putting away their Israelitish wives, and taking outlandish women in their stead, "the daughters of a strange God." This the prophet calls "profaning the covenant of their fathers." And then pointing in this case, as in the former, to the original design and purport of their covenant-calling, he asks, in a question which has been entirely misunderstood, from not being viewed in relation to the precise object of the prophet, "And did not He make one? Yet had he the residue of the Spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth." The *one*, which God made, is not Adam, nor Abraham, to either of whom the commentators refer it, though the case of neither of them properly suits the point more immediately in question. The oneness referred to is that distinctive species of it, on which the whole section proceeds as its basis—Israel's oneness as a family. God had chosen them—them alone of all the na-

tions of the earth—to be his peculiar treasure. If he had pleased, he might have chosen more ; the residue of the Spirit was, with him, by no means exhausted by that single effort. He could have either left them like others, or chosen others besides them. But he did not ; he made one—one alone, to be peculiarly his own, setting it apart from the rest ; and wherefore that one ? Simply that he might have a godly seed ; that they might be an holy people, and transmit the true fear of God from generation to generation. How base, then, how utterly subversive of God's purposes concerning them, to act as if no such separation had taken place ? to put away their proper wives, and by heathenish alliances bring into the bosom of their families the very defilement and corruption, against which God had especially called them to contend ? Such was this prophet's understanding of the covenant made with the fathers of the Israelitish people ; and no other view of it, we venture to say, would ever have prevailed, if its nature had been sought primarily in those fundamental records, which describe the procedure of God in bringing it originally into existence.

SECTION SIXTH.

THE INHERITANCE DESTINED FOR THE HEIRS OF BLESSING.

THE covenant made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was connected not only with a seed of blessing, but also with an inheritance of blessing destined for their possession. And in order to get a correct view both of the immediate and of the ultimate bearing of this part of the covenant-promise, it is not less necessary than in the other case, to consider the specific object proposed in its relation to the entire scheme of God, and especially to bear in mind, that it forms part of a series of arrangements, in which the particular or the individual was selected with a view to the general, the universal. In respect to the good to be inherited, as well as in respect to the persons who might be called to inherit it, the end proposed on the part of God was from the first of the most comprehensive nature ; and if for a time there was an immediate narrowing of the field of promise, it could only be for the sake of an ultimate expansion. To see more distinctly the truth of this, it may be proper to take a brief retrospect of the past.

From the outset, the earth, in its entire extent and compass, was given for the domain and the heritage of man. He was placed in paradise as his proper home. There he had the throne of his kingdom, but not that he might be pent up within that narrow region ; rather that he might from that, as the seat of his empire, and the centre of his operations, go forth upon the world around, and bring it under his sway. His calling was to multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it ; so that it might become to its utmost bounds an extended and peopled paradise. But when the fall entered, though the calling was not withdrawn, nor the possession finally lost, yet man's relative position was changed. He had now, not to work from paradise as a rightful

king and lord, but from the blighted outfield of nature's barrenness to work as a servant, in the hope of ultimately reaching a new and better paradise than he had lost. The first promise of grace, and the original symbols of worship, viewed in connection with the facts of history, out of which they grew, presented him with the prospect of an ultimate recovery from the evils of sin and death, and put him in the position of an expectant through faith in God, and toil and suffering in the flesh, of good things yet to come. The precise hope he cherished respecting these good things, or the inheritance he actually looked for, would at first naturally take shape in his imagination from what he had lost. He would fancy, that though he must bear the deserved doom for his transgression, and return again to dust, yet the time would come, when, according to the revealed mercy and loving-kindness of God, the triumph of the adversary would be reversed, the dust of death would be again quickened into life, and the paradise of delight be re-occupied anew, with better hopes of continuance, and with enlarged dimensions suited to its destined possessors. He could scarcely have expected more with the scanty materials which faith and hope yet had to build upon ; and with the grace revealed to him, he could scarcely, if really standing in faith and hope, have expected less.

We deem it incredible, that with the grant of the earth so distinctly made to man for his possession, and death so expressly appointed as the penalty of his yielding to the tempter, he should, as a subject of restoring grace, have looked for any other domain as the result of the divine work in his behalf, than the earth itself, or for any other mode of entering on the recovered possession of it, than through a resurrection from the dead. For, how should he have dreamt of a victory over evil in any other region than that where the evil had prevailed ? Or, how could the hope of restitution have formed itself in his bosom, excepting as a prospective re-instatement in the benefits he had forfeited ? A paradise such as he had originally occupied—but prepared now for the occupation of redeemed multitudes—made to embrace, it may be, the entire territory of the globe—wrested for ever from the serpent's brood, and rendered through all its borders beautiful and good—that, and nothing else, we conceive, must have been what the first

race of patriarchal believers hoped and waited for, as the objective portion of good reserved for them.

But in process of time the deluge came, changing to a considerable extent the outward appearance of the earth, and in certain respects also the government under which it was placed, and so preparing the way for a corresponding change in the hopes that were to be cherished of a coming inheritance. The old world then perished, leaving no remnant of its original paradise, any more than of the giant enormities which had caused it to groan, as in pain, to be delivered. But the new world, cleansed and purified by the judgment of God, was now, without limit or restriction, given to Noah, as the saved head of mankind, that he might keep it for God, replenish and subdue it,—might work it, if such a thing were possible, into the condition of a second paradise. It soon became too manifest, however, that this was not possible; and that the righteousness of faith, of which Noah was heir, was still not that which could prevail to banish sin and death, corruption and misery, from the world. Another and better foundation yet remained to be laid for such a blessed prospect to be realized. But the promise of this very earth was nevertheless given for man's inheritance, and with a promise securing it against any fresh destruction. The needed righteousness was somehow to be wrought upon it, and the region itself reclaimed so as to become a habitation of blessing. This was now the heritage of good set before mankind; to have this realized was the object which they were called of God to hope and strive for. And it was with this object before them, an object, however, to which the events immediately subsequent to the deluge did not seem to be bringing them nearer, but rather to be carrying them more remote, that the call to Abraham entered. This call, as we have already seen, was of the largest and most comprehensive nature as to the personal and subjective good it contemplated. It aimed at the bestowal of blessing—blessing, of course, in the divine sense, including the fullest triumph over sin and death, (for where these are, there can be but the beginnings or smaller drops of blessing;) and the bestowal of them on Abraham and his lineal offspring, first and most copiously, but only as the more effectual way of extending them to all the families of mankind. The grand object of the covenant made

with him was to render the world truly blessed in its inhabitants, himself forming the immediate starting-point of the design, which was thereafter to grow and germinate, till the whole circle of humanity were embraced in its beneficent provisions. But in connection with this higher and grander object, there was singled out a portion of the earth for the occupation of his immediate descendants in a particular line—the more special line of blessing ; and the conclusion is obvious, even before we go into an examination of particulars, that unless this select portion of the world were placed in utter disagreement with the higher ends of the covenant, it must have been but a stepping-stone to their accomplishment—a kind of first-fruits of the proper good—the occupation of a *part* of the promised inheritance by a *portion* of the heirs of blessing to image and prepare for the inheritance of the whole by the entire company of the blessed. The particular must here also have been for the sake of the general, the universal, the ultimate.

Proceeding, however, to a closer view of the subject, we notice, first, the region actually selected for a possession of an inheritance to the covenant-people. The land of Canaan occupied a place in the ancient world that entirely corresponded with the calling of such a people. It was of all lands the best adapted for a people who were at once to dwell in comparative isolation, and yet were to be in a position for acting with effect upon the other nations of the world. Hence it was said by Ezekiel, ch. v. 5, to have been “set in the midst of the countries and the nations”—the *umbilicus terrarum*. In its immediate vicinity lay both the most densely-peopled countries, and the greater and more influential states of antiquity—on the south, Egypt, and on the north and east, Assyria and Babylon, the Medes and the Persians. Still closer were the maritime states of Tyre and Sidon, whose vessels frequented every harbour then known to navigation, and whose colonies were planted in each of the three continents of the old world. And the great routes of inland commerce between the civilized nations of Asia and Africa, lay either through a portion of the territory itself, or within a short distance of its borders. Yet bounded as it was on the west by the Mediterranean, on the south by the desert, on the east by the valley of the Jordan, with its two seas of Tiberias and Sodom, and on the north by the

towering heights of Lebanon, the people who inhabited it might justly be said to dwell alone, while they had on every side points of contact with the most influential and distant nations. Then, the land itself, in its rich soil and plentiful resources, its varieties of hill and dale, of river and mountain, its connection with the sea on one side, and with the desert on another, rendered it a kind of epitome of the natural world, and fitted it peculiarly for being the home of those who were to be a pattern-people to the nations of the earth. Altogether, it were impossible to conceive a region more wisely selected, and in itself more thoroughly adapted, for the purposes on account of which the family of Abraham were to be set apart. If they were faithful to their covenant engagements, they might there have exhibited, as on an elevated platform before the world, the bright exemplar of a people possessing the characteristics, and enjoying the advantages of a seed of blessing. And the finest opportunities were, at the same time, placed within their reach of proving in the highest sense benefactors to mankind, and extending far and wide the interests of truth and righteousness. Possessing the elements of the world's blessing, they were placed where these elements might tell most readily and powerfully on the world's inhabitants; and the present possession of such a region was at once an earnest of the whole inheritance, and, as the world then stood, an effectual step toward its realization. Abraham, as the heir of Canaan, was thus also "the heir of the world" as a heritage of blessing. (Rom. iv. 13.)¹

But, next, let us mark the precise words of the promise to Abraham concerning this inheritance. As it first occurs, it runs, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from

¹ We assume, that the land promised in the covenant to Abraham, and afterwards occupied by his posterity in the line of Isaac and Jacob, was simply what is known as the land of Canaan, lying between the Jordan and the Mediterranean sea, and between Lebanon and the wilderness below Kadesh. This is so clearly and definitely marked out in a multitude of historical passages, and the inhabitants of that precise region are so often named as those whom Israel dispossessed, that any considerations which would assign other limits, cannot possibly be well grounded. There are two or three prophetic passages which mention the Nile and the Euphrates as the two extremities of Israel's possession (Gen. xv. 18; xxiii. 31; Deut. i. 7). But, as in later prophecy, these rivers are merely used as representatives of the countries of Egypt and Assyria, and the meaning is, that in the region lying between, Israel alone should have the dominion—though still the portion to be actually possessed by them was of much narrower dimensions.

thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee, and I will make of thee a great nation," &c. Gen. xii. 1. Then, when he reached Canaan, the promise was renewed to him in these terms: "Unto thy seed will I give this land," v. 7. More fully and definitely, after Lot separated from Abraham, was it again given: "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever," xiii. 14, 15. Again, in chap. xv. 7, "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it;" and toward the close of the same chapter, it is said, "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river." In chap. 17th, the promise was formally ratified as a covenant, and sealed by the ordinance of circumcision; and there the words used respecting the inheritance are, "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God." We read only of one occasion in the life of Isaac, when he received the promise of the inheritance, and the words then used were, "Unto thee, and unto thy seed, will I give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father," chap. xxvi. 3. Such also were the words addressed to Jacob at Bethel, "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac, the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed;" and in precisely the same terms was the promise again made to Jacob many years afterwards, as recorded in chap. xxxv. 12.

It cannot but appear striking, that to each one of these patriarchs successively, the promise of the land of Canaan should have been given, first to themselves, and then to their posterity; while, during their own lifetimes, they never were permitted to get beyond the condition of strangers and pilgrims, having no right to any possession within its borders, and obliged to purchase, at the marketable value, a small field for a burying-ground. How shall we account for the promise, then, so uniformly running, "to thee," and to "thy seed?" Some, as Ainsworth and Bush, tell us that *and* here is the same as *even*, to thee, even to thy seed; as if a man were all one with his offspring, or the name of the latter

were but another name for himself! Gill gives a somewhat more plausible turn to it, thus: "God gave Abram the title to it now, and to them the possession of it for future times; gave him it to sojourn in now where he pleased, and for his posterity to dwell in hereafter." But the gift was the land for an inheritance, not for a place of sojourn; and a title, which left him personally without a foot's-breadth of possession, could not be regarded in that light as any real boon to him. Warburton, as usual, confronts the difficulty more boldly: "In the literal sense, it is a promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham and to his posterity; and in this sense it was literally fulfilled, though Abraham was never personally in possession of it; since Abraham and his posterity, put collectively, signify the RACE OF ABRAHAM; and that race possessed the land of Canaan. And surely God may be allowed to explain his own promise: now, though he tells Abraham, he would give *him* the land, yet, at the same time, he assures him, that it would be many hundred years before his *posterity* should be put in possession of it, Gen. xv. 13, &c. And as concerning himself, that he should go to his fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age. Thus we see, that both what God explained to be his meaning, and what Abraham understood him to mean, was, that his posterity, after a certain time, should be led into possession of the land."¹

But if this were really the whole meaning, the thought naturally occurs, it is strange so plain a meaning should have been so ambiguously expressed. Why not simply say, "thy posterity," if posterity alone were intended, and so render unnecessary the somewhat awkward expedient of sinking the patriarch's individuality in the history of his race? Why, also, should the promise have been renewed at a later period, with a pointed distinction between Abraham and his posterity, yet with an assurance that the promise was to him as well as to them: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger?" And why should Stephen have made such special reference to the apparent incongruity between the personal condition of Abraham and the promise given to him, as if there were some further meaning in what was said than lay on the sur-

¹ Legation of Moses, B. VI. sec. 3.

face—"He gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on, yet he promised to give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him?" Acts vii. 5.

We do not see how these questions can receive any satisfactory explanation, so long as no account is made of the personal standing of the patriarchs in regard to the promise. And there are others equally left without explanation. For no sufficient reason can be assigned on that hypothesis, for the extreme anxiety of Jacob and Joseph to have their bones carried to the sepulchre of their fathers, in the land of Canaan—betokening, as it evidently seemed to do, a conviction, that to them also belonged a personal interest in the land. Neither does it appear how the fact of Abraham and his immediate offspring, "confessing that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth," which they did no otherwise, that we are aware of, than by living as strangers and pilgrims in Canaan, should have proved that they were looking for and desiring a better country, that is, an heavenly one. And then, strange to think, if nothing more were meant by the promise than the view now under consideration would imply, when the posterity who were to occupy the land *did* obtain possession of it, we find the men of faith taking up precisely the same confession as to their being strangers and pilgrims in it, which was witnessed by their forefathers, who never had it in possession. Even after they became possessors, it seems, they were still like their wandering ancestors, expectants and heirs of something better, and faith had to be exercised, lest they should lose the proper fulfilment of the promise, (Ps. xxxix. 12, xcv., cxix. 19 ; 1 Chron xxix. 15.) Surely if the earthly Canaan had been the whole inheritance they were warranted to look for, after they were settled in it, the condition of pilgrims and strangers no longer was theirs—they had reached their proper destiny—they were dwelling in their appointed home—the promise had received its due fulfilment.

These manifold difficulties and apparent inconsistencies will vanish—and we see no other way in which they can be satisfactorily removed)—by supposing, what is certainly in accordance with the tenor of revelation, that the promise of Canaan as an inheritance to the people of God was part of a connected and growing scheme of preparatory arrangements, which were to have their proper outgoing and final termination in the establishment

of Christ's everlasting kingdom. Viewed thus, the grant of Canaan must be regarded as a kind of second Eden, a sacred region once more possessed in this fallen world—God's own land—out of which life and blessing were to come for all lands—the present type of a world restored and blessed. And if so, then we may naturally expect the following consequences to have arisen:—First, that whatever transactions may have taken place concerning the actual Canaan, these would be all ordered so as to subserve the higher design, in connection with which the appointment was made; and second, that as a sort of veil must have been allowed meanwhile to hang over this ultimate design, (for the issue of redemption could not be made fully manifest till the redemption itself was brought in), a certain degree of dubiety would attach to some of the things spoken regarding it—these would appear strange, or impossible, if viewed only in reference to the temporary inheritance—and would have the effect, with men of faith, as no doubt they were intended, to compel the mind to break through the outward shell of the promise, and contemplate the rich kernel enclosed within. Thus the promise being made so distinctly and repeatedly to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while personally they were allowed no settled footing in the inheritance bestowed, could scarcely fail to impress them, and their more pious descendants, with the conviction, that higher and more important relations were included under those in which they stood to the land of Canaan during their earthly sojourn, and such as required another order of things to fulfil them. They must have been convinced, that for some great and substantial reason, not by a mere fiction of the imagination, they had been identified by God with their posterity as to their interest in the promised inheritance. And so, they must have felt shut up to the belief, that when God's purposes were completely fulfilled, his word of promise would be literally verified, and that their respective deaths should ultimately be found to raise no effectual barrier in the way of their actual share in the inheritance; as the same God who would have raised Isaac from the dead, had he been put to death, to maintain the integrity of his word, was equally able, on the same account, to raise them up.

Certainly the exact and perfect manner in which the other line of promise, that which respected a seed to Abraham, was

fulfilled, gave reason to expect a fulfilment in regard to this also, in the most proper and complete sense. Abraham did not at first understand how closely God's words were to be interpreted ; and after waiting in vain for some years for the promised seed by Sarah, he began to think, that God must have meant an offspring that should be his only by adoption, and seems to have thought of constituting the son of his steward his heir. Then, when admonished of his error in entertaining such a thought, and informed, that the seed was to spring from his own loins, he acceded, after another long period of fruitless waiting, to the proposal of Sarah regarding Hagar, under the impression, that though *he* was to be the father of the seed, yet it should not be by his proper wife ; the expected good was to be obtained by a worldly expedient, and to be his only in a kind of secondary sense. Here again, however, he was admonished of error, commanded to cease from such unworthy devices, and walk in uprightness before God ; reminded that He, who made the promise, was the Almighty God, to whom, therefore, no impossibility connected with the age of Sarah could be of any moment, and assured that the long promised child was to be the son of him and his lawful spouse.¹ And when Abraham was thus taught to interpret one part of the promise in the most exact and literal sense, how natural was it to infer, that he must do the same also with the other part ? If when God said, "Thou shalt be the father of a seed," it became clear that the word could receive nothing short of the strictest fulfilment ; what else, what less could be expected, when God said, "Thou shalt inherit this land," than that the fulfilment was to be equally proper and complete ? The providence of God, which furnished such an interpretation in the one case, could not but beget the conviction, that a similar principle of interpretation was to be applied to the other, and that as the promise of the inheritance was given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as well as to their seed, so it should be made good in their experience, not less than in that of their posterity.

No doubt, such a belief implied, that there must be a resurrection from the dead before the promise could be realized ; and to those, who conceive that immortality was altogether a blank page

¹ Gen. xvii. 1—17.

to the eye of an ancient Israelite, the idea may seem to carry its own refutation along with it. The Rabbis, however, with all their blindness, seemed to have had juster, because more scriptural, notions of the truth and purposes of God, in this respect. For, on Ex. vi. 4, the Talmud in Gemara, in reply to the question, "Where does the law teach the resurrection of the dead?" thus distinctly answers, "In that place where it is said, I have established my covenant with thee, to give thee the land of Canaan. For it is not said, with *you*, but with *thee*, (lit. yourselves.)"¹ The same answer substantially, we are told, was returned by Rabbi Gamaliel, when the Sadducees pressed him with a similar question. And in a passage quoted by Warburton (B. vi. sec. 3,) from Manasseh Ben-Israel, we find the argument still more fully stated: "God said to Abraham, I will give to thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger. But it appears, that Abraham and the other patriarchs did not possess that land; therefore it is of necessity that they should be raised up to enjoy the good promises,—else the promises of God should be vain and false. So that we have here a proof, not only of the immortality of the soul, but also of the essential foundation of the law, namely, the resurrection of the dead." It is surely not too much to suppose, that what Jewish Rabbis could so certainly draw from the word of God, may have been perceived by wise and holy patriarchs. And the fact, of which an inspired writer assures us, that Abraham so readily believed in the possible resurrection of Isaac to a present life, is itself conclusive proof, that he would not be slow to believe in his own resurrection to a future life, when the word of promise seemed no otherwise capable of receiving its proper fulfilment. Indeed, the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead—not that of the immortality of the soul—is the form which the prospect of an after-state of being must have chiefly assumed in the minds of the earlier believers, because that which most obviously and naturally grew out of the promises made to them, as well as most accordant with their native cast of thought. And nothing but the undue influence of

¹ Sic habetur traditio Rab. Simai; quo loco astruit Lex resurrectionem mortuorum? Nempe ubi dicitur, "Aque etiam constabili foedus meum cum ipsis, ut dem ipsis terram Canaan." Non enim dicitur *vobis* sed *ipsis*.

the Gentile philosophy on men's minds could have led them to imagine, as they generally have done, the reverse to have been the case.

In the writings of the Greeks and Romans, especially those of the former, we find the distinction constantly drawn between matter and spirit, body and soul,—and the one generally represented as having only elements of evil inhering in it, and the other elements of good. So far from looking for the resurrection of the body, as necessary to the final well-being of men, full and complete happiness was held to be impossible so long as the soul was united to the body. Death was so far considered by them a boon, that it emancipated the ethereal principle from its prison-house; and their visions of future bliss, when such visions were entertained, presented to the eye of hope, scenes of delight, in which the disembodied spirit alone was to find its satisfaction and repose. Hence it is quite natural to hear the better part of them speaking with contempt of all that concerned the body, looking upon death as a final, as well as a happy, release from its vile affections, and promising themselves a perennial enjoyment in the world of spirits. “In what way shall we bury you?” said Crito to Socrates, immediately before his death. “As you please,” was the reply. “I cannot, my friends, persuade Crito, that I am the Socrates that is now conversing, and ordering every thing that has been said; but he thinks I am that man, whom he will shortly see a corpse, and asks how you should bury me. But what I have all along been talking so much about,—that when I shall have drunk the poison, I shall no longer stay with you, but shall, forsooth, go away to certain felicities of the blest,—this I seem to myself to have been saying in vain, whilst comforting at the same time you and myself.” And in another part of the same dialogue (*Phædo*), after speaking of the impossibility of attaining to the true knowledge and discernment of things, so long as the soul is kept in the lumpish and impure body, he is represented as congratulating himself on the prospect now immediately before him: “If these things are true, there is much reason to hope, that he who has reached my present position, shall there soon abundantly obtain that, for the sake of which I have laboured so hard during this life; so that I encounter with a lively hope my appointed removal.” No doubt such representations give a highly coloured

and far too favourable view of the expectations which the more speculative part of the heathen world cherished of a future state of being,—for to most of them the whole was overshadowed with doubt and uncertainty, too often, indeed, the subject of absolute unbelief. But in this respect the idea it presents is perfectly correct, that so far as hope *was* exercised toward the future, it connected itself altogether with the condition and destiny of the soul; and so abhorrent was the thought of a resurrection of the body to their notions of future good, that Tertullian did not hesitate to affirm the heresy, which denied that Christian doctrine to be the common result of the whole Gentile philosophy.¹

It was precisely the reverse with believers in ancient and primitive times. *Their* prospects of a blessed immortality were mainly associated with the resurrection of the body; and the dark period to them was the intermediate state between death and the resurrection, which even at a comparatively late stage in their history, presented itself to their view as a state of gloom, silence, and forgetfulness. They contemplated man, not in the light in which an airy, speculative philosophy might regard him, but in the more natural and proper one of a compound being, to which matter as essentially belongs as spirit, and in the wellbeing of which there must unite the happy condition both of soul and body. Nay, the materials from which they had to form their views and prospects of a future state of being, pointed most directly to the resurrection, and passed over in silence the period intervening between that and death. Thus, the primeval promise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, taught them to live in expectation of a time when death should be swallowed up in victory; for death being the fruit of the serpent's triumph, what else could his complete overthrow be than the reversal of death—the resurrection from the dead? So also the prophecy embodied in the emblems of the tree of life, still standing in the midst of the garden of Eden, with its way of approach meanwhile guarded by the flaming sword, and possessed by the cherubim of glory—implying, that when the spoiler should be himself spoiled, and the way of life should again be laid open for the children of promise, they should have access to the food of

¹ Ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium philosophorum schola sumitur, De Praesc. adv. Haeret. § 7.

immortality, which they could only do by rising out of death and entering on the resurrection-state. The same conclusion grew, as we have just seen, most naturally, and we may say inevitably, out of that portion of the promises made to the fathers of the Jewish race, which assured them of a *personal* inheritance in the land of Canaan ; for dying, as they did, without having obtained any inheritance in it, how could the word of promise be verified to them, but by their being raised from the dead to receive what it warranted them to expect ? In perfect accordance with these earlier intimations, or ground-promises, as they may be called, we find, as we descend the stream of time, and listen to the more express utterances of prophecy regarding the hopes of the church, that the grand point on which they are all made to centre, is the resurrection from the dead ; and it is so, no doubt, for the reason, that as death is from the first represented as the wages of sin, the evil pre-eminently under which humanity groans, so the abolition of death by mortality being swallowed up of life, is understood to carry in its train the restitution of all things.

The Psalms, which are so full of the experiences and hopes of David, and other holy men of old, while they express only fear and discomfort in regard to the state after death, not unfrequently point to the resurrection from the dead as the great consummation of desire and expectation : “ My flesh also shall rest in hope, for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption,” Ps. xvi. 9, 10. “ Like sheep they are laid in the grave ; death shall feed on them ; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning ; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling ; but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me,” xlix. 14, 15. The prophets, who are utterly silent regarding the state of the disembodied soul, speak still more explicitly of a resurrection from the dead, and evidently connect with it the brightest hopes of the church. Thus Isaiah, “ He will swallow up death in victory,” xxv. 8 ; and again, “ Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise ; awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust,” xxvi. 19. To the like effect, Hosea xiii. 14, “ I will ransom them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death ; O death, I will be thy plagues ; O grave, I will be thy destruction.” The vision of

the dry bones, in the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel, whether understood of a literal resurrection from the state of the dead, or of a figurative resurrection, a political resuscitation from a down-cast and degraded condition, strongly indicates, in either case, the characteristic nature of their future prospects. Then, finally, in Daniel, we read, ch. xii., not only that he was himself, after resting for a season among the dead, "to stand in his lot at the end of the days," but also that at the great crisis of the church's history, when they should be for ever rescued from the power of the enemy, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth should awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Besides these direct and palpable proofs of a resurrection in the Jewish scriptures, and of the peculiar place it holds there, the Rabbinical and modern Jews, it is well known, refer to many others as inferentially teaching the same doctrine. That the earlier Jews were not behind them, either in the importance they attached to the doctrine, or in their persuasion of its frequent recurrence in the Old Testament scriptures, we may assuredly gather from the tenacity with which all but the Sadducees evidently held it in our Lord's time, and the ready approval which he met with when inferring it from the declaration made to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." It is nothing to the purpose, therefore, to allege, as has often been done, against any clear or well-grounded belief, on the part of the ancient Jews, regarding a future and immortal state of being, such passages as speak of the darkness, silence, and nothingness of the condition immediately subsequent to death, and during the sojourn of the body in the tomb. For that precisely was the period in respect to which their light failed them. Of a heathenish immortality, which ascribed to the soul a perpetual existence separate from the body, and considered its happiness, when thus separate, as the ultimate good of man, they certainly knew and believed nothing. But we are persuaded, no tenet was more firmly and sacredly held among them from the earliest periods of their history, than that of the resurrection from the dead, as the commencement of a final and everlasting portion of good to the people of God. And when the Jewish doctors gave to the resurrection of the dead a place among the thirteen fundamental

articles of their faith, and cut off from all inheritance in a future state of felicity, those who deny it, we have no reason to regard the doctrine as attaining to a higher place in their hands, than it did with their fathers before the Christian era.¹

There was something more, however, in the Jewish faith concerning the resurrection, than its being simply held as an article in their creed, and held to be a fact that should one day be realized in the history of the church. It stood in the closest connection with the promise made to the fathers, as some of the foregoing testimonies shew, and especially with the work and advent of Messiah. They not only believed that there would be a resurrection of the dead, to a greater or less extent, when Messiah came (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* John i. 21, v. 25), but that his work, especially as regards the promised inheritance, could only be carried into effect through the resurrection. Levi² holds it as a settled point, that "the resurrection of the dead will be very near the time of the redemption," meaning by the redemption the full and final enjoyment of all blessing in the land of promise, and that such is the united sense of all the prophets who have spoken of the times of Messiah. In this, indeed, he only expresses the opinion commonly entertained by Jewish writers, who constantly assert that there will be a resurrection of the whole Jewish race, to meet and rejoice with Christ, when he comes to Jerusalem, and who often thrust forward their views regarding it, when there is no proper occasion to do so. Thus, in Sohar, *Genes. fol. 77*, as quoted by Schoettgen, II. p. 367, R. Nehorai is reported to have said, on Abraham's speaking to his servant, *Gen. xxiv. 2*, "We are to understand the servant of God, his senior domus. And who is he? Metatron (Messiah), who, as we have said, will bring forth the souls from their sepulchres." But a higher authority still may be appealed to. For the apostle to the Gentiles thus expresses—and with evident approval as to the general principle—the mind of his countrymen in regard to the Messiah and the resurrection: "I now stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and

¹ See Appendix C.

² *Dissertations on the Prophecies of Old Test.*, vol. i. p. 56.

night, hope to come—for which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?"¹ The connection, in which the resurrection of the dead is here placed with the great promise of a Messiah, for which the Jews are represented as so eagerly and intently looking, evidently implies, that the two were usually coupled together in the Jewish faith, nay that the one could reach its proper fulfilment only through the performance of the other, and that in believing on a Messiah risen from the dead, the apostle was acting in perfect accordance with the hopes of his nation.

But now, to apply all this to the subject under consideration, the promised inheritance,—if that inheritance was promised in a way, which from the very first implied a resurrection from the dead, before it could be rightly enjoyed,—and if all along, even when Canaan was possessed by the seed of Abraham, the men of faith still looked forward to another inheritance, when the curse should be utterly abolished, the blessing fully received, and death finally swallowed up in victory—then, a twofold boon must have been conveyed to Abraham and his seed, under the promise of the land of Canaan; one to be realized in the natural, and the other in the resurrection state,—a mingled and temporary good before, and a complete and permanent one after, the restitution of all things by the Messiah. So that, in regard to the ultimate designs of God, the land of Canaan would serve much the same purpose as the garden of Eden, with its tree of life and cherubim of glory—the same, and yet more,—for it not only presented to the eye of faith a type, but also gave in its possession an earnest of the inheritance of a paradisiacal world. The difference, however, is not essential, and only indicates an advance in God's revelations and purposes of grace, making what was ultimately designed for the faithful more sure to them by an instalment, through a singular train of providential arrangements, in a present inheritance of good. They thus enjoyed a real and substantial pledge of the better things to come, which were to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

But what were these better things themselves? What was

¹ Acts xxvi. 6-8.

thus indicated to Abraham and his believing posterity, as their coming inheritance of good? If it was clear that they must have attained to the resurrection from the dead, before they could properly enjoy the possession, it could not be Canaan in its natural state, as a region of the present earth, that was to be inherited. For that considered as the abode of Abraham and all his elect posterity, when raised from the tomb and collected into an innumerable multitude, must have appeared of far too limited dimensions, as well as of unsuitable character. Though it might well seem a vast inheritance for any living generation that should spring from the loins of Abraham, yet it was palpably inadequate for the possession of his collected seed, when it should have become like the stars of heaven for multitude. And not only so, but as the risen body is to be, not a natural, but a glorified one, the inheritance it is to occupy must be a glorified one too. The fairest portions of the earth, in its present fallen and corruptible state, could be a fit possession for men only so long as in their persons they are themselves fallen and corruptible. When redeemed from the power of the grave, and entered on the glories of the new creation, the natural Canaan will be as unfit to be their proper home and possession, as the original Eden would have been with its tree of life. Much more so, indeed—for the earth in its present state is adapted to the support and enjoyment of man, as constituted, not only after the earthly Adam, but after him as underlying the pernicious effects of the curse. And the ultimate inheritance destined for Abraham and the heirs of promise, which was to become theirs after the resurrection from the dead, must be as much higher and better than any thing which the earth, in its present state, can furnish, as man's nature, when glorified, shall be higher and better than it is while in bondage to sin and death.

Nothing less than this certainly is taught in what is said of the inheritance, as expected by the patriarchs, in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things, declare plainly, that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might

have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly ; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city." Without entering into any minute commentary on this passage, it cannot but be regarded as perfectly conclusive of two points : First, that Abraham, and the heirs with him of the same promise, did understand and believe, that the inheritance secured to them under the promise of Canaan (for that was the only word spoken to them of an inheritance), was one in which they had a personal interest. And then, secondly, that the inheritance as it was to be occupied and enjoyed by them, was to be not a temporary, but a final one,—one that might fitly be designated a "heavenly country," a city built by divine hands, and based on immoveable foundations,—in short, the ultimate and proper resting-place of redeemed and risen natures. This was what these holy patriarchs expected and desired,—what they were *warranted* to expect and desire ;—for their conduct in this respect is the subject of commendation, and is justified on the special ground, that otherwise God must have been ashamed to be called their God. And, finally, it was what they found contained in the promise to them, of an inheritance in the land, in which they were pilgrims and strangers ; for to that promise alone could they look for the special ground of the hopes they cherished of a sure and final possession.

But the question again returns, what is that possession itself really to be ? That it cannot be the country itself of Palestine, either in its present condition, or as it might become under any system of culture of which nature is capable, is too obvious to require any lengthened proof. The twofold fact, that the possession was to be man's ultimate, heavenly inheritance, and that it could be attained only after the resurrection from the dead, clearly forbids the supposition of its being the literal land of Canaan, under any conceivable form of renovated fruitfulness and beauty. This is also evident from the nature of the promise, that formed the ground of Abraham's hope,—which made mention only of the land of Canaan,—and which, as pointing to an ulterior inheritance, must have belonged to that combination of

¹ Heb. xi. 13-16.

type with prophecy, which we placed first, viz. having the promise, or prediction, not in the language employed, but in the typical character of the object which that language described. The promise made to Abraham was simple enough in itself. It gave assurance of a land distinctly marked off by certain geographical boundaries. It was not properly in the words of that promise that he could read his destiny to any future and ultimate inheritance; but putting together the two things, that the promised good could only be realized fully in an after-state of being, and that all the relations of the church then were preparative and temporary representations of better things to come, he might then perceive, that the earthly Canaan was a type of what was finally to be enjoyed. Thus the establishment of his offspring there would be regarded as a prophecy, *in fact*, of the exaltation of the whole of an elect seed to their destined state of blessing and glory. But such being the case,—the prediction standing altogether in the type,—the thing predicted and promised must in conformity with all typical relations, have been another and far higher thing than that which served to predict and promise it, —Canaan could not be the type of itself,—it could only represent, on the lower platform of nature, what was hereafter to be developed on the loftier arena of God's everlasting kingdom,—and as far as the things of fallen and corrupt nature differ from, and are inferior to, those of redemption, so far must the rest of Canaan have differed from, and been inferior to, “that rest which remaineth for the people of God.”

What that final rest or inheritance, which forms the antitype to Canaan, really is, we may gather from the words of the apostle concerning it in Eph. i. 14, where he calls the Spirit “the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession.”¹ It is plain, that the subject here discoursed of, is not our

¹ That the received translation gives here the sense of the original with substantial correctness, I am fully satisfied. The latter part of it, *ἐἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως*, has been variously understood, and its natural import too commonly overlooked. Robinson in his Lexicon makes it, *ἀπολύτρωσιν τὴν περιποιηθεῖσαν*, the redemption acquired for us,—a violent change, which could only be justified if absolutely necessary. The only two senses, in which the word occurs in the New Testament, are, 1. *Acquiring, acquisition, obtaining*, 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 2. *The thing obtained or acquired, possession*, in which sense, unquestionably, it is used in Mal. iii. 17, and in

persons, but our goods ; not what believers in their souls and bodies are to be hereafter, but what is prepared for their enjoyment. For the inheritance which belongs to a person, must always be separate from the person himself. And as that which is called an inheritance in the one clause, is undoubtedly the same with that which in the other is named a possession, purchased or acquired, but not yet redeemed, the redemption of the possession must be a work to be accomplished *for* us, and not to be wrought *in* us. It must be a change to the better, effected not upon our persons, but upon the outward provision secured for their ulterior happiness and well-being.

It is true, that the church of God, the company of sound and genuine believers, is sometimes called the inheritance or purchased possession of God. In Old Testament Scripture his people are styled his "heritage," "his treasure ;" and in New Testament Scripture we find St Peter addressing them as "a peculiar people,"

1 Pet. ii. 9. In both of these places it is applied to the church, as God's acquired, purchased possession, and is equal to his peculium, or property in the stricter sense, his select treasure, which is related to him as nothing else is, which he has acquired or purchased, *πεντηκοστήσας*, by his own blood, Acts xx. 28, comp. also Ex. xix. 6 ; Deut. vii. 6 ; Tit. ii. 14. The great majority of interpreters, from Calvin to Harless, are of opinion, that because in these passages *πεντηκοστήσας* is used as a designation of the church, considered as God's peculiar property, it has the same meaning here, "unto, or until the redemption of his purchased people," as Boothroyd expressly renders. But this view is liable to three objections. 1. The word *πεντηκοστήσας*, is nowhere absolutely and by itself put for "purchased people," or "church ;" when so used, it has the addition of *λαός*. 2. The redemption of the church would then be regarded as future, whereas it is always represented as past. We read of the redemption of the *bodies* of believers as yet to take place, but never of the redemption of the *church* ; that is uniformly spoken of as having been effected by the death of Christ. 3. It does not suit the connection ; for the apostle is speaking of the in-dwelling of the spirit as the earnest of the inheritance, to which believers are destined, and as an earnest is given as a temporary substitute for the inheritance or possession, the term to which, or the end in respect to which it is given, must be, not some other event of a collateral nature, but the coming or receiving of the possession itself. Then, while these objections apply to the common view, there is no need for resorting to it ; while it does violence to the word, it only obscures the sense. *Εἰς πενήκονθας* both Œcumenius and Theophylact on 1 Pet. ii. 9, hold to be *εἰς κτηνῶν*, *εἰς κληρονομίαν*, for a possession, for an inheritance. And Didymus on the same place, as quoted by Steiger, says, "that is *πεντηκοστήσας*, which, by way of distinction, is reckoned among our substance and possessions." Therefore, the correct meaning here is that given by Calov : "*Πεντηκοστήσας*, the abstract being placed for the concrete, is to be understood of the acquired inheritance, for the Holy Spirit is the pledge and earnest until the full redemption of the acquired inheritance."

or literally, a people for a possession—namely, a possession of God, acquired or purchased by the precious blood of his dear Son. The question here, however, is not of what may be called God's inheritance, but of ours ; not of our redemption from the bondage of evil as a possession of God, which he seeks to enjoy free from all evil, but of that which we are ourselves to possess and occupy as our final portion. And as we could with no propriety be called our own inheritance, or our own possession, it must be something apart from, and out of ourselves, which is here to be understood,—not a state of being to be held, but a portion of blessing and glory to be enjoyed.

Now, whatever the inheritance or possession may be in itself, and whatever the region where it is to be enjoyed, when it is spoken of as needing to be redeemed, we are evidently taught to regard it, as something that has been alienated from us, but is again to be made ours ; not a possession altogether new, but an old possession, lost, and again to be reclaimed from the powers of evil, which now overmaster and destroy it. So was it certainly with our persons. They were sold under sin. With our loss of righteousness before God, we lost, at the same time, our spiritual freedom, and all that essentially belonged to the pure and blessed life, in the possession of which we were created. Instead of this we became subject to the tyrannous dominion of the prince of darkness, holding us captive in our souls to the foul and wretched bondage of sin, and in our bodies to the mortality and corruption of death. The redemption of our persons is just their recovery from this lost and ruinous state, to the freedom of God's children, and the blessedness of immortal life in his presence and glory. It proceeds at every step by acts of judgment upon the great adversary and oppressor, who took advantage of the evil, and ever seeks to drive it to the uttermost. And when the work shall be completed by the redemption of the body from the power of the grave, there shall then be the breaking up of the last bond of oppression that lay upon our natures,—the putting down of the last enemy, that the son of wickedness may no longer vex or injure us.

In this redemption-process, which is already begun upon the people of God, and shall be consummated in the glories of the resurrection, it is the same persons, the same soul and body,

which have experience both of the evil and of the good. Though the change is so great and wonderful, that it is sometimes called a new creation, it is not in the sense of any thing being brought into existence, which previously had no being. Such language is simply used on account of the happy and glorious transformation, that is made to pass upon the natures which already exist, but exist only in a state of misery and oppression. And when the same language is applied to the inheritance, which is used of the persons of those who are to enjoy it, what can this indicate, but that the same things are true concerning it? The bringing in of that inheritance, in its finished state of fulness and glory, is in like manner called "the making of all things new;" but it is so called only in respect to the wonderful transformation which is to be wrought upon the old things, which are thereby to receive another constitution, and present another aspect, than they were wont to do before. For that the possession is to be *redeemed*, bespeaks it as a thing to be recovered, not to be made,—a thing already in being, though so changed from its original destination, so marred and spoiled, overlaid with so many forms of evil, and so far from serving the ends for which it is required, that it may be said to be alienated from us, in the hands of the enemy, for the prosecution of his purposes of evil.

Now, what is it, of which this can be affirmed? If it is said heaven, and by that is meant what is commonly understood, some region far removed from this lower world, in the sightless realms of ether, then, we ask, was heaven in that sense ever man's? Has it become obnoxious to any evils, from which it must be delivered? or has it fallen into the hands of an enemy and an oppressor, from whose evil sway it must again be redeemed? None of these things surely can be said of *such* a heaven. It would be an altogether new inheritance, a possession never held, consequently never lost, and incapable of being redeemed. And there is nothing that answers such a description, or can possibly realize the conditions of such an inheritance, but what lies within the bounds and compass of this earth itself, with which the history of man has hitherto been connected both in good and evil, and where all the possession is, that he can properly be said either to have held or to have lost.

Let us again recur to the past. Man's original inheritance was

a lordship or dominion, stretching over the whole earth, but extending no farther. It entitled him to the ministry of all creatures within its borders, and the enjoyment of all fruits and productions upon its surface—one only excepted, for the trial of his obedience (Gen. i. 28–31 ; Ps. viii.) When he fell, he fell from his dominion, as well as from his purity ; the inheritance departed from him ; he was driven from paradise, the throne and palace of his kingdom ; labour, servitude, and suffering, became his portion in the world ; he was doomed to be a bondsman, a hewer of wood and drawer of water, on what was formed to be his inheritance, and all that he has since been able, by hard toil and industry, to acquire, is but a partial and temporary command over some fragments of what was at first all his own. Nor is that the whole. For with man's loss of the inheritance, Satan was permitted to enter, and extend his usurped sway over the domain, from which man has been expelled as its proper lord. And this he does by filling the world with agencies and works of evil,—spreading disorder through the elements of nature, and disaffection among the several orders of being,—above all, corrupting the minds of men, so as to lead them to cast off the authority of God, and to use the things he confers on them for their own selfish ends and purposes, for the injury and oppression of their fellow-men, for the encouragement of sin and suppression of the truth of God, for rendering the world, in short, as far as possible, a region of darkness and not of light, a kingdom of Satan and not of God, a theatre of malice, corruption, and disorder, not of love, harmony, and blessedness.

Now, as the redemption of man's *person* consists in his being rescued from the dominion of Satan, from the power of sin in his soul, and from the reign of death in his body, which are the two forms of Satan's dominion over man's nature ; what can the redemption of the *inheritance* be, but the rescuing of this earth from the manifold ills, which through the instrumentality of Satan have come to lodge in its bosom,—purging its elements of all mischief and disorder,—changing it from being the vale of tears and the charnel-house of death, into a paradise of life and blessing,—restoring to man, himself then redeemed, and fitted for the honour, the sceptre of a real dominion over all its fulness,—in a word, rendering it in character and design what it was on

creation's morn, when the sons of God shouted for joy, and God himself looked with satisfaction on the goodness and order and beauty, which pervaded this portion of his universe? To do such a work as this upon the earth, would manifestly be to redeem the possession, which man by disobedience forfeited and lost, and a new title to which has been purchased by Christ for all his spiritual seed; for were that done, the enemy would be completely foiled and cast out, and man's proper inheritance restored.

But some are perhaps ready to ask, is that, then, *all* the inheritance that the redeemed have to look for? Is their abode still to be upon earth, and their portion of good to be confined to what may be derived from its material joys and occupations? Is paradise restored, to be simply the re-establishment and enlargement of paradise lost? We might reply to such questions by putting similar ones regarding the persons of the redeemed. Are these still, after all, to be the same persons they were during the days of their sojourn on earth? Is the soul, when expatiating amid the glorious scenes of eternity, to live in the exercise of the same powers and faculties, which it employed on the things of time? And is the outward frame, in which it is to lodge and act and enjoy itself, to be that very tabernacle, which it bore here in weakness, and which it left behind to rot and perish in the tomb? Would any one feel at a moment's loss to answer such questions in the affirmative? Does it in any respect shock our feelings, or lower the expectations we feel warranted to cherish concerning our future state, when we think, that the very soul and body, which together constitute and make up the being we now are, shall also constitute and make up the being we are to be hereafter? Assuredly not; for however little we know what we are to be hereafter, we are not left in ignorance, that both soul and body shall be freed from all evil; and not only so, but in the process shall be unspeakably refined and elevated. We know it is the purpose of God to magnify in us the riches of his grace by raising our natures higher than the fall has brought them low—to glorify, while he redeems them, and so to render them capable of spheres of action and enjoyment beyond, not only what eye has seen or ear has heard, but even what has entered into the mind of man to conceive.

And why may we not think and reason thus also, concerning

the inheritance which these redeemed natures are to occupy? Why may not God do a like work of purification and refinement on this solid earth, so as to transform and adapt it into a fit residence for man in glory? Why may not, why *should* not that, which has become for man as fallen, the house of bondage, and the field of ruin, become also for man redeemed the habitation of peace, and the region of pre-eminent delight? Surely He, who from the very stones can raise up children unto Abraham, and who *will* bring forth from the noisome corruption of the tomb, forms clothed with honour and majesty, can equally change the vile and disordered condition of the world, as it now is, and make it fit to be "the house of the glory of his kingdom,"—a world, where the eye of redeemed manhood shall be regaled with sights of surpassing loveliness, and his ear ravished with sounds of sweetest melody, and his desires satisfied with purest delight,—aye, a world, it may be, which, as it alone of all creation's orbs has been honoured to bear the footsteps of an incarnate God, and witness the performance of his noblest work, so shall it be chosen as the region, around which he will pour the richest manifestations of his glorious presence, and possibly send from it, by the ministry of his redeemed, communications of love and kindness, to the farthest bounds of his habitable universe!

No; when rightly considered, it is not a low and degrading view of the inheritance, which is reserved for the heirs of salvation, to place it in the possession of this very earth, which we now inhabit, after it shall have been redeemed and glorified. I feel it for myself to be rather an ennobling and comforting thought; and were I left to choose, out of all creation's bounds, the place where my redeemed nature is to find its local habitation, enjoy its redeemer's presence, and reap the fruits of his costly purchase, I would prefer none to this. For if destined to so high a purpose, I know it will be made in all respects what it should be,—the paradise of delight, the very heaven of glory and blessing, which I desire and need. And, then, the connection between what it now is, and what it shall have become, must impart to it an interest, which can belong to no other region in the universe. If any thing could enhance our exaltation to the lordship of a glorious and blessed inheritance, it would surely be the feeling of possessing it in the very place, where we were once miserable

bondsmen of sin and corruption. And if any thing should dispose us to bear meekly our present heritage of evil, to quicken our aspirations after the period of deliverance, and to raise our affections above the vain and perishable things around us, it should be the thought, that all we can now either have or experience from the world is part of a possession forfeited and accursed, but that it only waits for the transforming power of God to be changed into the inheritance of the saints in light, when heaven and earth shall be mingled into one.

But if this renovated earth is to be itself the inheritance of the redeemed,—if it, in the first instance at least, is to be the heaven where they are to reap life everlasting, how, it may be asked, can heaven be spoken of as above us, and represented as the higher region of God's presence? Such language is never, that we are aware of, used in Scripture to denote the final dwelling-place of God's people; and if it were used there, as it often is in popular discourse, it would need, of course, to be understood with that limitation, which requires to be put upon all our more definite descriptions of a future world. To regard expressions of the kind referred to, as determining our final abode to be over our heads, were to betray a childish ignorance of the fact, that what is such by day, is the reverse of what is so by night. Such language properly denotes the superior nature of the heavenly inheritance, and not its relative position. God can make any region of his universe a heaven, since heaven is there, where he manifests his presence and glory; and why might he not do so here, as well as in any other part of creation?—But is it not said, that the kingdom, in which the redeemed are to live and reign for ever, was prepared for them before the foundation of the world; and how, then, can the scene of it be placed on this earth, still waiting to be redeemed for the purpose? The preparation there meant, however, cannot possibly be an actual fitting up of the place which believers are to occupy with their Lord; for wherever it is, the apostle tells us, it still needs to be redeemed; in that sense it is not yet ready; and Christ himself said, in reference to his leaving the world, that he was going to prepare it, which he does by directing, on his throne of glory, the events which are to issue in its full establishment. Still, from the first it might be said to be prepared, because destined for Christ and his elect

people in the mind of God, even as they were all chosen in him before the foundation of the world ; and every successive act in the history of the mediatorial kingdom is another step toward the accomplishment of the purpose.—Are we not again told, however, that the earth is to be destroyed, its elements made to melt with fervent heat, and all its works consumed ? Unquestionably this *is* said—though not by any means necessarily implying, that the earth is really to be annihilated. We know, that God is perpetually causing changes to pass over the works of his hands, but that he actually annihilates any, we have no ground, either in nature or in Scripture, to suppose. If in the latter we are told of man's body, that it perishes, and is consumed by the moth, yet of what are we more distinctly assured, than that it is not doomed to absolute destruction, but shall live again ? When we read of the old world being destroyed by the flood, we know that the material fabric of the earth continued as before. Indeed, much the same language that is applied to the earth in this respect, is also extended to the heavens themselves ; for they too are represented as ready to pass away, and to be changed as a vesture, and the promise speaks of new heavens as well as a new earth. And in regard to this earth in particular, there is nothing in the language used concerning it to prevent us from believing, that the fire which, in the day of God's judgment, is to burst forth with consuming violence, may, like the waters of the deluge, and in a far higher respect than they, act as an element of purification—dissolving, indeed, the present constitution of things, and leaving not a wreck behind of all we now see and handle, but at the same time rectifying and improving the powers of nature, refining and elevating the whole framework of the earth, and impressing on all that belongs to it a transcendent, imperishable glory—so that in condition and appearance it shall be substantially a new world, and one as far above what it now is, as heaven is above the earth.

There is nothing, then, in the other representations of Scripture, which appears, when fairly considered, to raise any valid objection against the renovated earth being the ultimate inheritance of the heirs of promise. And there is much to shut us up to the conclusion that it is so. We have enlarged on one testimony of inspiration, not because it is the only, or the chief one

on the subject, but because it is so explicit, that it seems decisive of the question. For, an inheritance, which has been already acquired or purchased, but which must be redeemed before it can really be our possession, can be understood of nothing but that original domain, which with man himself sin brought into the bondage of evil at the fall. And of what else can we understand the representation in the 8th Psalm, as interpreted by the pen of inspiration itself, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. ii. 5-9, and in I Cor. xv. 27, 28? These passages in the New Testament put it beyond a doubt, that the idea of perfect and universal dominion, delineated in the Psalm, is to be realized in the world to come, over which Christ, as the head of redeemed humanity, is to rule, in company with his redeemed people. The representation itself in the Psalm, is evidently borrowed from the first chapter of Genesis, and considered as a prophecy of good things to come, or a prediction of the dignity and honour already obtained for man in Christ, and hereafter to be revealed, it may be regarded as simply presenting to our view the picture of a restored and renovated creation. "It is just that passage in Genesis, which describes the original condition of the earth," to use the words of Hengstenberg, "turned into a prayer for us," and we may add, into an object of hope and expectation. When that prayer is fulfilled—in other words, when the natural and moral evils entailed by the fall have been abolished, and the earth shall stand to man, when redeemed and glorified, in a similar relation to what it did at the birth of creation, then shall the hope we now possess of an inheritance of glory be turned into enjoyment. In Isa. xi. 6-9, the final results of Messiah's reign are in like manner delineated under the aspect of a world, which has obtained riddance of all the disorders introduced by sin, and is restored to the blessed harmony and peace which characterized it, when God pronounced it very good. And still more definitely, though with reference to the same aspect of things, the apostle Peter (Acts iii. 21), represents the time of Christ's second coming as "the time of the restitution of all things," that is, when every thing should be restored to its pristine condition,—the same condition in kind, all pure and good, glorious and blessed, but higher in degree, as it is the design and tendency of redemption to ennoble whatsoever it touches.

¹ That this is simply the force of the original here, it may be enough to give the mean-

It is precisely on the same object, a redeemed and glorified earth, that the apostle Paul, in the 8th chap. of the Romans, fixes the mind of believers as the terminating point of their hopes of glory. An incomparable glory is to be revealed in them, and in connection with that "the deliverance of a suffering creation from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." What can this deliverance be, but what is marked in the Epistle to the Ephesians, as "the redemption of the purchased possession?" Nor is it possible to connect with any thing else the words of Peter in his second Epistle, where, after speaking of the dreadful conflagration which is to consume all that belongs to the earth in its present form, he adds,—as if expressly to guard against supposing, that he meant the actual and entire destruction of this world as the abode of man,—“Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.”

It is only by understanding the words of Christ himself, "the meek shall inherit the earth," of the earth in that new condition, its state of blessedness and glory, that any full or adequate sense can be attached to them. He could not surely mean the earth as it then was, or as it is to be during any period of its existence, while sin and death reign in it. So long as it is in that condition, not only will the saints of God have many things to suffer in it, as our Lord immediately foretold, when he spake of the persecutions for righteousness' sake, which his people should have to endure, and on account of which he bade them look for their "reward in heaven;" but all the treasure it contains must be of the moth-eaten, perishable kind, which they are expressly forbidden to covet, and the earth itself must be that city without continuance, in contrast to which they are called to seek one to come. To speak, therefore, as many commentators do, of the tendency of piety in general, and of a mild and gracious disposition in particular, to secure for men a prosperous and happy life on earth, is to say comparatively little as regards the fulfilment of the promise, that they shall "inherit the earth." If it could even command for them the whole that earth now can give, would Christ

ing of the main word from the lexicographer Hesychius: ἀποκατάστασις, "is the restoration of a thing to its former state, or to a better; restitution, consummation, a revolution of the grander kind, from which a new order of things arises, rest after turmoil."

on that account have called them *blessed*? Would he not rather have warned them to beware of the deceitfulness of riches, and the abundance of honours thus likely to flow into their bosom? To be blessed in the earth as an inheritance, must import, that the earth has become to them a real and proper good, such as it shall be, when it has been transformed into a fit abode for redeemed natures. This view is also confirmed, and apparently rendered as clear and certain as language can make it, by the representations constantly made by Christ and the inspired writers, of his return to the earth and manifestation on it in glory, as connected with the last scenes and final issues of his kingdom. When he left the world, it was as a man going into a far country, from which he was to come again;¹ the heaven received him at his resurrection, but only until the times of the restitution of all things;² the period of his residence within the veil, is coincident with that during which his people have to maintain a hidden life, and is to be followed by another, in which they and he together are to be manifested in glory.³ And in the book of Revelation, while unquestionably the scenes are described in typical language, yet when exact localities are mentioned as the places where the scenes are to be realized, and that in connection with a plain description of the condition of those who are to have part in them, we are compelled by all the ordinary rules of composition, to regard such localities as real and proper habitations. What, then, can we make of the ascription of praise from the elders, representatives of a redeemed church, when they give glory to the Messiah, as "having made them kings and priests unto God, and they shall reign with him upon the earth?" Or, what of the closing scenes, where the Evangelist sees a new heaven and a new earth, in the room of those which had passed away, and the new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven to settle on the renovated earth, and the tabernacle of God fixed amongst men?⁴ Granting that the delineations of the book are a succession of pictures, drawn from the relations of things in

¹ Math. xxv. 14; Luke xix. 12; John xiv. 3.

² Acts iii. 21.

³ Col. iii. 4; Heb. ix. 28; 1 John iii. 2; Rev. i. 7.

⁴ Rev. v. 9, 10, xxi. 1—5.

the former ages of the world, and especially under the Old Testament economy, and that the fulfilment to be looked for is not as of a literal description, but as of a symbolical representation, yet there must be certain fixed landmarks as to time and place, persons and objects, which, in their natures or their names, are so clearly defined, that by them the relation of one part to another, must be arranged and interpreted. For example, in the above quotations, we cannot doubt who are kings and priests, or with whom they are to reign; and it were surely strange, if there could be any doubt of the theatre of their dominion, when it is so expressly denominated *the earth*. And still more strange if, when heaven and earth are mentioned relatively to each other, and the scene of the church's future glory fixed upon the latter as contradistinguished from the former, still earth should stand for heaven, and not for itself. Indeed the most striking feature in the representations of the Apocalypse, is the uniformity with which they connect the higher grade of blessing with earth, and the lower with the world of spirits. As Hengstenberg has justly remarked on ch. xx. 4, 5, it invariably points to a double stage of blessedness, the one awaiting believers immediately after their departure out of this life, the other what they are to receive when they enter the New Jerusalem, and reign with Christ in glory. But we find the same in our Lord's teaching, as when he said to the thief on the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," and yet pointed his disciples to the state of things on earth after the resurrection for their highest reward (Matth. xix. 28). And, on the whole, we are forced to conclude with Usteri, that "the conception of a transference of the perfected kingdom of God into the heavens, is properly speaking modern, seeing that according to Paul, and the Apocalypse, (and, he might also have added, Peter and Christ himself,) the seat of the kingdom of God is the earth, inasmuch as that likewise partakes in the general renovation."¹

¹ The above passage is quoted by Tholuck, on Rom. viii. 19, who himself there, and on Heb. ii., concurs in the same view. He also states, what cannot be denied, that it is the view, which has been adopted by the greatest number, and the most ancient of the expositors, amongst whom he mentions, though he does not cite, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Luther, &c. And Rivet, on Gen. viii. 22, states, that the opinion, which maintains only a change, and not an utter destruction of the

Having now closed our investigation, we draw the following conclusions from it.

1. The earthly Canaan was neither designed by God, nor from the first was it understood by his people, to be the ultimate and proper inheritance, which they were to occupy; things having

world, has most supporters, both among the older and the more recent writers, so that it may be called, says he, "the common one, and be said to prevail by the number of its adherents." In the present day, the opposite opinion would probably be entitled to be regarded as by much the most common; and the view here set forth, will perhaps by some be eyed with jealousy, if not condemned as novel. It may be proper, therefore, to give a few quotations from the more eminent commentators. Jerome, on Isa. lxxv. 17, quotes Ps. cii. 26 and 27, which he thinks "clearly demonstrates, that the perdition spoken of, is not a reducing to nothing, but a change to the better;" and having referred to what Peter says of the new heavens, and the new earth, he remarks, that the Apostle "does not say, we look for other heavens and another earth, but for the old and original ones transformed into a better state." Of the fathers generally, as of Justin Martyr in particular, Semish states, that they regarded the future destruction of the world by fire, "far more frequently, as a transformation, than as an annihilation." (*Life and Times of Justin*, Bib. Cab. Vol. XLII. p. 366.) Calvin, while he discourages minute inquiries and vain speculations regarding the future state, expresses himself with confidence, on Rom. viii. 21, as to this world being the destined theatre of glory, and considers it as a proof of the incomparable glory to which the sons of God are to be raised, that the lower creation is to be renewed for the purpose of manifesting and ennobling it, just as the disorders and troubles of creation have testified to the appalling evil of our sin. So also Haldane, a man of peculiarly sober judgment, on the same passage, after quoting from 2 Pet. and Rev. continues: "The destruction of the substance of things differs from a change in their qualities. When metal of a certain shape is subjected to fire, it is destroyed as to its figure, but not as to its substance. Thus the heavens and the earth will pass through the fire, but only that they may be purified and come forth anew, more excellent than before. This hope—the hope of deliverance—was held out in the sentence pronounced on man, for in the doom of our first parents the divine purpose of providing a deliverer was revealed. We know not the circumstances of this change, how it will be effected, or in what form the creation—those new heavens and that new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, suited for the abode of the sons of God—shall then exist; but we are sure it shall be worthy of the divine wisdom, although at present beyond our comprehension." To the same effect Fuller, in his *Gospel its own Witness*, ch. v. Thiersch says of the promise to Abraham, "Undoubtedly it pointed to a kingdom of God upon earth, not in an invisible world of spirits. Paradise itself had been upon earth, much more should the earth be the centre of the world to come." (*History*, I. p. 20). See Olshausen also on Matth. viii. Mr Stuart, in his work on Romans, expresses his strong dissent from such views, on the ground of their being opposed to the declarations of Christ, and requiring such a literal interpretation of prophecy, as would lead to absurd and ridiculous expectations in regard to other predictions. We can perceive no contrariety in our opinion to any declaration of Christ or his apostles, and the other predictions he refers to belong to quite another class, and do not require, or even admit, as might quite easily be shewn, of a strictly literal fulfilment.

been spoken and hoped for concerning it, which plainly could not be realized within the bounds of Canaan.

2. The inheritance was one which could be enjoyed only by those who had become the children of the resurrection, themselves fully redeemed in soul and body from all the effects and consequences of sin, made more glorious and blessed, indeed, than if they had never sinned, because constituted after the image of the heavenly Adam. And as the inheritance must correspond with the inheritor, it can only be man's original possession restored,—the earth redeemed from the curse which sin brought on it, and, like man himself, rendered exceedingly more beautiful and glorious, than in its primeval state,—the fit abode of a church, made like, in all its members, to the Son of God.

3. The occupation of the earthly Canaan by the natural seed of Abraham, was a type, and no more than a type, of this occupation by a redeemed church, of her destined inheritance of glory ; and consequently every thing concerning the entrance of the former on their temporary possession, was ordered so as to represent and foreshadow the things which belong to the church's establishment in her permanent possession. Hence, between the giving of the promise, which though it did not terminate in the land of Canaan, yet included that, and through it prospectively exhibited the better inheritance, a series of important events intervened, which are capable of being fully and properly explained in no other way, than by means of their typical bearing on the things hereafter to be disclosed respecting that better inheritance. If we ask, why did the heirs of promise wander about so long as pilgrims, and withdraw to a foreign region, before they were allowed to possess the land, and not rather, like a modern colony, quietly spread, without strife or bloodshed, over its surface, till the whole was possessed ? Or, why were they suffered to fall under the dominion of a foreign power, from whose cruel oppression they needed to be redeemed, with terrible executions of judgment on the oppressor, before the possession could become theirs ? Or why, before that event also should they have been put under the discipline of law, having the covenant of Sinai, with its strict requirements and manifold obligations of service, superadded to the covenant of grace and promise ? Or, why again should their right to the inheritance itself, have to be vindicated from a race of occupants, who

had been allowed for a time to keep possession of it, and whose multiplied abominations had so polluted it, that nothing short of their extermination could render it a fitting abode for the heirs of promise? The full and satisfactory answer to all such questions, can only be given, by viewing the whole in connection with the better things of a higher dispensation,—as the first part of a plan, which was to have its counterpart and issue in the glories of a redeemed creation, and for the final results of which the church needed to be prepared by standing in similar relations, and passing through like experiences, in regard to an earthly inheritance. No doubt, with one and all of these, there were connected reasons and results for the time then present, amply sufficient to justify every step in the process, when considered simply by itself. But it is only when we take the whole as a glass, in which to see mirrored the far greater things, which from the first were in prospect, that we can get a comprehensive view of the mind of God in appointing them, and know the purposes which he chiefly contemplated.

For example, the fact of Abraham and his immediate descendants, being appointed to wander as pilgrims through the land of Canaan, without being allowed to occupy any part of it as their own possession, may be partly explained, though in that view it must appear somewhat capricious, by its being considered as a trial to their own faith, and an act of forbearance and mercy toward the original possessors, whose iniquities were not yet full. But if we thus find grounds of reason to explain, why it *may* have been so ordered, when we come to look upon the things which happened to them, as designed to image other things, which were afterwards to belong to the relation of God's people to a higher and better inheritance, we see it was even *necessary* that those transactions should have been so ordered, and that it would have been unsuitable for the heirs of promise, either entering at once on the possession, or living as pilgrims and expectants, any where but within its borders. For thus alone could their experience fitly represent the case of God's people in gospel times, who have not only to wait long for the redemption of the purchased possession, but while they wait, must walk up and down as pilgrims in the very region, which they are hereafter to use as their own, when it shall have been delivered from the

powers of evil who now hold it in bondage, and purged from their abominations. Hence, if they know aright their relation to the world as it now is, and their calling as the heirs of promise, they must sit loose to the things of earth, even as the patriarchs did to the land of their sojourn,—must feel, that it cannot be the place of their rest, so long as it is polluted, and that they must steadfastly look for the world to come as their proper home and possession. And thus also the whole series of transactions, which took place between the confirmation of the covenant of promise with Jacob, and the actual possession of the land promised, and more especially the things which concerned that greatest of all the transactions, the revelation of the law from Sinai, is to be regarded as a delineation in the type, of the way and manner in which the heirs of God are to obtain the inheritance of the purchased possession. Meanwhile, apart from these later transactions, there are two important lessons, which the church may clearly gather from what appears in the first heirs of promise, and which she ought never to lose sight of:—First, that the inheritance, come when and how it may, is the free gift of God, bestowed by him, as sovereign lord and proprietor, on those whom he calls to the fellowship of his grace: And, second, that the hope of the inheritance must exist as an animating principle in their hearts, influencing all their procedure. Their spirit and character must be such as become those who are the expectants, as well as heirs, of that better country, which is an heavenly. And Christ is never truly formed in the heart, until he be formed as “the hope of glory.”

APPENDIX A.

TYPICAL FORMS IN NATURE.—P. 94.

It is scarcely possible, within the compass of a few pages, to exhibit the prevalence of Typical Forms in Nature, so as to make it tell in the manner it is capable of doing on our general argument. For as it rests upon a multiplicity of facts, bearing a certain relation to each other, and these facts such as have been but recently, and some of them as yet only partially ascertained—the subject must inevitably suffer, when presented in a great measure apart from these, in a brief and imperfect outline. But such an outline is all that can be given here. Those who desire to enter more fully into the investigation may have recourse to the works of Professor Owen, especially to his Treatises on *Limbs*, and on the *Archetype and Homologies of the Vertebrate Skeleton*; to Mr Hugh Miller's *Footprints of the Creator*; and the ingenious and interesting article on *Typical Forms* in the 30th Number of the North British Review, understood to be the production of the author of the *Method of the Divine Government*. The writer of this article pursues the subject even into the vegetable field of nature, and endeavours to shew that in plants which have leaves that strike the eye, the leaf and plant are typically analogous: the leaf is a typical plant or branch, and the tree or branch a typical leaf. In this field, however, the facts are neither so fully established, nor do they appear so perfectly uniform, as in the higher region of animal forms, or comparative anatomy. Here it is found, by a wide and satisfactory induction, that the human is what may be called the *pattern* form of animal existences—the archetype of the vertebrate division of animated nature. In the structure of all other animal forms there are observable striking resemblances to that of man, and resemblances of a kind that seem plainly designed to assimilate the lower, as near as circumstances would admit, to the higher. It is found, that in all vertebrate animals, from fishes to man, the vertebrate skeleton is composed of a series of parts of essentially the same order, though modified in a great variety of ways to suit the particular functions which each organ has to perform in the different animals respectively. Thus, to give only a single instance, every segment, and almost every bone present in the human hand and arm, exist also in the fin of the whale, though they do not seem required for the support and movement of that undivided and inflexible paddle; and one can think of no specific rea-

son for such a peculiarity of structure, excepting the intention of having it brought into the nearest possible conformity to the archetype. Most strikingly does the similarity to the human type, coupled with its relative superiority to the others, appear in regard to the brain, which is the most peculiar and distinguishing part of the animal frame. "Nature," says Mr Miller, "in constructing this curious organ in man, first lays down a grooved cord, as the carpenter lays down the keel of his vessel; and on this narrow base the perfect brain, as month after month passes by, is gradually built up, like the vessel from the keel. First it grows up into a brain closely resembling that of a fish; a few additions more convert it into a brain undistinguishable from that of a reptile; a few additions more impart to it the perfect appearance of the brain of a bird; it then develops into a brain exceedingly like that of a mammiferous quadruped; and finally, expanding atop, and spreading out its deeply corrugated lobes, till they project widely over the base, it assumes its unique character as a human brain. Radically such at the first, it passes through all the inferior forms, from that of the fish upwards, as if each man were in himself, not the microcosm of the old fanciful philosopher, but something greatly more wonderful—a compendium of all animated nature, and of kin to every creature that lives. Hence the remark, that man is the sum total of all animals—'the animal equivalent,' says Oken, 'to the whole animal kingdom.'"—(*Footprints*, p. 291.)

This, however, is not the whole. For, as geology has now learned to read with sufficient accuracy the stony records of the past to be able to tell of successive creations of vertebrate animals, from fish, the first and lowest, up to man, the last and highest; so here also we have a kind of typical history—the animal productions of nature during those earlier geological periods bore, as the imperfect, a prospective reference to man, as the complete and ultimate form of animal existence. They were the types, and he is the antitype in the mundane system. In the words of Professor Owen, "all the parts and organs of man had been sketched out in anticipation, so to speak, in the inferior animals; and the recognition of an ideal exemplar in the vertebrated animals proves, that the knowledge of such a being as man must have existed before man appeared. For the divine mind, which planned the archetype, also foreknew all its modifications. The archetypal idea was manifested in the flesh long prior to the existence of those animal species that actually exemplify it. To what natural laws or secondary causes the orderly succession and progression of such organic phenomena may have been committed, we are as yet ignorant. But if, without derogation of the divine power we may conceive the existence of such ministers, and personify them by the term NATURE, we learn from the past history of our globe that she has advanced with slow and stately steps, guided by the archetypal light amidst the wreck of worlds, from the first embodiment of the vertebrate idea under its old ichthyic vestment, until it became arrayed in the glorious garb of the human form."

In this view of the matter, what a striking analogy does the history of God's operations in nature furnish to his plan in providence, as brought out in the history of redemption! Here, in like manner, there is a grand archetypal idea in the person and kingdom of Christ, towards which for ages

the divine plan was continually working. Partial exhibitions of it appear from time to time in certain personages, events, and institutions that rise prominently into view as the course of providence proceeds, but all marred with obvious faults and imperfections in respect to the great object contemplated; until, at length, the idea in its entire length and breadth is seen embodied in Him to whom all the prophets gave witness—the *God-man foreordained before the foundation of the world*. “The Creator”—to adopt again the language of Mr Miller, who, in an article in the *Witness* newspaper of 2d August 1851, has very felicitously described the analogy in this respect between the natural and the moral departments of God’s plan—“The Creator, in the first ages of his workings, appears to have been associated with what he wrought simply as the producer or author of all things. But even in those ages, as scene after scene, and one dynasty of the inferior animals succeeded another, there were strange typical indications which pre-Adamite students of prophecy among the spiritual existences of the universe might possibly have aspired to read—symbolical indications to the effect that the Creator was in the future to be more intimately connected with his material works than in the past, through a glorious creature made in his own image and likeness. And to this semblance and portraiture of the Deity—the first Adam—all the merely natural symbols seem to refer. But in the eternal decrees it had been for ever determined that the union of the Creator with creation was not to be a mere union by proxy or semblance. And no sooner had the first Adam appeared and fallen, than a new school of prophecy began, in which type and symbol were mingled with what had now its first existence on earth—verbal enunciations; and all pointed to the second Adam, ‘the Lord from heaven.’ In him creation and the Creator meet in reality and not in semblance. On the very apex of the finished pyramid of being sits the adorable Monarch of all:—as the Son of Mary—of David—of the first Adam, the created of God; as God and the Son of God, the eternal Creator of the universe. And these—the two Adams—form the main theme of all prophecy, natural and revealed. And that type and symbol should have been employed with reference not only to the second, but—as held by men like Agassiz and Owen—to the first Adam also, exemplifies, we are disposed to think, the unity of the style of Deity, and serves to shew that it was He who created the worlds that dictated the Scriptures.”

The subject might even be prosecuted farther still, for it is as well fitted to stimulate the aspirations of hope toward the future, as to strengthen the foundations of faith in the past. If the archetypal idea in animated nature has been wrought at, through long periods and successive stages of being, till it found its proper realization in man; now that the nature of man is linked in personal union with the Godhead, for the purpose of repairing what is evil, and raising manhood to a higher than its original condition, who can conceive to what peerless glory and perfection it may yet attain? The divine power is no longer to be displayed in creating what is new, but in a work of “regeneration” upon the old, to the intent that the earthly and human in us may be brought to the nearest possible conformity to the spiritual and divine in Christ. The frame and condition of redeemed men, therefore, though relatively perfect as compared with the past, is yet but in

embryo when viewed with respect to the more elevated future. All has still to assume the form and impress of a more glorious type, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard; of which the whole we can now say is—"We know not what we shall be, but we know that when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

APPENDIX B.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.—P. 102.

I.—THE HISTORICAL AND DIDACTIC PORTIONS.

BESIDES numberless allusions of various kinds in the New Testament to the Old, there are somewhat more than two hundred and fifty express citations in the writings of the one from those of the other. These citations are of unequal length; they consist often of a single clause, but sometimes also extend to several verses. They are taken indiscriminately from the different parts of Old Testament Scripture; though, with very few exceptions, they belong to the five books of Moses, the Psalms, and the writings of the prophets.

Not a few of these citations from the Old Testament are citations of the simplest kind; they appear merely as passages quoted in their plain sense from the previously existing canon of Scripture. Such, for example, are the passages out of the books of Moses, with which our Lord, after the simple notification, "It is written," thrice met the assaults of the tempter in the wilderness; and such also are those with which Stephen, in his historical speech before the Jewish council, sought, through appropriate references to the past, to enlighten the minds and alarm the consciences of his judges. In examples of this description, there is nothing that can be said to wear even the semblance of a difficulty, unless it may be regarded as such, that occasionally a slight difference appears in the passages as quoted, from what they are as they stand in the original Scripture. But the difference is never more than a verbal one; the sense of the original is always given with substantial correctness by the inspired writers in the New Testament; and so far as the great principles of interpretation are concerned, there is no need for lingering about the discussion of a matter so comparatively minute.

But there still remains a considerable variety of Old Testament passages, so cited in the New, as plainly to involve certain principles of interpretation; because they are cited as grounds of inference for some authoritative conclusion, or as proofs of doctrine respecting something connected with the person, the work, or the kingdom of Christ. And on the supposition of the authors of the New Testament being inspired teachers, the character

of these citations is of the gravest importance—first, as providing in the hermeneutical principles they involve, a test to some extent of the inspiration of the writers; and then as furnishing in those principles, an infallible direction for the general interpretation of ancient Scripture. For, there can be no doubt that the manner in which our Lord and his apostles understood and applied the Scriptures of the Old Testament, was as much intended to throw light generally on the principles of interpretation, as to administer instruction on the specific points, for the sake of which they were more immediately appealed to. What, then, is the kind of use made of the passages in question, and the spirit in which they are explained? Is it natural and proper? Is there nothing strained, nothing paradoxical, nothing arbitrary and capricious in the matter? Does it altogether commend itself to our understandings and consciences? Undoubtedly it does so in the great majority of cases. And yet it is not to be denied that there are certain peculiarities connected with the treatment of the Old Testament in the New, which are very apt to stagger inquirers in their first attention to the subject. Nay, there are real difficulties attaching to some parts of it, which have long exercised the ingenuity of the ablest interpreters, and of which no satisfactory solution can be given, without a clear and comprehensive insight being first obtained into the connection subsisting between the preparatory and the ultimate things in God's kingdom.

In a small publication, which materially contributed to the solution of some of these difficulties, issued so far back as 1824, Olshausen remarks concerning the use made of the Old Testament in the New :—

“This has been for all more recent expositors a stone of stumbling, over which not a few of them have actually fallen. It has appeared to them difficult and even impossible to discover a proper unity and connection in the constructions put upon the passages by the New Testament writers, or to refer them to rules and principles. Without being able to refer them to these, they could not properly justify and approve of them; neither could they, on the other hand, altogether disapprove and reject them, without abandoning every thing. So that in explaining the passages of the Old Testament which pointed to the New, and again explaining the passages of the New Testament which expressly referred to and applied the Old, expositors for the most part found themselves involved in the greatest difficulties, and, on the one side or the other, resorted to the most violent expedients. But the explanation of the Old Testament in the New is the very point from which alone all exposition that listens to the voice of divine wisdom must set out. For we have here presented to us the sense of Holy Scripture as understood by inspired men themselves, and are furnished with the true key of knowledge.”¹

It is more especially, however, in the application made by New Testament writers of the *prophecies* of the Old Testament that the difficulties in question present themselves. Nor are they by any means of one kind; they are marked by a considerable diversity, and the passages will require to be taken in due order and connection, if we are to arrive at a well-grounded and

¹ Ein Wort über tiefem Schriftsinn, pp. 7, 8.

satisfactory view of the subject. This is what we mean to do. But, as there are other portions of Old Testament Scripture, besides the prophecies, referred to and quoted in the New—as much use also is made there of the historical and didactic portions—it is important, in the first instance, to notice that this use, with only one or two apparent, and no real exceptions, is always of a quite natural and unsophisticated character; free from any ridiculous or extravagant conceits, and entirely approving itself to the judgments of profound and thoughtful readers. Such readers, indeed, so naturally expect it to be so, that they scarcely take cognisance of the fact, or ever think of the possibility of its having been otherwise. But it is the rather to be noted, as, at the period the New Testament was written, there was, both in the age generally, and in the Jewish section of it in particular, a strong tendency to the allegorical in interpretation—to the strained, the fanciful, the puerile. The records of gospel history contain many plain indications of this. Our Lord even charged the Jewish scholars and interpreters of his day with rendering of no effect the law of God by their traditions (Mark vii. 11, 12); and evidently had it as his chief aim, in a considerable part of his public teaching, to vindicate the real sense of ancient Scripture from their false glosses and sophistical perversions. The oldest Rabbinical writings extant, which profess to deliver the traditional interpretations of the leading doctors of the synagogue, sufficiently evince what need there was for our Lord adopting such a course. Such as know these only from the quotations adduced by Ainsworth, Lightfoot, and similar writers, see them only in what is at once by far their best side, and their smallest proportions. For, to a large extent, they consist of absurd, incredible, and impure stories; abound with the most arbitrary and ridiculous conceits; and, as a whole, tend much more to obscure and perplex the meaning of Old Testament Scripture, than explain it. It was even regarded as a piece of laudable ingenuity to multiply as much as possible the meanings of every clause and text; for, as Jeremiah had compared the Word of God to a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces, so, it was thought, the Word must admit of as many senses as the rock smitten with the hammer might produce splinters. Some Rabbinical authorities, therefore, contend for forty-nine, and others for as many as seventy meanings to each verse.¹

¹ Eisenmenger *Entwecetcs Judenthum*, vol. i. ch. 9. This laborious investigator of Jewish writings justly calls their expositions “foolish and perverted,” and supports the assertion with ample proof. Thus—to refer only to one or two—on the passage which narrates the meeting of Esau and Jacob, it is gathered in the *Bereschith Rabba*, from a small peculiarity in one of the words, that Esau did not come to kiss, but to bite, and that “our father Jacob’s neck was changed into marble, so that the teeth of the ungodly man were broken.” The passage in Ps. xcii. 10—“My horn shall thou exalt like the horn of an unicorn. I shall be anointed with fresh oil,” is explained in the *Jalkut Chudash* by the statement, that while in “anointing the other sons of Jesse, the oil was poured out, when David’s turn came, the oil of itself flowed and ran upon his head.” These, indeed, are among the simpler specimens; for, by giving a numerical value to the letters, the most extravagant and senseless opinions were thus obtained. The fact, however, is of importance, as it provides a sufficient answer to the mode of interpretation adopted by many modern expositors, who think it enough to justify the evangelists in putting what they regard as a false meaning upon words of prophecy, to say, that the Jewish writers were in the habit of applying Scripture in the same way—applying it in a sense different from its original import. It is forgotten in this case that the Jewish writers actually believed Scripture to have many senses, and that when they speak of its being fulfilled, they meant that the words really had the sense they ascribe to them.

When we pass out of the strictly Jewish territory to the other theological writings of the first ages, we are seldom allowed to travel far without stumbling on something of the same description. To say nothing of the writings of Philo, which are replete with fanciful allegorical meanings, but which could have little if any influence in Judea, in the epistle of Barnabas (ascribed to the pen of that Barnabas who was the companion of St Paul, and an acknowledged production of the first age), we find among other frivolous things, the circumcision of 318 persons in Abraham's house interpreted as indicating that the patriarch had received the mystery of three letters. For, the numerical value of the two leading letters that stand for the name of Jesus is 18, and the letter T, the figure of the cross, is 300; "wherefore by two letters he signified Jesus, and by the third his cross. He who has put the engrafted gift of his doctrine within us, knows that I never taught to any one a more certain truth." In the epistle of Clement, another production of the apostolical age, the scarlet thread which Rahab suspended from her window, is made to signify that there should be redemption through the blood of Jesus to all that believe and hope in him; and the fable of the Phoenix, dying after five hundred years, and giving birth, when dead, to another destined to live for the same period, is gravely treated as a fact in natural science, and held up as a proof of the resurrection. Some things of a similar nature are also to be met with in Irenæus, and many in the writings of Justin Martyr. Let the following suffice for a specimen:—

"When the people fought with Amalek, and the son of Nun, called Jesus, led on the battle, Moses was praying to God, having his arms extended in the form of a cross; as long as he remained in that posture, Amalek was beaten; but if he ceased in any degree to preserve it, the people were worsted,—all owing to the power of the cross; for the people did not conquer because Moses prayed, but because the name of Jesus was at the head of the battle, and Moses himself made the figure of the cross."—(*Dial. Tryph.* p. 248, *Ed. Sylburg*).

Now, it is surely no small proof of the divine character of the New Testament writings, that they stand entirely clear from such strained and puerile interpretations, notwithstanding that they were the production of the very age and people peculiarly addicted to such things. Though Jesus of Nazareth, from the circumstances of his early life, could not have enjoyed more than the commonest advantages, he yet came forth as a public teacher nobly superior to the false spirit of the times; never seeking for the frivolous or the fanciful, but penetrating with the profoundest discernment into the real import of the divine testimony. And even the apostle Paul, though brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, whose name is still held in veneration in the schools of Rabbinical learning, betrays nothing of the sinister bias in this respect, which his early training must have tended to impart; he writes as one well skilled, indeed, to reason and dispute, but still always as one thoroughly versant in the real meaning of Scripture, and incapable of stooping to any thing trifling and fantastical. And that there should thus have been, in persons so circumstanced, along with a frequent handling of Old Testament Scripture, a perfectly sober and intelligent use of it—a spirit of interpretation

pervading and directing that use, which can stand even the searching investigations of the nineteenth century, cannot fail to raise the question in candid and thoughtful minds, "Whence had these men this wisdom?" It is alone fitted to impress us with the conviction, that they were men specially taught by God, and that the inspiration of the Almighty gave them understanding.

We have stated, however, that though there are no real departures in the writings of the New Testament from a sound and judicious explanation of the historical and didactic parts of the Old, there are a few apparent ones—a few that may seem to be such on a superficial consideration. One passage, and only one, in our Lord's history, belongs to this class. It is his scriptural proof of the resurrection, in reply to the shallow objection of the Sadducees, which he drew from the declaration of God to Moses at the bush, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." It is clear from this alone, our Lord argued, that the dead are raised; "for God is not the God of the dead but of the living; for all live unto him"—(Matt. xxii. 32; Luke xx. 38). The argument was plainly stigmatised by the notorious Wolfenbuttle-fragmentist of the last century, as of the Rabbinical hair-splitting kind; and more recently Strauss, with some others of a kindred spirit in Germany, have both regarded it as a "cabalistical exposition," and urged as an additional reason for so regarding it, that the doctrine of a future state was derived by the Jews from other nations, and cannot be proved from the writings of the Old Testament. Most worthy successors truly to those Sadducean objectors whom our Lord sought to confute—equally shallow in their notions of God, and equally at fault in their reading of his written word! So far from deriving the notion of a future state, in the particular aspect of it now under consideration—a resurrection from the dead—from the heathen nations around them, the Jews were the only people in antiquity who held it; the Gentile philosophy in all its branches rejected it as incredible. And the construction put by our Lord on the words spoken to Moses, so far from being cabalistical or hair-splitting, simply penetrates to the fundamental principles involved in the relation they indicate between God and his servants. "The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob"—*theirs* in the full and proper sense, to be to them, and to do for them, whatever such a Being, standing in such a relation, could be and do; therefore, most assuredly, to raise them from the dead, since, if one part of their natures were to be left there the prey of corruption, he might justly be ashamed to be called their God—(Heb. xi. 16). "How could God," Neander properly asks, "place himself in so near a relation to individual men, and ascribe to them so high a dignity, if they were mere perishable appearances, if they had not an essence akin to his own, and destined for immortality? The living God can only be conceived of as the God of the living."¹ Yes, the whole law, in a sense, bore witness to that; for there death constantly appears as the embodiment of foulness and corruption, with which the pure and holy One cannot dwell in union. So that for those who are really his, he must manifest himself as the conqueror of death; their relation to him, as his peculiar people, is a nonentity, if it

¹ Life of Jesus, § 248.

does not carry this in its train. How profound, then, yet how simple and how true, is the insight which our Lord here discovers into the realities of things, compared either with his ancient adversaries or his modern assailants! And how little does his argument need such diluted explanations to recommend it as those of Kuinoel,—“God is called the God of any one, in so far as he endows them with benefits; but he cannot bestow benefits upon the dead, therefore they live!” Nay, that is but a part; be not afraid to go a little deeper. There is more water in the well than is fetched up by such a bucket. It is clear still at a lower depth.

A passage that has much more commonly been regarded by commentators as breathing the dialectics of the Jewish schools, is Gal. iv. 21–31, where the apostle, in arguing against the legal and fleshly tendencies of the Galatians, summons them to “hear the law.” And then he calls to their remembrance the circumstances recorded of the two wives of Abraham and their offspring; the one Sarah, the free-woman, the mother of the children of promise, or the spiritual seed, corresponding to the heavenly Jerusalem and its true worshippers; the other, Hagar, the bond-woman, the mother of a seed born after the flesh, carnal and ungodly in spirit, and so corresponding to the earthly Jerusalem, or Sinai, with its covenant of law, and its slavish carnal worshippers. And the apostle declares it as certain, that worshippers of this class must all be cast out from any inheritance in the kingdom of God, even as Hagar and her fleshly son were, by divine command, driven out of Abraham’s house, that the true child of promise might dwell in peace, and inherit the blessing. It is true, the apostle himself calls this an allegorizing of the history, which is quite enough with some to stamp it as fanciful and weak. And there are others, looking merely to the superficial appearances, who allege that the exposition fails, since the child of Hagar had nothing to do with the law, while it was precisely the posterity of Sarah, by the line of Isaac, who stood bound by its requirements. This is an objection that could be urged only by those who did not perceive the real drift of the apostle’s statement. We shall have occasion to unfold this in a subsequent part of our inquiry, when we come to speak of what the law could not do. Meanwhile, we affirm that the apostle’s comment proceeds on the sound principle, that the things which took place in Abraham’s house in regard to a seed of promise and blessing, were all ordered specially and peculiarly to exhibit at the very outset the truth, that such a seed must be begotten from above, and that all not thus begotten, though encompassed, it might be, with the solemnities and privileges of the covenant, were born after the flesh—Ishmaelites in spirit, and strangers to the promise. The apostle merely reads out the spiritual lessons that lay infolded in the history of Abraham’s family as significant of things to come; and, to say that the similitude fails, because the law was given to the posterity of Sarah and not of Hagar, betrays a lamentable ignorance of what the real design of the law was, and what should have been expected from it. The interpretation of the apostle alone brings out the fundamental principles involved in the transactions, and it does no more.

Those who would fasten on the apostle the charge of resorting to Rabbinical arbitrariness and conceit, point with considerable confidence to a pas-

sage in the first epistle to the Corinthians. The passage is 1 Cor. x. 1-4, where the apostle reminds the Corinthians how their fathers had been under the cloud, and had passed through the sea; and had been baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and had all eaten the same spiritual food, and all drunk of the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ. In this latter part of the description, it has been alleged (and is still by De Wette, Rückert, Meyer), that the apostle adopts the Jewish legends respecting the rock at Horeb having actually followed the Israelites in their wanderings, and puts a feigned allegorical construction on the other parts to suit his purpose. The passage will naturally present itself for explanation when we come to the period in Israel's history to which it refers.¹ At present we merely say, that it only requires us to take the apostle's statements in their proper connection, and make due allowance for the figurative use of language. He is representing the position of the Israelites in the desert as substantially one with that of the Corinthians. And, to make it more manifest, he even applies the terms fitted to express the condition of the Corinthians to the case of the Israelites:—These, says he, were baptized like you, had Christ among them like you, and like you were privileged to eat and drink as guests in the Lord's house. Of course, language transferred thus from one part of God's dispensations to another, could never be meant to be taken very strictly—no more could it be so, when the *new* things of the Christian dispensation were applied to the Israelites, than when the *old* things of the Jewish are applied to the members of the Christian Church. In this latter mode of application, the Christian Church is spoken of as having a temple as Israel had, an altar, a passover-lamb and feast, a sprinkling with blood, a circumcision. Yet every one knows that what is meant by such language is, not that the very things themselves, the things in their outward form and appearance, but that the inward realities signified by them, belong to the Church of Christ. The old name is retained, though actually denoting something higher and better. And we must interpret in the same way, when the transference is made in the reverse order—when the new things of the Christian Church are ascribed to the ancient Israelites. By the cloud passing over and resting between them and the Egyptians, and afterwards by their passing under its protection through the Red sea in safety, they were baptised into Moses—for thus the line of demarcation was drawn between their old vassalage and the new state and prospects on which, under Moses, they had entered; and Christ himself, whose servant Moses was, was present with them, feeding them as from his own hand with direct supplies of meat and drink, till they reached the promised inheritance. In short, these were to them relatively what Christian baptism and the Lord's supper are to believers now. But not in themselves formally the same. Christ was there only in a mystery; Gospel ordinances were possessed only under the shadow of means and provisions, adapted immediately to their bodily wants and temporal condition. Yet still Christ and the Gospel were there; for all that was then given and done linked itself by a spiritual bond with the better things to come, and as

¹ See Book III., § 4.

in a glass darkly reflected the benefits of redemption. So that, as the Israelites in the desert stood relatively in the same position with the professing Church under the Gospel, the language here used by the apostle merely shews how clearly he perceived the points of resemblance, and how profoundly he looked into the connection between them.

II.—PROPHECIES REFERRED TO BY CHRIST.

We no sooner open the evangelical narratives of New Testament Scripture than we meet with references and appeals to the *prophecies* of the Old. The leading personages and transactions of gospel times are constantly presented to our view as those that had been foreseen and described by ancient seers; and at every important turn in the evolution of affairs, we find particular passages of prophecy quoted as receiving their fulfilment in what was taking place. But we soon perceive, that the connection between the predictions referred to and their alleged fulfilment, is by no means always of the same kind. It appears sometimes as more natural and obvious in its nature, and sometimes as more mystical and recondite. The latter, of course, in an inquiry like the present, are such as more especially call for consideration and remark; but the others are not on that account to be passed over in silence. For they are so far at least of importance, that they shew what class of predictions, in the estimation of our Lord and his apostles, most obviously point to the affairs of the Messiah's kingdom, and afford also an opportunity of marking how the transition began to be made to a further and freer application of Old Testament prophecy.

In this line of inquiry, however, it will not do to take up the references to the prophets precisely as they occur in the gospels; for the evangelists did not write their narratives of our Lord's personal history till a considerable time after the events that compose it had taken place—not till the deeper, as well as the more obvious things connected with it had become known to them; and not a few of the prophetic references found in their narratives were only understood by themselves at a period much later than that at which the events occurred. It is in Christ's own teaching, communicated as the events were actually in progress, that we may expect to find the most simple and direct applications of prophecy, and the key to the entire use of it subsequently made by his apostles. For the present, therefore, we shall throw ourselves back upon the transactions of the gospel age, and with our eye upon him who was at once the centre and the prime agent of the whole, we shall note the manner in which he reads to those around him the prophecies that bore on himself and his times. We shall take them, not in the historical order they occupy in the narratives of the evangelists, but in the antecedent order which belonged to them, as quoted in the public ministry of Christ. We shall thus see how he led those around him, step by step, to a right understanding of the prophecies in their evangelical import.

At the very commencement of our Lord's public ministry, and on the occasion, as it would seem, of his first public appearance in the synagogue of Nazareth, he opened the book of the prophet Isaiah that had been put

into his hands, and read from chap. lxi. the following words: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor: he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book," it is added by the evangelist, "and began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." The passage thus quoted, and so emphatically applied by Jesus to himself, is one of those in the latter portion of Isaiah's writings (comprehending also chap. xlii., xlix., liii.), which evidently treat of one grand theme,—“the Lord's servant,” his “elect” one, him “in whom his soul delighted;” unfolding what this wonderful and mysterious personage was to be, to do, and to suffer for the redemption of the Lord's people, and the vindication of his cause in the earth. It is matter of certainty that, in the judgment of the ancient Jewish church, the person spoken of in all these passages was the Messiah;¹ so that in applying to himself that particular passage in Isaiah, Jesus not only advanced the claim, but he must have been perfectly understood by those present to advance the claim, to be the Messiah of the Jewish prophets. The modern Jews, and a considerable number also of Christian expositors (chiefly on the continent), have endeavoured to prove that the immediate and proper reference in this, and the other passages in Isaiah connected with it, is to the Jewish nation as a whole, or to the prophetic part of it in particular. But these attempts have signally failed. It stands fast, as the result of the most careful and searching criticism, that the words of the prophet can only be understood of a single individual, in whom far higher than human powers were to develop themselves, and who was to do, as well for Israel as for the world at large, what Israel had been found utterly incompetent, even in the lighter departments of the work, to accomplish. In a word, they can be understood only of the promised Messiah. And of all that had been spoken concerning him by the prophet Isaiah, there is not a passage to be found that could more fitly have been appropriated by Jesus than the one he read at that opening stage of his career; as it describes him in respect to the whole reach and compass of his divine commission, with all its restorative energies and beneficent results. We see as well the wisdom of the selection as the justness of the application. It is also to be noted, that the appropriation by our Lord of the passage in this sixty-first chapter of Isaiah, gives the virtual sanction of his authority to the applications elsewhere made of other passages in the same prophetic discourse to gospel-times—such as Matt. xii. 18-21; Acts viii. 32-35; xiii. 47; Rom. x. 21; 1 Peter ii. 23-25, where portions of Isa. xlii., xlix., liii. are so applied.

The next *open and public* appeal made by our Lord to an ancient prophecy, was made with immediate respect to John the Baptist. It was probably about the middle of Christ's ministry, and shortly before the death of John. Taking occasion from John's message to speak of the distinguished place he held among God's servants, the Lord said: "This is he, of whom

¹ See Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. on Matt. xii. 20, and John v. 19*; Schöttgen *de Messia*, pp. 113, 192; Hengstenberg's *Christology on Isa. xlii. 1-9, xlix., liii. 2*. Also Alexander on the same passages, and lxi.

it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, and he shall prepare thy way before thee." The words are taken from the beginning of the third chapter of Malachi—with no other difference than that he who there sends is also the one before whom the way was to be prepared: "He shall prepare the way before *me*." The reason of this variation will be noticed presently. But, in regard to John, that he was the person specially intended by the prophet as the herald-messenger of the Lord, can admit of no doubt on the part of any one who sincerely believes that Jesus was God manifest in the flesh, and personally tabernacling among men. John himself does not appear to have formally appropriated this passage in Malachi. But he virtually did so when he described himself in the words of a passage in Isaiah, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord;" for the passage in Malachi is merely a resumption, with a few additional characteristics, of that more ancient one in Isaiah. And on this account they are both thrown together at the commencement of St Mark's Gospel, as if they formed indeed but one prediction: "As it is written in the prophets (many copies even read 'by Isaiah the prophet'), Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." And there is still another prediction—one at the very close of Malachi—which is but a new, and, in some respects, more specific announcement of what was already uttered in these earlier prophecies. In this last prediction, the preparatory messenger is expressly called by the name of Elias the prophet, and the work he had to do "before the coming of the Lord," is described as that of turning "the heart of the fathers (or making it return) to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." As this was the last word of the Old Testament, so it is in a manner the first word of the New; for the prophecy was taken up by the angel, who announced to Zacharias the birth of John, and at once applied and explained it in connection with the mission of John. "Many of the children of Israel," said the angel, "shall he turn to the Lord their God; and he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord" (Luke i. 16, 17). Here the coming of the Lord, as in all the passages under consideration, was the grand terminating point of the prophecy, and, as preparatory to this, the making ready of a people for it. This making ready of the people, or turning them back again (with reference to the words of Elijah in 1 Kings xviii. 37) to the Lord their God, is twice mentioned by the angel as the object of John's mission. And, between the two, there is given what is properly but another view of the same thing, only with express reference to the Elijah-like character of the work: John was to go before the Lord as a new Elias, in the spirit and power of that great prophet, and for the purpose of effecting a reconciliation between the degenerate seed of Israel and their pious forefathers—making them again of one heart and soul, so that the fathers might not be ashamed of their children, nor the children of their fathers; in a word, that he might effect a real reformation, by turning "the disobedient (offspring) to the wisdom of the

just (ancestors).” Thus in all these passages—to which we may also add the private testimony of our Lord to the disciples as to Elias having indeed come (Mark ix. 13)—there is a direct application of the Old Testament prophecy, in a series of closely-related predictions, to the person and mission of John the Baptist. And, so far from any violence or constraint appearing in this application, the predictions are all taken in their most natural and obvious meaning. For that the literal Elias was no more to be expected from the last of these predictions, than the literal David from Ezek. xxxiv. 23, seems plain enough; the person meant could only be one coming in the spirit of Elias, and commissioned to do substantially his work. So also, Jezebel and Balaam are spoken of as reviving in the teachers of false doctrine and the patrons of corruption, who appeared in some of the churches of Asia (Rev. ii. 14, 20).

But we must pass on to another instance of fulfilled prophecy. It will be observed, that in all those passages out of Isaiah and Malachi applied to John the Baptist, there was involved an application also to Christ himself, as being the person whose way John was sent to prepare. The assertion, that John was the herald-messenger foretold in them, clearly implied, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Lord who was to come to his people, or “the Angel of the Covenant that was to come suddenly to *his* temple.” He, therefore, was the Lord of the temple, or the divine head and proprietor of the covenant people whom that temple symbolized, and in the midst of whom he appeared as God manifest in the flesh. But this the Lord merely left to be inferred from what he said of John; he even seems to have purposely drawn a sort of veil over it, by the slight change he introduced into the words of Malachi, saying, Not “before *me*,” but “before *thy* face.” For he well knew, that those to whom he spake could not bear in this respect the plain announcement of the truth, indeed, least of all here; they could not even bear to hear Jesus call himself by the milder epithet of the Son of God. Sometime, however, if not at present, the Lord must give them to know, that in this rooted antipathy to the essentially divine character of Messiah, they had their own Scriptures against them. And so, in the next public appeal he made to the prophetic Scriptures, he selected this point in particular for proof. But that the appeal might come with more power to their consciences, he threw it into the form, not of an assertion, but of an interrogation; he put it to themselves: “What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?” (Matt. xxii. 42-45). The familiar allusion here, and in other passages of the New Testament, to this psalm as descriptive of the Messiah, clearly evinces what was the view taken of it by the ancient Jewish church; such an argumentative use of it could only have been made on the ground that it was held by general consent to be a prophecy of Christ. Efforts have again and again been made in modern times to controvert this view, but without any measure of success. And, indeed, apart altogether from the explicit testimony of our Lord and his apostles, looking merely to what is said of the hero of this psalm—that he

stood to David himself in the relation of Lord ; that he was to sit on Jehovah's right hand, that is, should be invested with the power and sovereignty of God ; that he should, like Melchizedec, be a priest on the throne, and that for ever—it is impossible to take these parts of the description in their natural meaning, and understand them of any one but the Messiah—a Messiah, too, combining in his mysterious person properties at once human and divine. The silence of our Lord's adversaries then, and the fruitless labours of his detractors since, are confirmatory testimonies to the soundness of this application of the psalm, as the only tenable one.

Another purpose—one immediately connected with his humiliation—led our Lord, very shortly after the occasion last referred to, to point to another prophecy as presently going to meet with its fulfilment. It was when fresh from the celebration of the paschal feast and his own supper, he had retired with his disciples, under the shade of night, to the Mount of Olives : “ Then said Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night ; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad ” (Matt. xxvi. 31). So it had been written in Zachariah, xiii. 7, respecting that peculiar shepherd and his flock, who was to be Jehovah's fellow, or rather his near relation—for so the word in the original imports ; and hence, when spoken of any one's relation to God, it cannot possibly denote a mere man, but can only be understood of one who, by virtue of his divine nature, stands on a footing of essential nearness and equality toward God. All other interpretations, whether by Jews or Christians, can only be regarded as shifts, devised to explain away or get rid of the plain meaning of the prophecy. And it was here more especially chosen by our Lord, as, more distinctly and emphatically perhaps than any other prediction in Old Testament Scripture, it combined with the peerless dignity of Christ's nature the fearful depth of his humiliation and suffering ; and so was at once fitted to instruct and comfort the disciples in respect to the season of tribulation that was before them. It told them, indeed, that the suffering was inevitable ; but at the same time imparted the consolation, that so exalted a sufferer could only suffer for a time. But though this was the only prophetic passage particularly noticed, as having been explained by Christ with reference to his sufferings, we are expressly informed that, after his resurrection at least, he made a similar application of many others. He reproved the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, for their dulness and incredulity, because they had not learned from the prophets how Christ must suffer before entering into his glory : “ And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.” Indeed, it would appear that, even before his death, he had referred to various Scriptures bearing on this point ; for, at Luke xxiv. 44, we find him saying to the disciples as a body : “ These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.” But as what had been spoken previously had been spoken to little purpose, he then “ opened their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures ; ” and said unto them, “ Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day,” &c.

Nor are we left altogether without the means of knowing what portions of Old Testament Scripture our Lord thus applied to himself. The apostles undoubtedly proceeded to act upon the instruction they had received, and to make use of the light that had been imparted to them. And when, on opening the Acts of the Apostles, we find Peter, in chap. i., applying without hesitation or reserve what is written in Ps. cix., of the persecutions of Jesus and the apostacy of Judas : again, in chap. ii., applying in like manner, what is written in Ps. xvi. to Christ's speedy resurrection ; Ps. cx., to his exaltation to power and glory ; and Joel ii. 28-32, to the gift of the Spirit ; in chap. iii., affirming Jesus to be the prophet that Moses had foretold should be raised up like to himself ; in chap. iv., speaking of Jesus as the stone rejected by the builders, but raised by God to the head of the corner, as written in Ps. cxviii. (an application that had already been indicated, at least, by Christ in a public discourse with the Jews, Matt. xxi. 42), and, along with the other apostles, describing Christ as the anointed king in Ps. ii., against whom the heathen raged, and the people imagined vain things ;—when we read these things, it would be folly to doubt that we have in them the fruit of that more special instruction which our Lord gave to his disciples, when he opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures. It is Christ's own teaching made known to us through the report of those who had received it from his lips. And any interpretation of those passages of Old Testament Scripture, which would deny their fair and legitimate application to Christ and the things of his kingdom, must be regarded as a virtual reflection on the wisdom and authority of Christ himself.

But it does not follow from this, that Christ and Gospel events must in all of them have been *exclusively* intended : it may be enough if in some they were more peculiarly included. More could scarcely be meant, especially in respect to Ps. cix. and cxviii., in both of which the language is such as to comprehend classes of persons, and whole series of events. That the proper culmination of what is written should be found in Christ and his Gospel dispensation, is all that could justly be expected. But of this it will be necessary to speak more fully, as it touches on a more profound and hidden application of Old Testament things to those of the New. There were other parts also of our Lord's personal teaching which still more strikingly bore on such an application, but which, from their enigmatical character, we have purposely omitted referring to in this section. Meanwhile, in those more obvious and direct references which have chiefly passed under our review, what a body of well-selected proof has our Lord given from the prophecies of the Old Testament, to the truth of his own Messiahship ! And how clear and penetrating an insight did he exhibit into the meaning of those prophecies, compared with what then prevailed among his countrymen !

III.—THE DEEPER PRINCIPLES INVOLVED IN CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We have seen that nearly all the prophecies of Old Testament Scripture,

which our Lord applied to himself and the affairs of his kingdom, during the period of his earthly ministry, were such as admitted of being so applied in their most direct and obvious sense. In nothing else could they have found a proper and adequate fulfilment. This can scarcely, however, be said of the whole of them. When his ministry was drawing to a close, he on one occasion publicly, and on several occasions with the disciples privately, made application to himself and the things of his kingdom, of prophecies which could not be said to bear immediate and exclusive respect to New Testament times. And we have now to examine these later and more peculiar applications of prophetic Scripture, in order to perceive the deeper principles of connection between the Old and the New, involved in our Lord's occasional use of the word of prophecy.

The *public* occasion we have referred to was when, a few days before his death, Christ solemnly pointed the attention of the Jews to a passage in Ps. cxviii. "Did ye never read," he asked (Matt. xxi. 42), "in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?" Though Jesus did not say in respect to this psalm, as he said shortly after in respect to the 110th, that in inditing it the Psalmist spake through the Spirit of Christ; yet both the question itself he put regarding the passage, and the personal application he presently afterwards made of it, clearly implied, that he considered himself and the Jewish authorities of his time, to be distinctly embraced in the Psalmist's announcement. And the same opinion was still more explicitly avowed by the Apostle Peter, after he had been instructed more fully by Christ respecting the Old Testament Scriptures, when, standing before the Jewish council, he exclaimed, "This is the stone which was set at nought by you builders, which is become the head of the corner."—(Acts iv. 11.)

Yet, when we turn to the psalm itself, the passage thus quoted and applied to Christ, in his relation to the Jewish rulers, has the appearance rather of a statement than actually verified in the history and experience of the covenant-people, than of a prediction still waiting to be fulfilled. The psalm throughout has the appearance of a national song, in which priests and people joined together to celebrate the praise of God, on some memorable occasion when they saw enlargement and prosperity return after a period of depression and contempt. It was peculiarly an occasion of this kind, when the little remnant that escaped from Babylon, amid singular tokens of divine favour, found themselves in a condition to set about the restoration of God's house and kingdom in Jerusalem. Indeed, Ezra iii. 11 leaves very little room to doubt, that the psalm owes its origin to that happy occasion, as we are there told, that when they met to lay anew the foundation of the temple, the assembled multitude began to praise the Lord in the very words which form the commencement of this psalm. There could not be a more seasonable moment for the joyous burst of thanksgiving, which the people seem in the psalm, as with one heart and soul, to pour forth to God, on account of his distinguishing goodness in having rescued them from the deadly grasp of their heathen adversaries, and for the elevating and assured hope they express of the final and complete ascendancy of his kingdom. Of this, the eye

of faith was presented with an encouraging pledge in current events. By a remarkable turn in God's providence, the apparently dead had become alive again; the stone rejected by the mighty builders of this world, as worthless and contemptible, was marvellously raised to the head of the corner; and, in connection with it, a commencement was made, however feebly, toward the universal triumph of the truth of God over the corruption and idolatry of the world. But such being the natural and direct purport of the psalm, how could the sentiment uttered in it concerning the stone be so unconditionally applied to Christ? The right answer to this question presupposes the existence of a peculiarly close relation between the commonwealth of Israel and Christ; and such a relation as can only be understood aright, when we have first correctly apprehended the real calling and destiny of Israel.

Now, this was declared at the outset by anticipation to Abraham, when the Lord said concerning his seed, that it should be blessed and made a blessing—made so peculiarly the channel of blessing, that in it *all* the families of the earth were to be blessed. To fulfil this high destination, was the calling of Israel as an elect people. Viewed, therefore, according to their calling, they were the children of God, Jehovah's first-born (Deut. xiv. 1; Exod. iv. 22); Jehovah was the father that begot them—that is, raised them into the condition of a people, possessing a kind of filial relationship to himself (Deut. xxxii. 6, 18; Jer. xxxi. 9); but possessing it only in so far as they were a spiritual and holy people, abiding near to God, and fitted for executing his righteous purposes—for so far only did their actual state correspond with their destination.—(Exod. xix. 5, 6; Deut. xiv. 2; Ps. lxxiii. 15.) For the most part, this correspondence palpably failed. God was true to *his* engagements, but not Israel to *theirs*. He gave freely to them of his goodness; gave often when he might have withheld; but *their* history is replete with backslidings and apostasies, shame and reproach. Even within the limits of Canaan, the real children of God—the seed of blessing—were usually in a grievous minority; they were, for the most part, the comparatively poor, the afflicted, the needy, amid multitudes of an opposite spirit—the internal heathen, who differed only in name and outward position from the heathen abroad. But this very imperfection in the reality, as compared with the idea, was here, as in other things, made to contribute toward the great end in contemplation. For it was this especially that shewed the necessity of something higher and better to accomplish what was in prospect. So long as God stood related to them, merely as he did, or had done to their fathers, believers in Israel felt that they had to wage an unequal conflict, in which fearful odds were generally against them, even on Israelitish ground. And how could they expect to attain to a righteousness, and acquire a position, that should enable them to bless the whole world? For this, manifestly, there was needed another and still closer union than yet existed between Israel and God—a union that should somehow impenetrate their condition with the very power and sufficiency of Godhead. Only if the relation between earth and heaven could be made to assume a more vital and organic form—only if the divine and human, the angel of the covenant and the seed of Abraham, Jehovah and Israel, could become truly and person-

ally one—then only could it seem possible to raise the interest of righteousness in Israel to such an elevation as should bring the lofty destination of Abraham's seed to bless the world within the bounds of probability. It was one leading object of prophecy to give to such thoughts and anticipations a definite shape, and convert what might otherwise have been but the vague surmises, or uncertain conjectures of nature, into a distinct article of faith. Especially does this object come prominently out in the latter portion of Isaiah's writings, where, in a lengthened and varied discourse concerning the calling and destiny of Israel, we find the Lord perpetually turning from Israel in one sense, to Israel in another; from an Israel full of imperfection, false, backsliding, feeble, and perverse, (for example, in chap. xlii. 19; xliii. 22; xlvi. 4; lviii. ; lix.), to an Israel full of excellence and might, the beloved of Jehovah, the very impersonation of divine life and goodness, in whom all righteousness should be fulfilled, and salvation for ever made sure to a numerous and blessed offspring.—(Chap. xlii. 1-7; xlix. ; li. 13-15, liii. ; lv. ; lxi. 1-3.) So that what Israel, as a whole, had completely failed to realize—what, even in the *spiritual* portion of Israel, had been realized in a very partial and inadequate manner, *that*, the prophet gave it to be understood, was one day to be accomplished without either failure or imperfection. But let it be marked well how it was to be accomplished;—simply by there being raised up in Israel One who should link together in his mysterious person the properties of the seed of Abraham and the perfections of Jehovah; in whom, by the singular providence of God, should meet on the one side all that distinctively belonged to Israel of calling and privilege, and all, on the other, that was needed of divine power and sufficiency to make good the determinate counsel of Heaven to bless all the families of the earth.

But this is still only one, and what may be called the more general, aspect of the matter. Within the circle of the chosen seed, a special arrangement was, from the first, contemplated (Gen. xlix. 8-10), and came at last to be actually made, which was rendered yet more remarkably subservient to the design of at once nourishing the expectation of a Messiah, and exhibiting the difference, the antagonism even, that should exist between him and the fleshly Israel. We refer to the appointment of a royal house, in which Israel's peculiar calling to bless the world was to rise to its highest sphere, and by which it was more especially to reach its fulfilment. To render more clearly manifest God's real purpose in this respect, he allowed a false movement to be made, in the first instance, concerning it. The choice was virtually given to the people, who sought merely to have a king and kingdom like the nations around them (1 Sam. viii. 5; ix. 20; xii. 13); and so the king they got, being carnal, like themselves, soon proved incapable, notwithstanding the peculiar means that were employed to elevate his spiritual condition, of reigning as God's vicegerent, and his kingdom equally incapable of establishing righteousness within, or resisting assaults from without. It was but a human institution, and fell alike unblessed and un blessing. Therefore, the Lord stepped in to exercise *his* choice in the matter, and found David, who, by special training and gifts, was prepared to wield the kingdom for the Lord. So thoroughly did he enter into the Lord's mind in the matter,

and act as the Lord's servant, that the kingdom was made to stand in him as its living root, and the right to administer a kingdom of blessing in the earth was connected in perpetuity with his line.—(2 Sam. vii.) But here, again, the same kind of results presently began to discover themselves, as in the former case. It was with the utmost difficulty at first, and never more than in the most imperfect manner, that David himself, or any of his successors, could succeed in establishing righteousness and dispensing blessing even among the families of Israel. The kingdom, too, with all its imperfections, lasted but for a brief period, and then fell into hopeless confusion. So that if the divine purpose in this matter was really to stand; if there was to be a kingdom of truly divine character, administered by the house of David, and encompassing the whole earth with its verdant and fruitful boughs (Ezek. xvii. 22-24; Dan. vii. 13, 14), it was manifest that some other link of connection must be formed than any that still existed, between the divine source and the earthly possessor of the sovereignty—a connection not merely of delegated authority, but of personal contact and efficient working; on the one side humanizing the Deity, and on the other deifying humanity. For no otherwise than through such intermingling of the divine and human could the necessary power be constituted for establishing and directing such a kingdom throughout the nations of the earth.

Now, this destined rise in the kingdom founded in David, and its culmination in a divine-human Head, is also the theme of many prophecies. David himself took the lead in announcing it; for he already foresaw, through the Spirit, what, in this respect, would be required to verify the wonderful promise made to him.—(2 Sam. vii.; Ps. ii., xlv., lxxii., cx.; also Isa. vii. 14; ix. 6, &c.) But as David was himself the root of this new order of things, and the whole was to take the form of a verification of the word spoken to him, or of the perfectionment of the germ that was planted in him, so in his personal history there was given a compendious representation of the nature and prospects of the kingdom. In the first brief stage was exhibited the embryo of what it should ultimately become. Thus, the absoluteness of the divine choice in appointing the king—his *seeming* want, but *real* possession of the qualities required for administering the affairs of the kingdom—the growth from small, because necessarily *spiritual*, beginnings of the interests belonging to it—still growing, however, in the face of an inveterate and ungodly opposition, until judgment was brought forth unto victory,—these leading elements in the history of the first possessor of the kingdom must appear again—they must have their counterpart in Him, on whom the prerogatives and blessings of the kingdom were finally to settle. There was a real necessity in the case, such as always exists where the end is but the development and perfection of the beginning; and we may not hesitate to say, that if they had failed in Christ, he could not have been the anointed king of David's line, in whom the purpose of God to govern and bless the world in righteousness, was destined to stand. Here, again, we have another and lengthened series of predictions, connecting, in this respect, the past with the future, the beginning with the ending (for example, Ps. xvi., xxii., xl., lxix., cix.; Isa. liii.; Zech. ix. 9; xii. 10; xiii. 1-7.)

Such, then, is the close and organic connection, in two important respects,

between God's purpose concerning Israel, and his purpose in Christ. And if we only keep this distinctly in view, we shall have no difficulty in perceiving that a valid and satisfactory ground existed for the application of Ps. cxviii. 22 to Christ, and many applications of a similar kind made both by him and by the apostles. In the psalm now mentioned, the calling and destination of Israel to be blessed, and to bless mankind, notwithstanding that they were in themselves so small in number, and had to carry it against all the might and power of the world—this is the theme which is chiefly unfolded there, and it is unfolded in connection with the singular manifestation of divine power and goodness, which had even then given such a striking token of the full accomplishment of the design. But this accomplishment, as we have seen, could only be found in Christ, in whom was to meet what distinctively belonged to Israel, on the one side, and, on the other, what exclusively belongs to God. In him, therefore, the grand theme of the psalm must embody itself, and through him reach its complete realization. He pre-eminently and peculiarly is the stone, rejected in the first instance by the carnalism of the world, as represented in the Jewish rulers, but at length raised by God, on account of its spiritual and divine qualities, to be the head of the corner. And all that formerly occurred of a like nature in the history of Israel, was but the germ of what must again, and in a far higher manner, be developed in the work and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The same thing, with no material difference, holds of an entire class of passages in the Psalms, only, in most of them, respect is chiefly had to the covenant made with the house of David, rather than to the more general calling and destination of Israel. Such, for example, are the two closely-related Psalms lxix. and cix., parts of which were first privately applied by Christ, and afterwards more publicly by Peter, to the case of Judas (John xv. 25; Acts i. 20, comp. with Ps. lxix. 4, 25; cix. 3, 8); but to him only as the worst embodiment and most palpable representative of the malice and opposition of which the Messiah was the object: for such Judas was in reality, and such also is the kind of enmity described in the Psalms—an enmity that had many abettors, though concentrating itself in one or more individuals. Hence St Paul applies the description to the Jews generally.—(Rom. xi. 9, 10.) Other passages in the same two psalms are applied by the evangelists and apostles to Christ—Matt. xxvii. 34, 48; John ii. 17; Rom. xv. 3.) And to these psalms we may add, as belonging to the same class, Ps. xli., a verse of which, "He that did eat of my bread, lifted up his heel against me," is pointed to by our Lord as finding its fulfilment in the treachery of Judas (John xiii. 18); Ps. xxii., of which several similar appropriations are made concerning Christ (Matt. xxvii. 46; John xix. 24, &c.); and Ps. xl., which contains the passage regarding the insufficiency of animal sacrifices, and the necessity of a sublime act of self-devotion, quite unconditionally applied to Christ in Heb. x. 4-10. The references to these psalms, it will be observed, were made either by Christ, near the close of his ministry, when seeking to give the disciples a deeper insight into the bearing of Old Testament Scripture on gospel-times, or by the evangelists and apostles after his work on earth was finished, and all had become plain to them. The Psalms themselves are so far alike, that they are all the productions of David, and pro-

ductions in which he, as the founder and root of the kingdom, endeavoured, through the Spirit, out of the lines of his own eventful history, to set forth the light it furnished respecting the more important and momentous future. That his eye was chiefly upon this future is evident, as well from the extremity of the sufferings described, which greatly exceeded what David personally underwent (Ps. xxii. 8, 14-18 ; lxi. 8, 21 ; cix. 24, 25), as from the world-wide results, the everlasting and universal benefits that are spoken of as flowing from the salvation wrought, far beyond any thing that David could have contemplated respecting himself.—(Ps. xxii. 27 ; xl. 5, 10, 16 ; xli. 12 ; lxi. 35.) But still, while the future is mainly regarded, it is seen by the Psalmist under the form and lineaments of the past ;—his own sufferings and deliverances were like the book from which he read forth the similar, but greater things to come. And why should not David, who so clearly foresaw the brighter, have foreseen also the darker and more troubled aspect of the future ? If it was given him through the Spirit to descry, as the proper heir and possessor of the kingdom, One, so much higher in nature and dignity than himself, that he felt it right to call him Lord and God (Ps. xlv., cx.), why should it not also have been given him to see that this glorious personage, *as his son*, should bear his father's image alike in the more afflicting and troubled, and in the better and more glorious part of his career ? This is simply what David did see, and what he expressed, with great fulness and variety, in the portion of his writings now under consideration. And hence their peculiar form and structure, as partaking so much of the personal. When unfolding the more *divine* aspect and relations of the kingdom, the Psalmist speaks of the possessor of it as of another than himself, nearly related to him, but still different, higher and greater—(Ps. ii., xlv., lxxii., cx.) But when he discourses, in the psalms above referred to, concerning its more *human* aspect and relations, he speaks as of himself ; the sufferings to be borne and overcome seemed like a prolongation, or rather like a renewal in an intenser form, of his own ; the father, in a manner, identifies himself with the son, as the son again, in alluding to what was written, identifies himself with the father ; for so it behoved to be—the past *must* here foreshadow the future, and the future take its shape from the past.

The view now given of this series of psalms, it will be observed, differs materially, not only from that which regards them as properly applicable only to David, and merely accommodated to Christ and gospel things, but also from that of Hengstenberg and others, according to which the psalms in question describe the suffering righteous person in general, and apply to Christ only in so far as he was pre-eminently a righteous sufferer. We hold them to be, in a much closer sense, prophecies of Christ, and regard them as delineations of what, in its full sense, could only be expected to take place in him who was to fulfil the calling and destination, of which the mere foreshadow and announcement was to be seen in David. And this connection between David and Christ, on which the delineation proceeds, seems to us satisfactorily to account for two peculiarities in the structure of these psalms, which have always been the occasion of embarrassment. The first is the one already noticed—their being written as in the person of the

Psalmist. This arose from his being led by the Spirit to contemplate the coming future as the continuation and only adequate completion of what pertained to himself—to descry the Messiah as the second and higher David. The other peculiarity is the mention that is made in some of these psalms of sin as belonging to the person who speaks in them; as in Ps. xl., for example, where he confesses his sins to be more in number than the hairs of his head—and that, too, presently after he had declared it to be his purpose and delight to do the will of God in a way more acceptable than all sacrifice. This has been deemed inexplicable, on the supposition of Christ being the speaker. And if Christ alone, directly and exclusively, had been contemplated, we think it *would* have been inexplicable. His connection with sin would not have been represented exactly in that form. But let the ground of the representation be what we have described; let it be understood that David wrote of the Messiah as the Son, who, however higher and greater than himself, was still to be a kind of second self, then the description *must* have taken its form from the history and position of David, and should be read as from that point of view. If it is true in some respects that “things take the signature of thought” (*Coleridge*), here the reverse necessarily happened—the thought, imaging to itself the future as the reflection and final development of the past, naturally took the signature of *things*; and sin, with which the second as well as the first David had much to do in establishing the kingdom, must be confessed as from the bosom of the royal Psalmist. It is merely a part of the relatively imperfect nature of all the representations of Christ’s work and kingdom, which were unfolded under the image and shadow of past and inferior, but closely related circumstances. And this imperfection in the form was the more necessary in psalms, since, being destined for public use in the worship of God, they could only express such views and feelings as the congregation might be expected to sympathise with, and should, even when carrying forward the desires and expectations of the soul to better things to come, still touch a chord in every believer’s bosom.

There is, however, another and more peculiar, indeed the *most* peculiar, application made by our Lord of the Old Testament Scriptures;—but an application proceeding on a quite similar, though more specific, connection between the past and the future in God’s kingdom. We refer to what our Lord said after the transfiguration respecting John the Baptist. Before this, he had even publicly asserted John to be the Elias predicted by Malachi: “And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come: He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.”—(Matt. xi. 14, 15.) It was a profound truth, our Lord would have them to know, which he was now delivering—one that did not lie upon the surface, and could only be received by spiritual and divinely-enlightened souls. This much is implied in the words, “If ye will receive it,”—if ye have spiritual discernment so far as to know the mind of God; and still more by the call that follows, “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear;” a call which is never uttered but when something enigmatical, or difficult to the natural mind, requires to be understood. The disciples themselves, however, still wanted the capacity for understanding what was said, as they betrayed, when putting the question to Christ after the transfiguration, “Why, then, do the scribes say, that Elias must first come?” This

led our Lord again to assert what he had done before, and also to give some explanation of the matter: "And he answered and said unto them, Elias verily cometh first and restoreth all things. . . . But I say unto you, that Elias has indeed come, and they have done to him whatsoever they listed; as it is written of him." (Mark ix. 12, 13.) Here he so nearly identifies John with Elias, that what had been recorded of the one he holds to have been written of the other; for certainly the things that had happened to this second Elias, were no otherwise written of him, than as things of a similar kind were recorded in the life of the first. The essential connection between the two characters, rendered the history of the one, in its main elements, a prophecy of the other. If John had to do the work of Elias, he must also enter into the experience of Elias; coming as emphatically the preacher of repentance, he must have trial of hatred and persecution from the ungodly; and the greater he was than Elias in the one respect, it might be expected he should also be the greater in the other. It must, therefore, have been merely in regard to his commission from above, that he was said to "come and restore all things;" for here again, as of old, the sins of the people—headed at last by a new Ahab and Jezebel, in Herod and Herodias—cut short the process; "they rejected the counsel of God against themselves," and only in a very limited degree experienced the benefit, which the mission of John was in itself designed and fitted to impart. Nor *could* John have been the new Elias, unless, amid all outward differences, there had been such essential agreements as these between his case and that of his great predecessor.

We have now adverted to all the applications of Old Testament prophecy which are expressly mentioned by the evangelists to have been made by our Lord to himself and gospel-times, with the exception of a mere reference in Matt. xxiv. 15 to Daniel's "abomination of desolation," and the use made of Isa. vi. 9, 10, as describing the blind and hardened state of the men of his own generation, not less than of those of Isaiah's. Besides those passages, however, expressly quoted and applied by our Lord, it is right to notice, as preparatory to the consideration of what was done in this respect by evangelists and apostles, that he not unfrequently appropriated to himself, as peculiarly true of him, the language and ideas of the Old Testament. As when he takes the words descriptive of Jacob's vision, and says to Nathanael, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man;" or when he said to the Jews of his own body, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up;" or when he speaks of himself as going to be lifted up for the salvation of men, as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, and of the sign of the prophet Jonas going to appear again in him. Such appropriations of Old Testament language and ideas evidently proceeded on the ground of that close connection between the Old and the New, which we have endeavoured to unfold, as one that admitted of being carried out to many particulars. If, therefore, we shall find the evangelists and apostles so carrying it out, they have the full sanction of Christ's authority as to the *principle* of their interpretation. And on the ground even of Christ's own expositions, we may surely see how necessary it is in explaining Scripture to

keep in view the pre-eminent place which Christ from the first was destined to hold in the divine plan, and how every thing in the earlier arrangements of God tended to him as the grand centre of the whole. Let us indeed beware of wresting any passages of the Old Testament for the purpose of finding Christ where he is not to be found; but let us also beware of adopting such imperfect views as would prevent us from finding him where he really is. And especially let it never be forgotten, that the union of the divine and the human in Christ, while in itself the great mystery of godliness, is, at the same time, the grand key to the interpretation of what else is mysterious in the divine dispensations; and that in this stands the common basis of what ancient seers were taught to anticipate, and what the church now is in the course of realizing.

IV.—THE APPLICATIONS MADE BY THE EVANGELISTS OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES.

It is to be borne carefully in mind, then, that the stream of Old Testament prophecy respecting the Messiah, in its two great branches—the one originating in the calling and destination of Israel, the other in the purpose to set up a kingdom of righteousness and blessing for the world in the house of David—flowed in the same direction, and pointed to the same great event. The announcements in both lines plainly contemplated and required an organic or personal connection between the divine and human natures as the necessary condition of their fulfilment; so that if there was any truth in the pretensions of Jesus of Nazareth—if he was indeed that concentrated Israel, and that peerless son of David, in whom the two lines of prophecy were to meet and be carried out to their destined completion, the indwelling of the divine in his human nature must have existed as the one foundation of the whole building. That very truth which the Jews of our Lord's time could not bear even to be mentioned in their presence—the truth of his proper deity—was the indispensable preliminary to the realization of all that was predicted. Hence it is that the four evangelists, each in his own peculiar way, but with a common insight into the import of Old Testament prophecy, and the real necessities of the case, all begin with laying this foundation. St John opens his narrative with a formal and lengthened statement of Christ's relation to the Godhead, and broadly asserts that in him the divine Word was made flesh. St Luke also relates at length the circumstances of the miraculous conception, and with the view evidently of conveying the impression, that this mode of being born into the world stood in essential connection with Christ's being, in the strictest sense, “the son of the Highest.” Even Mark, while observing the greatest possible brevity, does not omit the essential point, and begins his narrative with the most startling announcement that ever headed an historical composition:—“The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ *the Son of God.*” And the first evangelist, who wrote more immediately for his Jewish brethren, and continually selects the points that were best fitted to exhibit Jesus as the Messiah of the Jewish Scriptures, characteristically enters on *his* narrative by describing the circum-

stances of Christ's miraculous birth as the necessary fulfilment of one of the most marvellous prophecies of the incarnation :—" Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us."

Commentators, it is well known, are not agreed as to the precise manner in which this prediction should be applied to Christ; and not a few hold that it is to be understood, in the first instance, of an ordinary child born after the usual manner in the prophet's own time, and only in a secondary, though higher and more complete sense, applicable to the Messiah. Their chief reason for this is, that they see no other way of understanding how the facts announced in the prophecy could properly have been a sign to Ahaz and his people, as they were expressly called by the prophet. Without entering into the discussion of this point, we simply state it as our conviction, that the difficulty felt arises mainly from a wrong view of what is there meant by a *sign*—as if the prophet intended by it something which would be a ground of comfort to the wicked king and kingdom of Judah. On the contrary, the prediction manifestly bears the character of a threatening to these, though with a rich and precious promise inclosed for a future generation. Between the promise of the child and its fulfilment, there was to be a period of sweeping desolation—for the child was to be born in a land distinguished for "butter and honey," the spontaneous products of a desolated region, as opposed to one well-peopled and cultivated (comp. Isa. vii. 15 with v. 22), and was to be fed of these. This state of desolation the prophet describes to the end of the chapter as ready to fall on the kingdom of Judah, and inevitably certain, notwithstanding that a present temporary deliverance was to be granted to it; so that, from the connection in which the promise of the child stands, coupled with the loftiness of the terms in which it is expressed, there appears no adequate occasion for it till the impending calamities were overpast, and the real Immanuel should come. Indeed, as Dr Alexander justly states (on Isa. vii. 14), "There is no ground, grammatical, historical, or logical, for doubt as to the main point, that the church, in all ages, has been right in regarding the passage as a signal and explicit prediction of the miraculous conception and nativity of Jesus Christ." Even Ewald, whose views are certainly low enough as to his mode of explaining the prediction, yet does not scruple to say, that "every interpretation is false which does not admit that the prophet speaks of the coming Messiah."

We have no hesitation, therefore, in regarding the application of this prophecy of Isaiah to Christ as an application of the more direct and obvious kind. And such also is the next prophecy referred to by St Matthew, the prophecy of Micah regarding Bethlehem as the Messiah's birth-place. The evangelist does not formally quote this prophecy as from himself, but gives it from the mouth of the chief priests and scribes, of whom Herod demanded where Christ should be born. The prediction is so plain, that there was no room for diversity of opinion about it. And as both the prediction itself, and its connection with Isa. vii. 14, have already been commented on in the body of the work (p. 134), there is no need that we should further refer to it here.

Presently, however, we come in the second chapter of St Matthew to another and different application of a prophecy. For, when relating the providential circumstances connected with Christ's temporary removal to Egypt, and his abode there till the death of Herod, he says it took place, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my Son."—(Chap. ii. 15.) It admits of no doubt, that this word of the prophet Hosea was uttered by him rather as an historical record of the past, than as a prophetic announcement of the future. It pointed to God's faithfulness and love in delivering Israel from his place of temporary sojourn,—“When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.” When regarded by the evangelist, therefore, as a word needing to have its accomplishment in Christ, it manifestly could not be because the word itself was prophetic, but only because the event it recorded was typical. Describing a prophetic circumstance or event, it is hence, by a very common figure of speech, itself called a prophecy; since what it records to have been done in the type, must again be done in the antitype. And the only point of moment respecting it is, how could the calling of Israel out of Egypt be regarded as a prophetic action in such a sense, that it must be repeated in the personal history of Jesus?

This question has already been answered by anticipation, as to its more important part, in the last section, where the relation was pointed out between Christ and Israel. This relation was such that the high calling and destination of Israel to be not only blessed, but also the channel of blessing to the world, necessarily stood over for its proper accomplishment till He should come, who was to combine with the distinctive characteristics of a child of Abraham, the essential properties of the Godhead. All that could be done before this, was no more than the first feeble sproutings of the tree, as compared with the gigantic stature and expansion of its full growth. So that, viewed in respect to the purpose and appointment of God, Israel, in so far as they were the people of God, possessed the beginnings of what was in its completeness to be developed in Jesus; they, God's Son in the feebleness and imperfection of infancy, he the Israel of God in realized and concentrated fulness of blessing. And hence to make manifest this connection between the old and the new, between Israel in the lower and Israel in the higher sense, it was necessary, not only that there should belong to Christ, in its highest perfection, all that was required to fulfil the calling and destination of Israel, as described in prophetic Scripture, but that there should also be such palpable and designed correspondences between his history and that of ancient Israel, as would be like the signature of heaven to his pretensions, and the matter-of-fact testimony to his true Israelite destiny. Such a correspondence was found especially in the temporary sojourn in Egypt, and subsequent recal from it to the proper field of covenant-life and blessing. If, as our Lord himself testified, even the things that befel the Elias of the Old Testament, were a prophecy in action of the similar things that were to befall the still greater Elias of the New, how much more might Israel's former experience in this respect be taken for a prophecy of what was substantially to recur in the so closely related history of Jesus! That the old things were thus so palpably returning again, was God's sign in pro-

vidence to a slumbering church, that the great end of the old was at length passing into fulfilment. It proclaimed—and as matters stood there was a moral necessity that it should proclaim—that He, who of old loved Israel, so as to preserve him for a time in Egypt, and then called him out for the *lower* service he had to render, was now going to revive his work, and carry it forward to its destined completion by that Child of Hope, to whom all the history and promises of Israel pointed as their common centre.

In such a case, of course, when both the prophecy and the fulfilment are deeds, and deeds connected, the one with a lower, the other with a higher sphere of service, there could only be a general, not a complete and detailed agreement. There must be many differences as well as coincidences. It was so in the case of John the Baptist as compared with his prototype Elias. It was so, too, with our Lord, in his temporary connection with Egypt, as compared with that of ancient Israel. Amid essential agreements there are obvious circumstantial differences—but these such only as the altered circumstances of the case naturally, and, indeed, necessarily gave rise to. Enough, if there were such palpable correspondences as clearly bespoke the same overruling hand in Providence, working toward the accomplishment of the same great end. These limitations hold also, and, indeed, with still greater force, in respect to the next application made by St Matthew, when he says of the slaughter by Herod of the infants at Bethlehem, “Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning; Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.” Here the relation is not so close between the Old and the New as in the former case; and the words of the evangelist imply as much, when he puts it merely, “Then was fulfilled,” not as before, “That it might be fulfilled.” It is manifest, indeed, that, when a word originally spoken respecting an event at Rama (a place some miles north of Jerusalem) is applied to another event, which took place ages afterwards at Bethlehem (another place lying to the south of it), the fulfilment meant in the latter case must have been of an inferior and secondary kind. Yet there must also have been some such relation between the two events, as rendered the one substantially a repetition of the other; and something, too, in the whole circumstances, to make it of importance that the connection between them should be marked by their being ranged under one and the same prophetic testimony.

Now, the matter may be briefly stated thus: It was at Rama, as we learn incidentally from Jer. xl. 1, that the Chaldean conqueror of old assembled the last band of Israelitish captives before sending them into exile. And being a place within the territory of Benjamin, the ancestral mother of the tribe, Rachel, is poetically represented by the prophet as raising a loud cry of distress, and giving way to a disconsolate grief, because getting there, as she thought, the last look of her hapless children, seeing them ruthlessly torn from her grasp, and doomed to an apparently hopeless exile. The wail was that of a fond mother, whose family prospects seemed now to be entirely blasted. And, amid all the outward diversities that existed, the evangelist described substantially the same ground for such a disconsolate grief in the event at Bethlehem. For here, again,

there was another, though more disguised enemy, of the real hope of Israel, who struck with relentless severity, and struck what was certainly meant to be an equally fatal blow. Though it was but a handful of children that actually perished, yet, as among these the Child of Promise was supposed to be included, it might well seem as if all were lost; Rachel's offspring, as the heritage of God, had ceased to exist; and the new covenant, with all its promises of grace and glory, was for ever buried in the grave of that Son of the virgin—if so be that he *had* fallen a victim to the ruthless jealousy of the tyrant. So that, viewed in regard to the main thing, the Chaldean conqueror had again revived in the cruel Edomite, who then held the government of Judea, and the slaughter at Bethlehem was, in spirit and design, as fatal a catastrophe as the sweeping away of the last remnant of Jews into the devouring gulph of Babylon. As vain, therefore, for the church of the New Testament to look for a friend in Herod, in respect to the needed redemption, as for the church of old to have looked for such in Nebuchadnezzar. Such is the instruction briefly contained in the evangelist's application of the prophecy of Jeremiah; an instruction much needed then, when so many were disposed to look for great things from the Herods, instead of regarding them as the deadliest enemies of the truth, and the manifest rods of God's displeasure. The lesson, indeed, was needed for all times, that the church might be warned not to expect prosperity and triumph to the cause of Christ from the succour of ungodly rulers of this world, but from God, who alone could defend her from their ceaseless machinations and violence.

In this last application of a prophetic word by St Matthew to the events of the gospel, there is a remarkable disregard of external and superficial differences, for the sake of the more inward and vital marks of agreement. It is somewhat singular, that, in his next application, the reverse seems rather to be the case—a deep spiritual characteristic of Messiah is connected with the mere name of a city. The settling of Joseph and Mary at Nazareth, it is said, at the close of chap. ii., took place “that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene.” There is here a preliminary difficulty in regard to the thing said to have been spoken by the prophets, which is not in so many words to be found in any prophetic book of the Old Testament; and, indeed, from its being said to have been spoken by the prophets generally, we are led to suppose, that the evangelist does not mean to give us the precise statement of any single prophet, but rather the collected sense of several. He seems chiefly to refer to those passages in Isaiah and Zechariah, where the Messiah was announced as the *Nezer* or sprouting branch of the house of David, pointing to the unpretending lowliness of his appearance and his kingdom. It is understood that the town Nazareth had its name from the same root, and on account of its poor and despised condition. That it was generally regarded with feelings of contempt even in Galilee, appears from the question of Nathanael, “Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?”—(John i. 46.) And it is quite natural to suppose, that this may have been expressed in its very name. So that the meaning of the evangelist here comes to be, that the providence of God directed Joseph to Nazareth, as

a place in name, as well as general repute, peculiarly low and despised, that the prophecies respecting Jesus as the tender shoot of David's stem might be fulfilled. The meaning, indeed, thus becomes plain enough; but it seems strange that so outward and comparatively unimportant a circumstance should be pointed to as a fulfilment of prophecy. In this, however, we are apt to judge too much from the present advanced position of Christ's cause and kingdom; and also from the greatly altered tone of thinking in respect to the significance of names. The Jews were accustomed to mark every thing by an appropriate name; with them the appellations of men, towns, and localities every where uttered a sentiment or told a history. A respect to this prevalent tone of thinking pervades the whole gospel narrative, and appears especially in the names given to the place of Christ's birth (Bethlehem, house of bread), to the Baptist (John, the Lord's favour), and Jesus, (Saviour); in the surnames applied by Christ to Simon, (Cephas), to James and John (Boanerges); in the fact of the traitor, who among the disciples represented the cupidity, and blindness, and treachery of the Jewish people, also bearing the name of Judas (the Jew.) So natural was this mode of viewing things to the disciples, that the evangelist John even finds a significance in the name of Siloam as connected with one of the miracles of Jesus. (Chap. ix. 7.) It was fitly called Siloam, *sent*, since one was now sent to it for such a miracle of mercy; its name would henceforth acquire a new significancy. It might, therefore, be perfectly natural for those who lived in our Lord's time, to attach considerable importance to the name of the town where he was brought up, and whence he was to manifest himself to Israel. And in that state of comparative infancy, when a feeble faith and a low spiritual sense required even outward marks, like finger-posts, to guide them into the right direction, it was no small token of the overruling providence of God, that he made the very name of Christ's residence point so distinctly to the lowly condition in which ancient prophets had foretold he should appear. By no profound sagacity, or deep spiritual insight, but even as with their bodily eyesight they might behold the truth, that Jesus was the predicted *Nezer*, or tender shoot of David. Thus the word of the prophets was fulfilled in a way peculiarly adapted to the times.

The same kind of outwardness and apparent superficiality, but coupled with the same tender consideration and spiritual discernment, discovers itself in some of the other applications made by the evangelists of ancient prophecy. Thus in Matt. viii. 17, Christ is said to have wrought his miraculous cures on the diseases of men, "that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." Was this the whole that the prophet meant? Was it even the main thing? The evangelist does not, in fact, say that it was; he merely says, that Christ was now engaged in the work, of which the prophet spake in these words; and so, indeed, he was. Christ was sent into the world to remove by his mediatorial agency the evil that sin had brought into the world. He began this work when he cured bodily diseases, as these were the fruits of sin; and the removal of them was intended to serve as a kind of ladder to guide men to the higher and more spiritual part that still remained to be done. It was this very connection which our Lord

himself marked, when he said alternately to the sick man of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," and, "Arise, take up thy bed and walk;" it was as much as to say, the doing of the one goes hand in hand with the other; they are but different parts of the same process. That Matthew knew well enough which was the greater and more important part of the process, is evident from the explanation he records of the name of Jesus (chap. i. 21, "He shall save his people from their sins"); and his reporting such a declaration of Christ as this, "The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many." (Chap. xx. 28.) We have similar examples in John xix. 36, where the preservation of our Lord's limbs from violence is regarded as a fulfilment of the prophecy in type—"A bone of him (the Paschal Lamb) shall not be broken;" and in ver. 37, where the piercing of Christ's side is connected with the prediction in Zechariah—"They shall look on Him whom they pierced." It is evident that in both cases alike the original word looked farther than the mere outward circumstances here noticed, and had respect mainly to spiritual characteristics. But this evangelist, who had a quick eye to the discerning of the spiritual in the external, who could even see in the slight elevation of the cross something that pointed, as it were, to heaven (chap. xii. 33), saw also the hand of God in those apparently accidental and superficial distinctions in Christ's crucified body—the finger-mark of heaven, giving visible form and expression to the great truths they embodied, that they might be the more readily apprehended. It was not as if these outward things were the whole in his view, but that they were the heaven-appointed signs and indications of the whole; seeing these, he, in the simplicity of faith, saw all—in the unbroken leg the all-perfect Victim; in the pierced side the unutterable agony and distress of the bleeding heart of Jesus.

We need do little more than refer to the other applications made of Old Testament prophecy to Jesus by the evangelists. They are either applications in the most direct and obvious sense of predictions, that can be understood of no other circumstances and events than those they are applied to, or applications of some of the psalms and other prophecies, which had already been employed in part by Christ himself. Thus, Matt. iv. 15, 16, which regards the light diffused by the preaching of Jesus in the land of Naphtali and Zebulun, as a fulfilment of the prophecy in Isa. ix. 1, 2; Matt. xxi. 4, John xii. 15, which connect Christ's riding into Jerusalem on an ass with the prophecy in Zech. ix. 9; Matt. xxvii. 9, which, in like manner, connects the transactions about the thirty pieces of money given to Judas with the prophecy in Zech. xi. 13—these are admitted by all the more learned and judicious interpreters of the present day to be applications of prophecy of the most direct and simple kind. Portions of Ps. xxii. and of Isa. xlii. 1-4; liii. 1, 12, of which we have already had occasion to speak, in connection with our Lord's own use of ancient Scripture, are referred to, as finding their fulfilment in Christ, in Matt. xxvii. 35; John xii. 38, 40; xix. 24; Mark xv. 28. The only remaining passage in the Gospels, in which there is anything like a peculiar application of Old Testament Scripture, is Matt. xiii. 34, 35, where the evangelist represents our Lord's resorting to the parabolical method of instruction as a fulfilment of what is written

in Ps. lxxviii. 2, and which has been explained in the chapter to which this Appendix refers. See p. 103.

Thus we see, that no arbitrary or unregulated use is made by the evangelists of ancient prophecy in regard to the events of gospel history, but such only as evinced a profound and comprehensive view of the connection between the Old and the New in God's dispensations. They had Christ's own authority for all they did—either as to the principle on which their applications were made, or the precise portions of Scripture applied by them. And nothing more is needed to ensure for them our entire sympathy and concurrence, than first, that we clearly apprehend the relation of Christ, as the God-man, to the whole scheme and purposes of God, and then that we realize the peculiar circumstances of the church, at the time when the higher and more spiritual things of the Gospel began to take the place of those that were more outward and preparatory. The want of these has been the chief source of the embarrassment that has been experienced on the subject.

V.—APPLICATIONS IN THE WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

No one can fail to perceive that very frequent use is made of Old Testament Scripture in the writings of the Apostle Paul. Sometimes the use he makes of it is quite similar to that made by the Apostle Peter in his epistles—one, namely, of simple reference or appropriation. He adopts the language of Old Testament Scripture as his own, as finding in that the most suitable expression of the thoughts he wished to convey (Rom. ii. 24, x. 18, xii. 19, 20; Eph. iv. 26, v. 14, &c.); or he refers to the utterances it contained of God's mind and will, as having new and higher exemplifications given to them under the Gospel (Rom. i. 17; 1 Cor. i. 19, 31; 2 Cor. vi. 16, 17, viii. 15, ix. 9, &c.). Of this latter sort also, substantially, is the application he makes to Christ in Eph. iv. 8 of a passage in Ps. lxxviii. (“He ascended up on high, he led captivity captive,” &c.)—a psalm which is nowhere else in New Testament Scripture applied to Christ, nor is it one of those which, from their clear and pointed reference to the things of Christ's kingdom, are usually distinguished as Messianic psalms. In applying the words of the psalm to the ascension of Christ, and his subsequent bestowal of divine gifts, the Apostle can hardly be understood to mean more than that what was done figuratively and in an inferior sense in the times of David by God, was now most really and gloriously done in Christ.

And there is also another application of an Old Testament Scripture by the Apostle Paul, which might, perhaps, without violence be understood, and by some evangelical interpreters is understood, in a similar manner, not as a direct prophecy, uttered in respect to Christian times, but as the announcement of a principle in God's dealing with his ancient people, which came again to be most strikingly exemplified under the Gospel. We allude to the passage in Isa. xxviii. 16 (combined with ch. viii. 14, 15), which is adduced by Paul in Rom. ix. 33 (as it is also, and still more emphatically by Peter in his first epistle, ch. ii. 7, 8) as bearing upon Christ, and the twofold effect of his manifestation upon the souls of men, “Behold, I lay in Zion a

stone," &c. We regard it, however, as by much the most natural method, to take the word of the prophet there as a direct prediction of gospel-times. The difficulty in finding a specific object of reference otherwise, is itself no small proof of the correctness of this view—some understanding it of the temple, some of the law, others of Zion, and others still again, of Hezekiah. The prophet, we are persuaded, is looking above and beyond all these. Contemplating the people in their guilt and waywardness as engaged in contriving, by counsels and projects of their own, to secure the perpetuity of their covenant blessings, he introduces the Lord as declaring that there *was* to be a secure and abiding perpetuity—but not by such vain and lying devices as theirs, nor for the men who followed such corrupt courses as they were doing—but God himself would lay the sure and immoveable foundation in Zion, by means of which every humble believer would find ample confidence and safety; while to the perverse and unbelieving this also should become but a new occasion of stumbling and perdition. It can be understood of nothing properly but Christ. And we therefore have no hesitation in considering the word as a direct prediction of gospel-times, of which the only proper fulfilment was to be found in the events of Christ's history.

It is not so much, however, by way of simple reference or application, that Paul makes either his most frequent or his most peculiar application of Old Testament Scripture; he is more remarkable for the argumentative use he makes of it. He often introduces it in express and formal citations to establish his doctrinal positions, or to shew the entire conformity of the views he unfolded of divine truth with those which had been propounded by the servants of God in former times. It is in connection with this use of ancient Scripture by Paul, that the only difficulties of any moment in his application of it are to be found. And as we have already referred (in the first section) to his use, in this respect, of the historical and didactic portions, we have at present only to do with his employment of the prophecies. In respect to these also, the subject, in so far as it calls for consideration here, narrows itself to a comparatively limited field; for it is only in the application made of a few prophecies, and these bearing on the questions agitated in the apostle's day between Jew and Gentile, that any marked peculiarity strikes us. In saying this, however, we must be understood as leaving out of view the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which such a distinctive use of Old Testament Scripture is made as will require a separate consideration.

Now, the chief peculiarity is this, that while the Apostle, in the portions of his writings referred to, wrote argumentatively, and consequently behoved to employ his weapons in the most unequivocal and uniform manner, he seems to vary considerably in his manner of handling the prophecies; he even seems to use a strange freedom with the literal and spiritual mode of interpretation; now, apparently, taking them in the one, and now, again, in the other sense, as suited his convenience. So, at least, the depreciators of the Apostle's influence have not unfrequently alleged it to be. But is it so in reality? The matter certainly demands a close and attentive consideration.

I. The passage that naturally comes first in order is that in Rom. iv. 11–16, where the Apostle refers to the promises of blessing made to Abraham,

and in particular to the two declarations, that he should be a father of many nations, and should have a seed of blessing—or rather, should be the head of *the* seed of blessing throughout all the families of the earth. In reasoning upon these promises, the object of the Apostle is plainly to shew, that as they were made to Abraham before he received circumcision, that is, while he was still, as to any legal ground of distinction, in a heathen state, so they bore respect to a posterity as well without as within the bounds of lineal descent and legal prescription; to those, indeed, within, but even there only to those who believed as he did, and attained to the righteousness of faith; and besides these, to all who should tread “in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had when still uncircumcised.” According, therefore, to the Apostle’s interpretation, the seed promised to Abraham in the original prophecy was essentially of a spiritual kind; it comprehended all the children of faith, wherever they might be found,—as well the children of faith apart from the law, as the children of faith under the law. The justness of this wide and profoundly spiritual interpretation, the Apostle specially bases, as we have said, on the time when circumcision—the sign and seal of the covenant—began to be administered; not before, but after the promises were given. And he might also have added, as a collateral argument, the persons to whom it was administered—not to that portion only of Abraham’s lineal descendants, of whom the Jews sprung, nor even to his lineal descendants alone as a body; but to all collectively, who belonged to him at the first as a household, and all afterwards who should enter into the faith of the covenant, and should seek to belong to him (Ex. xii. 48, &c.) What could more evidently shew that Abraham’s seed, viewed in the light contemplated in the promise as a seed of blessing, was to be pre-eminently of a spiritual nature? a seed, that was only in part to be found among the corporeal offspring of the patriarch; but, wherever found, was to have for its essential and most distinctive characteristic his faith and righteousness?

It is the *positive* side of the matter, that the Apostle seeks to bring out at this stage of his argument: his object is to manifest *how far* the spiritual element in the promise reaches. But at another stage, in chap. ix. 6–13, he exhibits with equal distinctness the *negative* side; he shews how the same spiritual element excludes from the promised seed all, even within the corporeal descent and the outward legal boundary, who at any period did not possess the faith and righteousness of Abraham. All along the blessing was to descend through grace by faith; and such as might be destitute of these were not, in the sense of the original prophecy, the children of Abraham; they were rather, as our Lord expressly called the Jews of his day, the children of the devil, John viii. 44,—a declaration that rests on the same fundamental view of the promise as that unfolded in the argument of the Apostle.

II. But now, if we turn to another portion of the Apostle’s writings—to the Epistle to the Galatians—where he is substantially handling the same argument as to the alone sufficiency of faith in the matter of justification, we find what, at first sight, appears to be in one respect a quite opposite principle of interpretation; we find the mere letter of the promise so much

insisted on, that even the word *seed*, being in the singular, is regarded as limiting it to an individual. In chap. iii. 6-18 of this epistle, the argument of the Apostle is of the following nature:—Abraham himself attained to blessing simply through faith; and when he was told that even all nations should come to partake in his blessing, it was implied that they also should attain to it through the same faith that dwelt in him. The law entered long after this promise of blessing had been given; and if the blessing were now made to depend upon the fulfilment of the law, then the promise would be virtually disannulled. Not only so, but the promise was expressly made to Abraham's seed, as of one, not as of many—"to thy seed," which, says the Apostle "is Christ;" thus, apparently, making the promise point exclusively to the Messiah, and in order to this, forcing on the collective noun *seed*, a properly singular meaning.

Yet, on the other hand, it would be very strange if the Apostle had actually done so. For every one knows, who is in the least degree acquainted with the language of the Old Testament, that *seed*, when used of a person's offspring, is always taken collectively; it never denotes a single individual, unless that individual were the whole of the offspring. Educated as Paul was, it was impossible he could be ignorant of this; nay, in this very chapter, he shews himself to be perfectly cognizant of the comprehensive meaning of the word *seed*; and the drift of his whole argument is to prove that *every child of faith* is a component part of the seed promised to Abraham—that "they which be of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham;" or, as he again puts it at the close, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

It is thus clear as day, that the Apostle here took the same comprehensive view of the promise to Abraham that he did in the fourth chapter of Romans; so that the distinction between *seed* and *seeds*, when properly understood, can only be meant to draw the line of demarcation between one class of Abraham's family and another—between posterity and posterity. For, though it would be quite against the ordinary usage to speak of *individuals in the same line* as so many seeds, it would by no means be so to speak thus of so many *distinct lines of offspring*; these might fitly enough be regarded as so many seeds or posterities. Such, precisely, is the meaning of the Apostle here. In his view Abraham's seed of blessing in the promise are his believing posterity—these alone, and not the descendants of Abraham in every sense. "Had this latter been expressed in the words," as Tholuck justly remarks, "seeds would require to have been used; as then only could it have been inferred that all the posterity of Abraham, including those by natural descent, were embraced. But since the singular is used, this shews that the prophecy had a *definite* posterity in view, namely, a *believing* posterity. The Jew must have been the more disposed to admit this, as for him also it would have proved too much, if the prophecy had been made to embrace absolutely the whole of Abraham's offspring. He, too, would have wished the lines by Ishmael and Esau excluded." So that, viewed in respect to the promised inheritance of blessing, those, on the one hand, who were merely born after the flesh, in the common course of nature, were not reckoned of the seed—they were still, in a sense, unborn, because they

wanted the indispensable spiritual element ; while, on the other hand, those are reckoned, who, though they want the natural descent, have come to possess the more important spiritual affinity—they have been born from above, and have their standing and inheritance among the children.

But if such be the import of the Apostle's statement, why, then, it may be asked, does he in v. 16, so expressly limit the seed of blessing to Christ ? He does it, we reply, in the very same sense in which at v. 8 he limited the blessing to Abraham—in the one case he identifies Abraham with all the posterity of blessing, and in the other Christ ; in both cases alike the two heads comprehend all who are bound up with them in the same bundle of life. "The Scripture foreseeing," he says at v. 8, "that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, 'In thee shall all nations be blessed.'" *In thee*, combining the blessing of Abraham and all his spiritual progeny of believers into compact unity ; he, the head, and those who spiritually make one person with him, being viewed together, and blessed in the same act of God. In like manner, when at v. 16, the Apostle passes from the parent to the seed, and regards the seed as existing simply in Christ, it is because he views Christ as forming one body with his people ; in him alone the blessing stands as to its ground and merit, and in him, therefore, the whole seed of blessing have their life and being. So that the term *seed* is still used collectively by the Apostle ; it is applied to Christ, not as an individual, but to Christ, as comprehending in himself all who form with him a great spiritual unity—those who in this same chapter of the Galatians are said to have "put on Christ," and to have become "all one in him" (a personal, mystical unity, v. 27, 28). We find precisely the same identification of Christ and his people, when the Apostle elsewhere says of the church, that it is "his body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 23) ; and yet again, when he says in 1 Cor. xii. 12, "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many, are one body, so also is Christ"—that is, Christ taken in connection with his church ; he and they together.

III. Reverting again to the Epistle to the Romans, to that part of it in which the Apostle discusses the subject of the present unbelief and rejection, together with the future conversion of the Jews, chap. ix. x. xi., we find an apparent want of uniformity somewhat more difficult to explain. If we look at one part, there is the greatest freeness, but if at another, there seems the greatest strictness and literality in the manner he handles and applies the words of prophecy. In chap. ix. 25, 26, he introduces from Hosea what was unquestionably spoken in immediate reference to ancient Israel, and gives it a quite general application. Speaking of Israel as now apostate and rejected, but afterwards to be converted, the prophet had said that those who had been treated without mercy should yet obtain mercy, and those who had been called, "Not my people," should yet be called, "The children of the living God" (chap. i. 10 ; ii. 23). This the Apostle adduces in proof of the statement, that God was now calling to the blessings of salvation vessels of mercy, "not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." It is certainly possible, that in applying the words thus, the Apostle did not

mean to press them as in the strict sense a prophecy of the calling and conversion of the Gentiles. He may have referred to them simply as exhibiting a display of divine mercy, precisely similar in kind to what was now exemplified in the salvation of the Gentiles; that is, mercy exercised on persons who previously were cut off from any interest in its provisions, and in themselves had lost all claims to its enjoyment. That was to be done, according to the prophet, in the case of many in Israel; and if it was now also done in the case of a people called alike from among Jews and Gentiles, it was no new thing; it was but the old principle of the prophecy finding a new exemplification. Such, perhaps, is all the Apostle means by this application of prophecy to gospel-times.

But we cannot so explain another application made in the next chapter of the epistle. There, in proof of the declaration that "there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, the same Lord over all being rich unto all that call upon him," he quotes what is said in Joel ii. 32, "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." As found in Joel, the prediction has throughout an Israelitish aspect. It is "in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem," that the deliverance or salvation is said to be provided; and while the Spirit is spoken of as going to be poured out on "all flesh," still it seems to be flesh only as belonging to the Israelitish territory; for in describing the effect of the outpouring, the prophet says, "*Your* sons and *your* daughters shall prophecy; *your* old men," &c. Referring to it, therefore, as the Apostle does, for a formal proof of the position, that there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek in the matter of salvation, he must have considered the prophet as simply addressing the church of God, without respect to the Jewish element, which at that time so largely entered into its composition. He must have understood the prophecy as uttered respecting the visible church of God—no matter of what element composed, or how constituted—otherwise there would have been room for plying him with the objection, that by the connection the "all flesh," and the "every one that calleth," should be understood of such only among the circumcised Jews, not of those who belonged to the uncircumcised Gentiles. In this more restricted sense, St Peter plainly applied the words of the prediction on the day of Pentecost, for not till some years afterwards did he entertain any thought of comprehending in its provisions the Gentiles as such. Paul's application of it, therefore, is much freer than Peter's, and proceeds on the ground of converted Gentiles, not less than believing Jews, being interested in the promises of salvation addressed to the Israelitish church.

We find precisely the same broad principle in the fourth chapter of Galatians, where, in regard to the church of the New Testament, the Apostle quotes Isa. liv. 1, "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate, than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord." It is distinctly as a proof text, that the Apostle introduces this verse of Isaiah, prefacing it with the words, "For it is written," a proof that the "Jerusalem that is above," in other words, the real church, is "the mother of us all" who are Christians, and as such is "free," the real and

proper spouse of the Lord. Yet there can be no doubt, that in uttering the word the prophet addressed more immediately the Jewish Church; of that no one who reads the prophecy in its original connection, can entertain the slightest doubt. Hence, according to the interpretation of St Paul, it is not the Jewish element at that time existing in the church, which is now to be respected; it is simply the element of her being the spouse of God ("For thy maker is thine husband"), which consequently gives to the church of the New Testament, though formed mainly of believers from among the Gentiles, an equal interest in the grace promised in that prophetic word, with the church as it was, when composed almost exclusively of the descendants of Jacob.

But then the Apostle seems suddenly to abandon this broad principle of prophetic application, when in Rom. xi. 26, he comes to speak of the future conversion of the natural Israel,—“And so (that is, after the fulness of the Gentiles has come in, till which blindness in part has happened to Israel) all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.” Appealed to as in itself a sufficient proof that the natural seed of Israel, as a whole, shall be saved, is not this prophecy from Isa. lix. 20, 21, here understood as spoken to the Jewish people not as a church, but merely as a race? Are not those “in Jacob” the fleshly descendants merely of the patriarch, with the literal Zion as the centre of their commonwealth? And if so here, why not elsewhere? Why not also in the prophecies already referred to? And how, then, should the Apostle in them have made account only of the *spiritual* element in Israel as the church of God, and regarded the *natural* (as expressed in the words, Jacob, Zion, Jerusalem) as but incidental and temporary?

Such questions not unnaturally arise here; and the rather so, as the Apostle has materially altered the words of the prophecy, apparently as if to make them suit better the immediate object to which he applied it. In the prophet it is *to Zion*, not out of it, that the Redeemer was to come; and he was to come, not to turn away ungodliness from Jacob, but “to those that turn from transgression in Jacob.” Such deviations from the scope and purport of the original have appeared to some so material, that they have come to regard the Apostle here, not so properly interpreting an old prediction, as uttering a prediction of his own, clothed as nearly as possible in the familiar language of an ancient prophecy. An untenable view, however, this; for how, then, can we vindicate the apostle from the want of godly simplicity, using, as he must then have done, his accustomed formula for prophetic quotations (“As it is written,”) only to disguise and recommend an announcement properly his own?

We repudiate any such solution of the difficulty, which would represent the Apostle as sailing under false colours. Nor can we regard the alterations as the result of accident or forgetfulness. They have manifestly sprung from design. The correct view both of the use made of the prediction, and of the line of thought connected with it, we take to be this:—The Apostle gives the substantial import of the prophecy in Isaiah, but in accordance

with his design gives it also a more special direction, and one that pointed to the kind of fulfilment it must now be expected in that direction to receive. According to the prophet, the Redeemer was to come, literally *for Zion*—somehow in its behalf; and in the behalf also of penitent souls in it—those turning from transgression. So, indeed, he had come already, in the most literal and exact manner, and the small remnant who turned from transgression recognised him and hailed his coming. But the Apostle is here looking beyond these; he is looking to the posterity of Jacob generally, for whom, in this and other similar predictions, he describes a purpose of mercy still in reserve. For, while he strenuously contends that the promise of a seed of blessing to Abraham, through the line of Jacob, was not confined to the natural offspring, he explicitly declares this to have been always included—not the whole, indeed, yet an elect portion out of it. At that very time, when so many were rejected, he tells us there was such an elect portion; and there must still continue to be so, “for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance;” that is, God having connected a blessing with Abraham and his seed in perpetuity, he could never recal it again; there should never cease to be *some* in whom that blessing was realised. But besides, here also there must be a fulness: the first fruits of blessing give promise of a coming harvest; and the fulness of the Gentiles itself is a pledge of it; for if there was to be a fulness of these coming in to inherit the blessing, because of the purpose of God to bless the families of the earth in Abraham and his seed, how much more must there be such a fulness in the seed itself? *The overflowings of the stream could not possibly reach farther than the direct channel.* But then this fulness, in the case of the natural Israel, was not to be (as they themselves imagined, and as many along with them still imagine) separate and apart; as if by providing some channel, or appointing for them some place of their own. Of this the Apostle gives no intimation whatever. Nay, on purpose, we believe, to exclude that very idea, he gives a more special turn to the prophecy so as to make it *out of Zion* that the Redeemer was to come, and to turn away ungodliness *from* those in Jacob. For the old literal Zion, in the Apostle’s view, was now gone; its external framework was presently to be laid in ruins, and the only Zion, in connection with which the Redeemer could henceforth come, was that Zion in which he now dwells, which is the same with the heavenly Jerusalem, the church of the New Testament. He must come *out of* it, at the same time that he comes *for* it, in behalf of the natural seed of Jacob; and this is all one with saying, that these could only now attain to blessing in connection with the Christian church; or, as the Apostle himself puts it, could only obtain mercy through *their* mercy—namely, by the reflux of that mercy which has been bearing in the fulness of believing Gentiles. Thus alone, now, could the prophecy reach its fulfilment in the case of the natural Israel generally, as the result of a Saviour’s gracious presence coming forth from his dwelling-place in Zion, and acting through the instrumentality of a Christian church.

So explained, this part of the Apostle’s argument is in perfect accordance with his principles of interpretation and reasoning elsewhere. And it holds out the amplest encouragement in respect to the good yet in store for the

natural Israel. It holds out none, indeed, in respect to the cherished hope of a literal re-establishment of their ancient polity. It rather tends to discourage any such expectations; for the Zion, in connection with which it tells us the Messiah is to come, is the one in which he at present dwells—the Zion of the New Testament church; to which he can no longer come, except at the same time by coming *out of* it. Let the church, therefore, that already dwells with him in this Zion (Heb. xii. 22), go forth in his name, and deal in faith and love with these descendants of the natural Israel. Let her feel that the presence and the blessing of the Lord are with her, that she may bring his word to bear with living power on the outcasts of Jacob, as well as on those ready to perish among the heathen. Let her do it *now*, not waiting for things that, if they shall ever happen, lie beyond the limits alike of her responsibility and her control; and remembering, that for any thing we can tell, the fulness of converted Israel may come in as gradually as the fulness of converted Gentiles. This also was spoken of as one great event by our Lord, when he warned the Jews that the Gospel would be taken from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof (Matt. xxi. 43.) Yet how slow and progressive the accomplishment! Converted Jews gradually diffused the leaven of the kingdom among the Gentiles, and converted Gentiles may have to do the part of as gradually diffusing it among the Jews that still remain in unbelief. And so “the life from the dead,” which the conversion of Israel is to bring to the Christian church, may be no single revival done at a stroke, but a succession of reviving and refreshing influences coming in with every new blessing vouchsafed to the means used for turning away ungodliness from Jacob.

VI.—THE APPLICATIONS MADE IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS—
CONCLUSION.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has, in this country, been usually regarded as an inspired production of the Apostle Paul. This opinion, however, has never been universally acquiesced in. The early church itself appears to have been divided on the subject,—the Greek or Eastern church generally ascribing it to St Paul, and the Western regarding it as the production of some other person. From the middle of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, the opinion became almost universal, that it had proceeded from the pen of the Apostle to the Gentiles. But in more modern times, very great diversity of opinion has again prevailed; and on the continent, the preponderance among the more learned commentators has rather been in favour of some other person than Paul—probably Luke, Timothy, Apollos, or Clement. The chief source of this disposition to find another author than Paul, arises from the marked difference in the style of this epistle, as compared with the acknowledged writings of the Apostle—a difference so marked, that it is impossible for any one acquainted with the original not to be struck with it, and the more noticeable as the much purer Greek idiom that distinguishes this epistle, is found where we should least have expected it—in a writing addressed, not to Greek readers, as the greater part of

Paul's epistles were, but to those whose native language was Syriac. This circumstance is so very singular in itself, and so unlike the course that is usually adopted in such cases, that if the epistle did proceed from the Apostle, he must have on purpose departed considerably from his usual style, and possibly allowed this to be chiefly modelled by some Grecian coadjutor, and none more likely than Luke, who went with Paul to Rome. And we think a sufficient reason may be discovered for such a procedure, in the jealousy that was entertained towards Paul personally among the Jewish churches. If the epistle had either borne his name expressly on its front, or had been marked by his well-known characteristics of style, the parties to whom it was addressed might have been disposed to cast it aside at once, or would have listened with prejudiced feelings to the line of argument, by which it sought to win them from their dangerous attachment to the decayed formalities of Judaism. Certainly, the argument itself, no one might have been expected so readily to handle as the Apostle Paul, as no one could be supposed more deeply alive to the importance of the object it aimed at. And his very eagerness to attain this object might quite naturally have led him to court the kind of disguise, which appears in the withholding of his name, and the adoption of another style than what was properly his own.

The epistle abounds with references to Old Testament Scripture, and with direct quotations from it; as was, indeed, unavoidable from the nature of the subject it discusses. It is in its main theme a reasoning from the Old to the New; not, however, for the purpose of proving that Jesus was the Christ promised to the fathers, but rather, taking for granted this as a point mutually held, and shewing from the dignity of Christ's person, and the perfection of his work, as indicated even in Old Testament Scripture, the completeness of his dispensation in itself, and the mingled folly and danger of keeping up the shadowy services of Judaism, which had lost all their importance when their design was accomplished in Christ. To continue still to adhere to them, of necessity betokened at the very outset defective views of the superlative glory of Christ, and a tendency to look to those merely temporary representations of it for more than they were ever intended to impart; and the probability was, that, if persevered in, the carnal element would carry it entirely over the spiritual, and complete shipwreck of the faith would be made amid the dead observances of an obsolete and now annulled Judaism. Such briefly is the aim and drift of this epistle; and it very naturally leads us to expect that the author, in treating the subject, would make considerable use of passages in Old Testament Scripture bearing on gospel-times; that he would lay especial emphasis on those passages which either substantially implied or expressly announced the pre-eminent greatness of Christ's person, and work, and kingdom; and that he would also draw largely upon the accredited memorials of the past for warnings and expostulations against the danger of backsliding and apostacy, and for incentives to progress in the higher degrees of knowledge and virtue. All this we might have expected, and all this we find, in an epistle full of doctrinal expositions, happily combined with the earnest enforcement of practical duty. But there are some peculiarities in the application of Old Testament passages that appear in the course of the argument, which are not to be met with, at least to the same

extent, in any other portions of the New Testament, and which call for some explanation.

1. First of all, there is a peculiarity in the mode of selection. Out of thirty-two or three passages in all that are quoted from the Scriptures, no fewer than sixteen, or one-half, are taken from the book of Psalms; and these, with only one or two exceptions in the two first chapters, comprise all that are referred to as bearing immediately on the person or work of Christ. There is something very singular in this, and something, we are disposed to think, which should have a degree of importance attached to it in connection with the author's manner of dealing with Scripture. For some reason or another he felt himself, if not absolutely shut up, yet practically influenced to confine almost entirely his proof passages respecting Christ as the head of the new dispensation, to such as might be found in the book of Psalms. What that reason might be we can only conjecture, or probably conclude from the nature and object of the epistle. Possibly it arose from the constant use made of the psalter in the Jewish worship, whereby it was not only rendered more familiar to the minds of the Judaizing Christians than any other portion of ancient Scripture, but was also most naturally regarded as of special authority in matters connected with the devotional service of God. So that arguments drawn from this source in behalf of a more spiritual worship, and for the disuse of those fleshly services with which it had been wont to be associated, could scarcely fail to tell with peculiar force on the subject of controversy—might even seem to come like a voice from the temple itself in testimony against its antiquated usages. At all events, the fact of the Apostle's quotations on this point being derived almost wholly from the Psalms, may justly be regarded as resting on some important consideration which it was necessary to keep in view. And this being the case, we should not so much wonder at testimonies respecting Christ being taken from passages there where he is not so plainly exhibited, while no reference is made to others in the prophetic books of Scripture more direct and explicit. The author deemed it right to draw his materials from a limited field, and he naturally pressed these as far as he properly could.

2. But does he not press them too far? Does he not really seek for materials in proof of Christ's personal or mediatorial greatness where they are not to be found? So it has been supposed; and it is not to be denied that another peculiarity meets us here, in the extent to which the book of Psalms is used in this epistle for testimonies respecting Christ. Particular psalms are employed in the discussion which are nowhere else in the New Testament applied to Christ. Not, however, it should be observed, to the neglect of those which *are* elsewhere applied to him; not as if the author were hunting for *concealed* treasures, and making light of such as lay *open* to his view. The more remarkable Messianic psalms, the 2d, the 22d, the 40th, the 45th, the 110th, are all referred to at different places as testifying of the things belonging to the Messiah. But besides these (to which we do not need now to refer more particularly), we find in the first chapter alone two other psalms, the 97th and the 102d, quoted without a note of explanation as portions bearing respect to Christ. Thus, at ver. 6, it is said, "When he

bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him," quoting the latter clause of Ps. xcvi. 7. And the concluding part of Ps. cii. is brought forward as spoken directly to the Son, "To the Son he saith, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands," &c.

It should be carefully remembered, however, in respect to the use made of such passages, that the Apostle is not appealing to them for the purpose of proving that Jesus was the Messiah, or that he who became the Messiah in the fulness of time originally brought the universe into being. The Apostle is writing to persons who understood and believed these points—believed both that Jesus was the Christ, and that by him, as God's Word and Son, the worlds had been at first made, as well as redemption now accomplished for a believing people. The question was, what honour and respect might be due to him as such? and whether there was not a glory in him that overshadowed, and, in a manner, extinguished the glory of all preceding revelations? Now, for this purpose the passages referred to were perfectly in point, and contained a testimony which must have been quite valid with believing Hebrews. According to *their* belief also (in fact they could not have been in any proper sense Christians without having first come to the belief that), the Messiah was, as to his divine nature, the Son of God, and the immediate agent of Godhead in the creation of the world. Hence, as a matter of course, the word, in the concluding portion of the 102d Psalm, addressed to God as the Creator, must have been held as immediately applicable to the Son; it is of necessity *his* creative energy, and uncreated, unchangeable existence that is there more directly celebrated. No one can doubt this who knows the relation of the Son to the Father as the revealer of Godhead in the works of creation and of providence. And in like manner the 97th Psalm, which points to the manifestation of God's power and glory in the world, as going to bring discomfiture on all the worshippers of idols, and joy to the Church. What believer can really doubt that this was mainly to be accomplished in the person and the work of Christ? Even Rabbinical writers have understood it of Messiah. There is no other manifestation of God, either past or to come, fitted to produce such results but the personal manifestation given in Christ; and the call to worship God, written in the psalm, was most properly connected with the incarnation of the Divine Word. When by that event the First-begotten was literally brought into the world, there was the loudest matter-of-fact proclamation, calling upon all to worship him. It was only then, indeed, that the peculiar displays of divine power and glory began to be put forth, which the psalm announces; and the spiritual results it speaks of always appear according as Christ comes to be known and honoured as the manifested God.

But the use made in the second chapter of the eighth Psalm is thought by some still more peculiar and difficult of explanation. For in that psalm the glory of God is celebrated in the most general way, as connected with the place and dignity of man upon the earth; and how can it be produced as a testimony for Christ? But is it so produced? As far as we can see, the Apostle does not understand what is written in that psalm as pointing at all, directly or exclusively, to Christ. He is answering an objection, which,

though not formally proposed, yet was plainly anticipated as ready to start up in the minds of his readers, to what he had advanced concerning the divine honour and glory due to Christ, as the Eternal Son of God. However he may be so when viewed simply in respect to his divine nature, yet as known to us, he was a man like ourselves; yea, a man compassed about with infirmity, and subject to suffering above the common lot of humanity; and might not the consideration of this detract somewhat from his dignity? Might it not even be justly regarded as placing him below the angels? By no means, says the Apostle, there is a glory of God connected also with man's estate; the Psalmist was filled with wonder and admiration at the imperfect indications he beheld of it in his day, regarding these as pledges of the more complete realisations of it yet to come; and it must be realised and perfected, not in connection with the nature of angels, but in connection with the nature of man. In allying himself with man, the Son of God, indeed, stooped for a time below the dignity of angels, but it was only that he might raise manhood to a higher position even than theirs; he humanized the Godhead, that he might, in a manner, deify humanity, that is, raise it to a participation in his own peerless majesty and fulness of blessing. In a word, the lordship of this world, which from the first was destined for man, and the thought of which filled the Psalmist with rapture and astonishment—this, in all its perfection and completeness, is still to be the inheritance of redeemed man, because the Eternal Son, as Redeemer, has, by becoming man, secured the title to it for himself and as many as are joined to him by a living faith. So that Christ has lost nothing of his proper glory by assuming the nature of man, but has simply made provision for a redeemed people sharing with him in it.

It is in connection with this branch of the argument also that the Apostle refers to a passage in Isaiah, which has been thought not strictly applicable to Christ. It is Isa viii. 17, 18, where the prophet, in his own name or another, says, "I will wait (or trust) upon the Lord; behold, I and the children which the Lord hath given me are for signs and wonders," &c. The prophet, it has been thought, speaks there of himself, and of his own proper children, as specially raised up by the Lord, to encourage the people to trust in the divine power and faithfulness for deliverance. That, however, is by no means so clear as some would have it. It is fully as probable, and the opinion is certainly growing among commentators, that the prophet rather rises here above himself and his children to those whom they represented, to the Angel of the Covenant, and his spiritual seed. For he says immediately before, "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples, and I will wait," &c. Who could speak thus of *his* disciples, and command the testimony to be bound up? Surely a higher than Isaiah is there. But even supposing that the prophet spoke of himself, supposing that in what follows, at least in the words quoted here, he does speak of himself and his own children; yet, as these must unquestionably have been viewed as personating the Immanuel and his spiritual offspring, the passage, even in that view of it, was a perfectly valid proof of the point for which it is quoted. It plainly indicates a oneness of nature in the Head and the members of the Lord's covenant people, and a common exposure to the ills of humanity.

3. A third peculiarity, and one that has been thought still more characteristic of the Old Testament quotations in this epistle from those elsewhere made in the New Testament, is, that they are uniformly taken from the Septuagint (*i. e.* the old Greek translation of the Old Testament), even where that differs materially from the original Hebrew. The New Testament writers generally, and the Apostle Paul in particular, very frequently quoted from that version, because it was in common use in the synagogues, and had acquired a kind of standard value. But they also, in many cases, departed from it, when it did not give at least the general sense of the original. This, however, is never done in the Epistle to the Hebrews; the Septuagint version is almost uniformly quoted from, whether it comes near or not to the exact meaning. Thus the words of the ninety-seventh Psalm, rendered in chap. i. 6, "Let all the angels of God worship him," are literally "Worship him all ye gods." So again in the quotation from the eighth Psalm in the second chapter, what is literally "Thou hast made him want a little of God," is given from the Septuagint, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels." A still greater deviation occurs in chap. x. 5, where the words from Psalm xl., which are in the original, "Mine ears hast thou bored," or opened, stand thus, "A body hast thou prepared me." And once more, a passage taken from Habakkuk, in chap. x. 38, which, according to the Hebrew, is, "Behold, his soul is lifted up, it is not upright in him," appears in the much altered form of the Greek version, "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

We omit other and less important variations. Those we have adduced undoubtedly shew a close adherence to the Greek version, even where it is not strictly correct. At the same time, it is to be observed, that nothing in the way of argument is built upon the differences between that version and the original, and the sentiment it expresses, so far as used by the Apostle, would not have been materially affected by a more literal translation. Indeed, in the last instance referred to, the passage from the prophet Habakkuk is not formally given as a citation at all; and as the order of the clauses also stands differently in the epistle from what it does in the Septuagint, so as to suit more exactly the object of the writer, we may rather regard him as adopting for his own what was found in the Septuagint, and giving it the sanction of his authority, than intending to convey the precise sense of the ancient prophet. And, after all, it is only a differently expressed, not by any means a discordant, sense with that of the prophet. The swollen, puffed-up soul is not upright, or does not maintain the even course of integrity. When the prophet says this, he only expresses more generally what is more fully and specifically intimated by the Apostle, when he speaks of such as draw back in times of trial, and incur thereby the displeasure of God. The passage taken from the fortieth Psalm admits of a similar explanation. The Apostle lays no stress upon the words, "A body hast thou prepared me;" he lays stress only on the declared readiness of the speaker in the psalm to do the will of God, by a personal surrender to its requirements; and as to say, "Mine ears hast thou opened," means, Thou hast made me ready to listen to all the demands of thy service; so to say, "A body hast thou prepared me," is but to turn it from a part of the body

to the whole, and to intimate that his body itself was provided for the purpose of yielding the obedience required. The difference is quite a superficial one as regards the vein of thought running through the passage. And such also is the case with the other quotations, in which the angels are substituted for God or gods. It is plain that, in such expressions as "Worship him ye gods," and, "Thou hast made him to want but a little of God," something else than the supreme Jehovah is meant by the *Elohim* of the original—it must denote more generally something divine, or divine-like in condition and dignity, whether esteemed such on earth, or actually such in heavenly places. And the angels being the creatures nearest to God that we are acquainted with, they were not unnaturally regarded as substantially answering to the idea indicated in the expression. Many, even of the most learned interpreters, still think, that it is best to abide by the word *angels* in the passages referred to.

4. In conclusion, we shall make only two remarks—the one more immediately applicable to the peculiarity just noticed in this epistle, and the other common to it with the New Testament generally, in respect to the use of the Old Testament Scriptures.

The first is, that it perfectly consists with a profound regard to Scripture as given by inspiration of God, to employ a measure of freedom in quoting it, if no violence is done to its general import. There are cases in which much hangs on a particular expression; and in these cases the utmost exactness is necessary. In this very epistle a striking example is furnished of the pregnancy of single words, in the comment made upon those of the 110th Psalm, "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec," where every expression is shewn to be important. And it is not too much to affirm, from such specimens of inspired interpretation, that the very words of Scripture are to be held as bearing on them the stamp of the Spirit's diction. On the other hand, the free renderings adopted in other places, where it was enough to obtain the general import, teach us to avoid the errors of superstitious Jews and learned pedants, and to be more anxious to imbibe the spirit of Scripture, than to canonize its mere words and letters. We must contend for every jot and tittle of the word, when the adversary seeks, by encroaching on these, to impair or corrupt the truth of God. But we are not absolutely bound up to that; we may freely use even a general or incomplete representation of its meaning, if by so doing we are more likely to get a favourable hearing for the important truths it unfolds. Correctness without scrupulosity should be the rule here, as in the Christian life generally.

Our second remark is, that the chief thing necessary for enabling us to go heartily along with the applications made both here and elsewhere of the Old Testament in the New, is a correct apprehension of the relation between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations. It is because the inspired writers went so much farther in this respect, than many of their readers and commentators are disposed to do now, that the great difficulty is experienced in sympathizing with this part of their writings. They saw every thing in the Old pointing and tending towards the manifestation of God in Christ, so that not only a few leading prophecies and more prominent institutions, but

even subordinate arrangements and apparently incidental notices in matters connected with the ancient economy, were regarded as having a significance in respect to Christ and the Gospel. No one can see eye to eye with them in this, if he has been wont practically to divorce Christ from the Old Testament. And in proportion as an intelligent discernment of the connection between the two economies is acquired, the course actually adopted by the New Testament writers will appear the more natural and justifiable. Let there only be a just appreciation of the things written and done in former times, as preparatory to the better things to come in Christ, and there will be found nothing to offend even the science and the taste of the nineteenth century in the principles of interpretation sanctioned in the writings of the New Testament.

APPENDIX C.

THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE.—P. 176.

IN the text we have merely vindicated the Old Testament Scriptures from any charge of inconsistency in the reserve these maintained regarding the doctrine of a future state. It is desirable, however, to present the subject in a fuller light, and to consider both the state of opinion that prevailed respecting it in heathen antiquity, and the relation in which the Old and the New Testament Scriptures alike stand to it. We shall thus have an opportunity of pointing out several erroneous views, as we conceive, that are still of frequent occurrence in discussions upon the subject.

1. First of all, we look to the general fact—that somehow, and in some form or another, a belief in the doctrine of the soul's immortality has prevailed in nations, which had only natural resources to guide them in their religious views and tenets. We are not aware of any considerable people, either in ancient or in modern times, of whom this might not be affirmed; and among all nations that have reached any degree of intelligence and civilization, it is notorious, that the doctrine has always held a recognised and prominent place in the articles of popular belief. In no age or country has a public religion existed, which did not associate with it the prospect of a future state of happiness or misery as one of its leading elements and most influential considerations. So much is this the case, that the fear of the gods in heathen states was very commonly looked upon as identified with the expectation of good and evil in a life after the present; and the ancient legislators, who established, and the sages who vindicated the importance of religion, with one consent agree in deriving its main virtue from the salutary hopes and terrors it inspired respecting the life to come.¹ We are perfectly

¹ See Warburton's *Div. Leg.*, B. III. s. 1, for the proof of this; and Russell's *Connexion*, vol. i. p. 308, seq.

entitled, therefore, from the existence and prevalence of religion among men, to infer, in a corresponding degree, the existence and prevalence of a belief in the immortality of the soul, or its destination in some form hereafter to a better or a worse state than belongs to it here. And as nothing ever attains to the rank of a universal belief, or general characteristic of mankind, which is not rooted in some common instinct of man's nature, we may further assert it as an undoubted fact, that this idea of a future state is one that springs from the spiritual instincts which belong to man as man; or, in the expressive language of Coleridge, that "its fibres are to be traced to the tap-root of humanity."

Exceptions, no doubt, are to be found to it, even among those who externally joined in the popular religion of their country—but only in the case of persons, or parties, who were unfavourably situated for the development of their spiritual instincts, and who have seldom, in any age or country, formed more than a small minority of their generation. Such an exception, for example, appeared in the case of the Sadducees in the latter days of the Hebrew commonwealth—a sect small in point of numbers, and one that sprung up, partly as a reaction from the superstitions and frivolities of Pharisaism, and partly from the spread of Grecian culture among the richer and more ambitious classes in Judea. It was essentially a sect of philosophy, and had drunk too deeply of the sceptical influences of heathenism to be much impressed with *any* religious beliefs; though its repulsion to Pharisaism probably led it to take up more of an extreme position in respect to them, than it might otherwise have done. But it is impossible for any one to read the occasional notices given of the sect in Josephus, without perceiving that, as a party, they habitually did violence to the moral, as well as the spiritual instincts of their nature; that they exhibited the usual characteristics of the infidel spirit, and would very soon have ceased even from the profession of religion, if they had not been surrounded by a religious atmosphere. So that they can scarcely be regarded as exceptions to the natural union of the religious sentiment with the prospect of an hereafter; for the religious sentiment had no proper place in their bosom.

Substantially the same explanation is to be given of the views entertained by individual writers, and by some whole sects of heathen philosophers. Their intellectual culture unfitted them for sympathizing with the popular forms, into which either the worship of the gods, or the belief of a future state of existence had thrown itself. They saw the grossness and manifold absurdity of what had obtained the general assent, without having anything of their own clearly defined and thoroughly ascertained to put in its place; and the inevitable result was, that many of them became sceptical on the whole subject of religion, and others wavered from side to side in a kind of half-belief—sometimes giving utterance to the hopes and fears that naturally sprung from the conviction of a Supreme Governor, and again expressing themselves as if all heaven were a fable, and all futurity a blank. It was not that nature in them wanted the spiritual instincts it seems to possess in other men, or that these instincts failed to link themselves with the prospect of a future existence; but that, situated as they were, the instincts wanted appropriate forms, in which to clothe their feelings and expectations, and

thus had either to hew out a channel of their own for faith and hope to flow in (which they were often too weak to do), or collapsed into a state of painful uncertainty or sceptical disbelief.

We take this to be both a fairer and a more rational account of the state of opinion prevalent among the more thoughtful and speculative part of ancient heathens, than that given by Bishop Warburton, and re-echoed in our own times by Archbishop Whately. Warburton has laboured with a great profusion of learning to shew, that all the ancient philosophers, with the exception of Socrates, were in their real sentiments disbelievers in a future state of reward and punishment, and only taught it in their exoteric writings as a doctrine profitable to the vulgar. We think it is impossible to make out this by any fair interpretation of the better writings of heathen antiquity; and, without giving far too much weight to the explanations and statements of the later Sophists and Neo-Platonists, who are no proper authorities on such questions. The doctrine of the soul's immortality, and of its destination to a future state of reward or punishment, comes out too frequently in the higher and even more philosophical productions of the ancients, to admit of being explained on the ground of a mere paltering to vulgar superstition and prejudice. And both the frequency of its recurrence, and the variety of forms in which the belief is uttered, force on us the conviction that the writers, in uttering it, often expressed the native sentiments of their hearts. But then the crude representations and incredible absurdities with which the doctrine was mixed up in the only authoritative form known to them, as often again drove them back from the ground they were inclined to occupy, and set speculation, with her daughters, doubt and uncertainty, wholly adrift. They could not fall in, heart and soul, with what had been embodied in the religion of their country, and had established itself in the popular belief; and it was, therefore, perfectly natural, that many inconsistencies on the subject should appear in their writings; that they should be found retracting at one time what they seemed to have conceded at another; and that in their recoil of feeling from the palpably erroneous on one side, they should often have lost themselves in thick darkness on the other.

All this, however, is to be understood only of the more learned and speculative portion of heathen antiquity; of those, who either formally attached themselves to some sect of philosophy, or were, to a certain extent, imbued with the spirit of philosophy. Such persons were manifestly in the most unfavourable position for the free developement of their spiritual instincts. Policy alone, or a sense of public duty, led them to take any part in defending the existence, or in observing the rites of the prevailing religion; so that they were continually doing the part of dissemblers and hypocrites. But undoubtedly they would not have done in this respect what they did, or avowed so often their belief in a moral government above, and a state of recompense before them, unless these ideas had been interwoven with the established religion, and had come, through it, to pervade the minds of their countrymen. Warburton's declarations to this effect may be regarded as substantially correct, when he lays down the position, that a future state of rewards and punishments was not only taught and propagated by lawgivers,

priests, and philosophers, but was also universally received by the people throughout the whole earth.¹

Dr Whately, however, who, in his *Essay on the Revelation of a Future State*, generally re-echoes, as before stated, the sentiments of Warburton, expresses discordant views on this part of the subject. He seems to think that the people generally had as little belief in the existence of a future state of reward and punishment as the philosophers. From an expression in Plato, that "men in general were highly incredulous as to the soul's future existence," he concludes it to have been "notoriously the state of popular opinion," at the time, that "the accounts of Elysium and Tartarus were regarded as mere poetical fables, calculated to amuse the imagination, but unworthy of serious belief." Let us test this conclusion by a parallel declaration from a Platonic English philosopher—Lord Shaftesbury. This nobleman, ridiculing the fear of future punishment as fit at best only for the vulgar, adds regarding others, "Such is the nature of the liberal, polished, and refined part of mankind; so far are they from the mere simplicity of babes and sucklings, that, instead of applying the notion of a future reward or punishment to their immediate behaviour in society, they are apt much rather, through the whole course of their lives, to shew evidently that they look on the pious narrations to be indeed no better than children's tales, and the amusement of the mere vulgar."² This is, in fact, a far stronger and more sweeping assertion of a general disbelief among the learned now regarding the expectation of a future state, than that made by Plato of the generality of men in ancient times; but who would think of founding on such a statement, though uttered with the greatest assurance, as if no one could doubt what was said, a conclusion as to the all but universal rejection by educated men in modern times of the Scripture representations of the future world? Who does not know, that the conclusion would be notoriously false? But the inference drawn from the remark of Plato rests on a still looser foundation. And, indeed, if the matter had been as Dr Whately represents it, even in Plato's time, where should have been the temptation to the philosophers who lived then and afterwards, for so often speaking and writing differently, as is alleged, from what they really thought, respecting the world to come? They did so, we are told, in accommodation to the popular belief—that is (if this representation were correct), in accommodation to a belief which was known to have had no actual existence.

Dr Whately lays special stress in this part of his essay on the account given by Thucydides, of the effects produced among the Athenians by the memorable plague, which ravaged the city and neighbourhood. Many at first, the historian tells us, "had recourse to the offices of their religion, with a view to appease the gods; but when they found their sacrifices and ceremonies availed nothing against the disease, and that the pious and impious alike fell victims to it, they at once concluded, that piety and impiety were altogether indifferent, and cast off all religious and moral obligations." "Is it not evident from this," the archbishop asks, "that those who did rever-

¹ Div. Leg. B. III. sec. 2.

² *Characteristics*, vol. iii. p. 177.

ence the gods had been accustomed to look for none but *temporal* rewards and punishments from them? Can we conceive that men who expected that virtue should be rewarded, and vice punished, in the other world, would, just at their entrance into that world, *begin* to regard virtue and vice as indifferent?" We hold this to be an entire misapplication of the historian's facts; and a misapplication that has arisen from an error very prevalent among English theologians, and shared in by Archbishop Whately, in the mode of contemplating the doctrine of a future recompense—as if the expectation of a *future* were somehow incompatible with the experience of a *present* recompense. We shall have occasion to expose this error by and by. But, meanwhile, we assert, that such a dissolution of manners and general lawlessness as took place at Athens under the awful visitation of the plague, and as always to some extent attends similar calamities, is rather a proof of men's expecting a future state of reward and punishment than the reverse—that is, of their doing so in their regular and ordinary state of mind, when they appear to pay some regard to virtue, and to wait on the offices of religion. The recklessness of what may be called their abnormal condition, bespeaks how much their normal one was under the restraining and regulating influences of fear and hope.

We hold it, then, as an established fact, that the expectation of a future state of reward and punishment, has been the general characteristic of men in every age—wherever they have been so situated as to find free scope to the spiritual instincts of their nature. The general prevalence alone of religious worship is a proof of it—for religion, whether in the nation or the individual, has never long flourished—it soon languishes and expires when divorced from the belief of a coming state of happiness or misery. The expectation, no doubt, of such a state, in all heathen forms of belief, has never failed to connect itself with many grievous errors—especially as to the mode of existence in the future world, and the kinds of reward and punishment that have been anticipated. *There* human reason and conjecture have always proved miserable guides; and the doctrines of the metempsychosis, from one fleshly form to another, the higher doctrine of the absorption into the divine unity, and the fables of Tartarus and Elysium, were but so many efforts on the part of the human mind to give distinct shape and form to its expectations of the future. These efforts were necessarily abortive. And the facts of the case will bear us no farther in the right direction, than in enabling us to assert the prevalence of a wide-spread, well-nigh universal, belief of a future existence, mainly depending for the good or evil to be experienced in it, on the conduct maintained during the present life. But *so far*, we are thoroughly satisfied, they do bear us.

Before leaving this point, we must be allowed to say, that there is a manifest unfairness in the way in which the sentiments of heathen antiquity, especially of its more profound thinkers, are very commonly represented by Warburton and his followers. This is particularly apparent in the use that is made of the alleged secret doctrine amongst them. It cannot be denied, that their writings contain strong statements in favour of a future state; but then, it is affirmed, these were only the writings that contained their exoteric doctrines—their real, or more strictly philosophical and esoteric doctrines,

must be sought elsewhere. In this way the whole argumentation in Plato's *Phædo* goes for nothing; because that, it is alleged, belonged to the exoteric class, or his writings for the vulgar. A strange sort of vulgar it must have been, that could be supposed to enter with relish into the line of argumentation pursued in that discourse! We should like also, on that supposition, to see the line described that separates, as to form and style, between the philosophical and the popular, the esoteric and the exoteric in ancient writings. But the ground for such a distinction at all has been enormously exaggerated, and was very much the invention of the later Platonists. And so we find Professor Brandis, in the article on Plato in Smith's Dictionary, treating "the assumption of a secret doctrine as groundless, and destitute of support even from the passages brought forward out of the insidious Platonic letters." We cannot but reckon it unfair, also, in regard to Cicero, the next great writer of antiquity, who has treated at large of the question of the soul's immortality, to set against his deliberate and formal statements on the subject a few occasional sentences culled from his private letters, and but too commonly written when the calamities of life had enveloped him in gloom and dependency. In the first book of the *Tusculan Disputations*, c. 15, he enunciates both his own and the general belief, as one growing out of the rational instincts of humanity; and we have no reason to question the sincerity of the statement: *Nescio quomodo, inheret in mentibus quasi seculorum quoddam augurium futurorum; idque in maximis ingenüs, altissimisque animis, et existit maxime, et apparet facillime.* He ridicules, indeed, the popular belief about Hades, as contrary to reason, and says enough to indicate how much of darkness and uncertainty mingled with his anticipations of the future; but the belief itself of a state of being after the present, is never disparaged or denied, but rather clung to throughout. It admits, however, of no doubt, that in the age of Cicero, the general tone of society at Rome among the more refined and influential classes, was deeply tinged with infidelity. The sceptical spirit of the later philosophy of Greece, which regarded nothing as true, except that everything was involved in uncertainty, had become extensively prevalent among the rulers of the world. And such public disclaimers respecting the future punishments of Hades as are to be found in Cæsar's speech against Catiline, ascribed to him by Sallust, or in Cicero's oration for Cluentius, and the *nox est perpetua, una dormienda*, of the loose epicurean and debauchee Catullus (on which Dr Whately lays stress), are no more to be regarded as fair indications of the general belief of heathendom, than the infidel utterances of the French philosophers of last century are to be taken as just representations of the general belief of Christendom.

2. Let us proceed, however, in the next place, to look at the natural grounds for this belief.

And here, at the outset, we are to bear in mind a truth which is often verified in respect to men's convictions and judgments, as well in secular matters as in those of a moral and spiritual kind, viz. that a belief may be correctly formed, or a fact may be truly stated, and yet the reasons assigned for it in individual cases may be, if not absolutely wrong, at least very inadequate and inconclusive. It was the advice of a learned judge to a man

of much natural shrewdness and sagacity, when appointed to a judicial function in the colonies, to give his decisions with firmness, but to withhold the reasons on which they were grounded; for in all probability the decisions would be right, while the reasons would be incapable of standing a close examination. We need not wonder, therefore, if in the higher field of religious thought and inquiry—if, especially in respect to those anticipations which men are prompted to form respecting a future existence—anticipations originating in the instincts of their rational nature, and nourished by a great variety of thoughts and considerations insensibly working upon their minds, both from within and from without—here especially we need not wonder if, when men began to reason out the matter in their own minds, they should often have rested their views on partial or erroneous grounds. This is what has actually happened, both in ancient and in modern times.

If we look, for example, into the most systematic and far-famed treatise, which has come down to us from heathen antiquity on this subject—the *Phædo* of Plato—we can scarcely help feeling some surprise at the manifest fancifulness of some of the reasons advanced for a future state of existence, and their utter inconclusiveness as a whole. It is the greatest of Grecian sages who is represented as unfolding them—Socrates;—Socrates, too, when on the very eve of his martyrdom; and his thoughts have the advantage of being developed by one of the greatest masters of reasoning, and the very greatest master of dialectical skill, of whom antiquity could boast. But what are the arguments adduced? There are altogether five. The first is, the soul's capacity and desire for knowledge, beyond what it can ever attain to in the present life: for, at present, it is encumbered on every side by the body, and obliged to spend a large portion of its time and resources in providing for bodily wants; so that it can never penetrate, as it desires, into the real nature and essence of things, and can even get very imperfectly acquainted with their phenomenal appearances. Hence, the soul being made for the acquisition of knowledge, and having capacities for making indefinite progress in it, there must be a future state of being, where, in happier circumstances, the end of its being in this respect shall be realized. The second argument is from the law of contraries—according to which things in nature are ever producing their opposites—rest issuing in labour, and labour again in rest—heat terminating in cold, and cold returning to heat—unity resolving itself into plurality, and plurality into unity;—and so, since life terminates in death, death must in turn come back to life; not, however, through the body which perishes, but in the soul itself that survives it. Then, thirdly, there are the soul's reminiscences of a previous life—by which are meant the ideas which it possesses, other than those it has derived from the five senses—such as of matter and space, cause and effect, truth and duty—ideas which, it is supposed, must have been brought by the soul from a previous state of existence; and if it has already passed out of one state of existence in coming into this world, the natural supposition is, that in leaving it, the soul shall again pass into another. The simple and indivisible nature of the soul is advanced as a fourth argument for immortality;—the soul in its essence is not, like bodily substances, compounded, divisible, and hence corruptible, but is itself, like the ideas it apprehends, immaterial, spirit-

nal, incapable of change or dissolution into other elements. Then, lastly, there is the consideration of the soul's essential vitality—being the principle of life that animates and supports the body—and which, like the element of heat in material substances, may leave its former habitation, but must still retain its own inherent properties—must be vital still, though the body it has left necessarily falls into inertness, corruption, and death.

Such are the arguments advanced in this celebrated discourse for the soul's immortality—every one of them, it will be observed, except the first, of a metaphysical nature; though toward the close a kind of moral application is made of them, by urging the cultivation of mental, as opposed to sensual, desires and properties. “On account of these things,” Socartes is made to say, “a man ought to be confident about his soul, who during this life has disregarded all the pleasures and ornaments of the body as foreign from his nature, and who, having thought they do more harm than good, has zealously applied himself to the acquirement of knowledge, and who, having adorned his soul, not with a foreign, but with its own proper ornament, temperance, justice, fortitude, freedom, and truth, thus waits for his passage to Hades, as one who is ready to depart whenever destiny shall summon him.” The meaning is—not that the enjoyment of immortality depends upon the cultivation of such tendencies and virtues—for the reasons are all derived from the soul's inherent nature; and if good for any thing are good for every one who possesses a soul—but that, by being so exercised here, the soul becomes ready for at once entering on its better destiny; while, in the case of others, a sort of purgatory has first to be gone through—processes of shame and humiliation to detach it from the grosser elements that have gained the ascendancy over it. But in regard to the arguments themselves, who would *now* be convinced by them? There is manifestly nothing in that derived from the law of contraries—for in how many things does it not hold? how many evils in nature appear to issue in no countervailing good? Neither is there any thing in that derived from the supposed reminiscences of a former life—there being in reality no such reminiscences. And the reason found in the soul's essential vitality, is a simple begging of the question; for, apart from what has appeared of this in its connection with the body, what is known of it? What proof otherwise exists of the soul's vitality?

Of the two remaining arguments, the one placed in the soul's simple and indivisible nature, has often been revived. Not only does it recur in Cicero, among the ancients, and in such modern metaphysical productions as those of Clarke and Cudworth; but the sagacious Bishop Butler also makes use of it in his Analogy. We have it also presented to us in the glowing lines of Tupper:—

“And corruption, closely noted, is but a dissolving of the parts,
The parts remain, and nothing lost, to build a better whole;
Moreover, mind is unity, however versatile and rapid;
Thou can'st not entertain two coincident ideas, although they quickly follow;
And unity hath no parts, so that there is nothing to dissolve;
The element is still unchanged in every searching solvent.”

And Dr Thomas Brown even lays the chief stress on it: “The mind,” he contends, “is a substance, distinct from the bodily organ, simple, and

incapable of addition or subtraction :” that is his first proposition ; and his next is, “ Nothing which we are capable of observing in the universe has ceased to exist since the world began.” The two together, he conceives, establish the conclusion, so far as analogy can have influence, that “ the mind does not perish in the dissolution of the body.” And he adds, “ in judging according to the mere light of nature, it is on the immaterialism of the thinking principle, that I consider the belief of its immortality to be most reasonably founded ; since the distinct existence of a spiritual substance, if that be admitted, renders it incumbent on the assertor of the soul’s mortality to assign some reason which may have led the only Being, who has the power of annihilation, to exert his power in annihilating the mind, which he is said, in that case, to have created only for a few years of life.” As if there were here no alternative between the annihilation of the *substance* of mind, and the destruction of its *existence* and *identity* as a living agent ! The matter of the body, it is true, is not annihilated at death ; the particles of which it is composed still continue to exist ; but not surely as the component elements of an organized structure. In that respect the body is destroyed—as far as our present observation goes, annihilated. And why may it not be so in respect to the mind ? Allow that this is an immaterial substance, and as such, essentially different from the body, yet, for aught we can tell, it might be capable of being resolved into some condition as far from a continuation of its present state, as that of the dead body is in respect to its living state. The phenomena of swoons and sleep clearly shew that immateriality is no security against the *suspension* of thought and consciousness :—And who shall be able to assure us, on merely natural considerations, that death is not a *destruction* of them ?

In truth, no sure footing can be obtained here on metaphysical grounds. It was the error and misfortune of the ancient philosophers—so far we certainly agree with Bishop Warburton¹—that they suffered themselves to be determined by metaphysical, rather than by moral arguments on the subject ; for this naturally took off their minds from the considerations that have real weight, and involved them in many absurd and subtle speculations, which could not stand with the soul’s personal existence hereafter. When he excepts Socrates from the number, and accounts for his firm belief in a future state, on the ground of his avoiding metaphysical, and adhering only to moral, studies, he certainly gives us a very different view of the reasonings of Socrates on the subject from that presented in Plato. And we are persuaded, that neither was Socrates so singular in his belief, nor the others so universal in their disbelief of a future state, as Warburton would have us to believe. But, undoubtedly, there would have been far more of belief among them, if their reasonings had taken less of a metaphysical direction, and they had looked more to those moral considerations, connected with man’s nature and God’s government, on which the stay of the argument should alone be placed.

Let us now endeavour to indicate briefly the different steps of the ratiocination, which it is possible for unassisted nature, when rightly directed, to take in the way of establishing the belief of the soul’s existence after death in a state of reward or punishment.

¹ Div. Leg. B. iii. § 4.

(1.) First of all, there is an argument furnished by the analogies of nature—an argument partly, indeed, of a merely negative character, and amounting to nothing more than that, notwithstanding the visible phenomena of death, the soul may survive and pass into another state of painful or blessed consciousness. For, however nearly connected the soul is with the body, it still is capable of many things that argue the possibility of its maintaining a separate and independent existence. Bodily organs may be lost—even great part of the body be reduced to an inactive lump by paralysis, while the mind exists in full vigour. In dreaming, and the exercise of abstract thought, there is sometimes found the most lively exercise of mind, when its connection with the body is the slightest, and, as far as *we* can discern, mind alone is at work. Why may it not, then, live and act when it is altogether released from the body—especially when we see the period of its release is often the moment of its highest perfection and most active energy? Those preceding analogies render it not unreasonable to imagine, that such at least *may* be the case.

Besides, life here is seen to move in cycles. It proceeds from one stage to another—each end proving only the starting-point of a new beginning. Man himself exists in two entirely different conditions—before and after birth :—And throughout his whole course of life on earth, he is perpetually undergoing change. Other creatures have still more marked changes and progressions in their career. Thus in many insects there is first the egg, then the worm, then the chrysalis, then the fully developed insect. And there are cases (of Aphides) in which as many as six or eight generations of successive change and development pass away, before a return is made to the original type. Such things appearing in the present operations of nature, afford, indeed, no positive proof that life in man is destined to survive the body and enter on a sphere entirely different from the present; but they are well fitted to suggest the thought—and they meet the objection, which might not un-naturally arise, when the thought *was* suggested, from the great diversity necessarily existing between the present and that supposed future life. For they shew that it is part of the divine plan to continue life through very different circumstances and conditions.

It is manifest, however, that such analogies in nature cannot be pressed farther than this—they simply render possible or conceivable the soul's destination to another life, and answer objections apt to arise against it—but they contain no positive proof of the fact. Indeed, proceeding as they do upon the constitution of man's physical nature, and what is common to him with the inferior creation, they start the objection on the other side—that if on such grounds immortality might be predicated of man, it might also be predicated of all animals alike. But there is another class of analogies, to which this objection does not apply, which bring out the essential difference between man and the inferior animals—and are not simply negative in their character, but contain something of presumptive evidence in favour of a future state, closely connected with the present. We refer to the analogies presented by the adaptations so largely pervading the divine administration on earth, by means of which every being and part of being is wisely fitted to its place and condition. We see this adaptation in the construction of the organs of

the human body—the eye, the ear, the taste, the limbs—all so nicely adjusted to the positions they occupy, both in respect to the human frame itself, and to the purposes they have to serve in connection with the material objects around them. We see it in the masticating and digestive apparatus, with which the various kinds of animals are furnished—one after one fashion, another after another—but each most appropriately suited to the nature and habits of the specific animal, and the kind of aliment required for its support. We see it even in the general condition of the inferior creation, which is so ordered in the great majority of instances, that each living creature gets the measure of good, of which it is capable, and with which it is satisfied. And then there are prospective contrivances in connection with all animal natures—contrivances formed at one stage of their existence, and preparing them for entering upon and enjoying another still before them—such as the eyes that are already fashioned in the fœtus, and the second row of teeth that lie for a time buried in the mouth of the child, and spring up only when they are required.

Now, when we turn to man with his large capacities and lofty aspirations—growing and rising as he proceeds through life—but still capable of indefinite expansion, and conscious of desires that can find no satisfaction here—does it not impress itself on our minds, that there would be something anomalous—at variance with the analogies everywhere appearing around us—if man, so formed and constituted, should terminate his existence on earth? He would, in that case, be the only creature that might seem out of place in the world, and that always the more, the higher he rose in the scale of intelligence and purity: in him alone there would be powers implanted, which seemed to fail of their proper end and object. “A brute arrives at a point of perfection that he can never pass: in a few years he has all the endowments he is capable of; and were he to live ten thousand more, would be the same thing he is at present. Were a human soul thus at a stand in her accomplishments, were her faculties to be full blown, and incapable of further enlargements, I could imagine it might fall away insensibly, and drop at once into a state of annihilation. But can we believe a thinking being, that is in a perpetual progress of improvements, and travelling on from perfection to perfection, after having just looked abroad into the works of its Creator, and made a few discoveries of his infinite goodness, wisdom, and power, must perish at her first setting out, and in the very beginning of her inquiries? Would an infinitely wise Being make such glorious creatures for so mean a purpose? Can he delight in such abortive intelligences, such short-lived reasonable beings? How can we find that wisdom, which shines through all his works in the formation of man, without looking on this world as only a nursery for the next, and believing, that the several generations of rational creatures, which rise up and disappear in such quick successions, are only to receive the rudiments of their existence here, and afterwards to be transplanted into a more friendly climate, where they may flourish to all eternity?”¹

¹ Addison, in *Spectator*, Brit. Essayists, vi. No. 111. The essay is a fine specimen of that delicate sensibility and admirably-balanced judgment, which enabled Addison often to seize on thoughts that had escaped profounder thinkers. He introduces the argument merely as

This argument might be presented as one merely arising out of the general law of adaptation, and is so presented by Dr Chalmers in his *Institutes*. But it is the analogies connected with that law, which give it all its power to awaken any presumption in favour of a future state of being for man, as separate and distinct from the inferior creation; for the presumption arises on the contemplation of the apparent discrepancy between man's present condition and his present capacities, viewed in the light of analogous arrangements in providence. It properly belongs, therefore, to the argument from analogy, and shews how that argument is capable also of assuming a positive form. It bears, too, quite appositely on the real state of the question—which is not, as Bishop Butler and most others in his day seemed to think, whether the soul is naturally and essentially immortal—but whether we are warranted to conclude it to be the will and design of God, as indicated in our own natures and his government of the world, that it should have a prolonged existence in a future state, different from, yet closely connected with the present.

(2.) A second, and still stronger ground for the general belief in such a state is furnished by the actings of conscience. For it belongs to this faculty to pronounce authoritatively on what men should, and should not do, and to record in the secret chambers of the breast sentences of approval or condemnation, according as the things done are perceived to have been right or wrong. But there is always a felt incompleteness about these judgments of the moral faculty—viewed simply by themselves; and they rather indicate, that the things so judged are fit subjects of reward and punishment, than that they have thereby received what is properly due. In short, the authority of conscience, by its very nature, stands related to a higher authority, whose will it recognises, whose verdict it anticipates. And, as Bishop Butler justly remarks concerning it in his sermons, “if not forcibly stopt, it naturally and always of course goes on to anticipate a higher and more effectual sentence which shall hereafter second and affirm its own.”

It is from the powerful sway that conscience has in awakening such anticipations, and its tendency to connect its own awards with those of a righteous lawgiver, that we are to account for the predominantly fearful and gloomy character of men's *native* thoughts respecting a future state. There is much in their natural condition to dispose them, when looking forward to another region of existence, to clothe the prospect in the most agreeable and fascinating colours, that they might find in it an effectual counterbalance to the manifold troubles of life, and a support amid the approaching agonies of death. But the reverse is so much the case, that it is the *apprehension*, rather than the *expectation* of a future state, which the belief of immortality most commonly awakens. And the vividness with which the mind of heathen antiquity pictured to itself the punishments of Tartarus—appear strangely contrasted with the dim and ghost-like pleasures of Elysium. A ready explanation of this peculiarity presents itself in the common operations of conscience, in

a “hint that he had not seen opened and improved by others, who had written on the subject,” and as a kind of subsidiary to the reasons derived from the essence and immateriality of the soul, which were then chiefly pressed. Bishop Butler contents himself with those current reasons, and has in consequence left his chapter on a future life the most imperfect and unsatisfactory of his whole Book.

which the notes of condemnation, if not more frequent, are at least greatly more distinct and impressive than those of satisfaction; and hence, as in glancing upwards, its sense of guilt naturally awoke the idea of an offended deity, requiring to be appeased by the blood of sacrifice, so in pointing forward, its sentences of reproof not less naturally cast ominous shadows before them, and threw a sombre and forbidding aspect over the coming eternity.

The convictions thus produced in men's minds respecting a future world by the natural workings of conscience, it is plain, involve the recognition of a moral government of the world, and one that is accompanied with sanctions which are destined to take effect in a state of being after the present. It is, if we may so speak, on the background of such a government with such sanctions, that conscience raises in the bosom its forebodings of a judgment to come.—Nor, indeed, on any other ground could it beget either fear or hope for the future.

(3.) But closely connected with this, and strongly corroborative of the argument, it affords for a coming existence after the present, is the evidence that appears of a moral government in the actual course of things—a government accompanied by present sanctions. And this we announce as a third, and, upon the whole, the most tangible and convincing reason for the anticipation of a future state of retribution. But here it will be necessary to go into some detail, as it is in connection with this part of the argument that divines in this country have most commonly erred, and, by a strange inversion, have sought for proof of a future state of retribution rather in the *inequalities* of the divine government, or its apparent want of moral rectitude and present sanctions, than its possession of these. Thus, it is mentioned by Jeremy Taylor, in his sermon on the death of Sir George Dalston, as one of the things “which God has competently taught to all mankind, that the soul of man does not die; that though things may be ill here, yet to the good, who usually feel most of the evils of this life, they should end in honour and advantages. When virtue,” he adds, “made man poor, and free speaking of brave truths made the wise to lose their liberty: when an excellent life hastened an opprobrious death, and the obeying reason and our conscience lost us our lives, or at least all the means and conditions of enjoying them, it was but time to look about for another state of things, where justice should rule, and virtue find her own portion.” The want of justice here, and virtue's bereavement of her proper reward, is thus represented as the main reason and impelling motive for anticipating a better state of things hereafter. And a long array of similar representations might be produced from the works of English moralists and theologians.

But we would rather point to the manifestation of this error—the error of overlooking the connection between a present and a future recompense—as exhibited in a more doctrinal form, and with a more direct injustice to the character of Scripture, by those who have treated of the religious tenets and prospects of the Jews. Not unfrequently do we find the one presented as the antithesis of the other—as if the expectation of a future recompense could only begin to take effect when the other began to give way. This is done in the coarsest manner by Spencer in his work, *De Leg. Hebræorum* (L. I. c. vi.), where, it is alleged the ancient Israelites were so gross and sensual, so addicted to the flesh and the world, as to be incapable of being

moved by anything but present rewards and punishments; and—which is but another modification of the same view—since idol-worship owed its influence chiefly to the expectations of present good or ill, which its imaginary deities were supposed to have at their command, so the tendency to idolatry among the Israelites required to be met by temporal threatenings and promises. As if God were willing by any sort of means to attach men to his service, and were content to fight idolatry with its own weapons, provided only he could induce his people to render him a formal and mercenary homage! The view of Warburton, as usual, differs only in a slight degree from Spencer's. It proceeds on the idea, that down to the later periods of the Jewish commonwealth, everything was administered by what he calls an extraordinary providence of present rewards and punishments, which supplied the place of the yet undiscovered and altogether unknown future world; and that in proportion as the extraordinary providence broke down, the belief of a future state of reward and punishment rose in its stead. Dean Graves, in his work on the Pentateuch, follows much in the same track, although he would not so absolutely exclude the belief of a future world from the remoter generations of God's people. Among the secondary reasons which he assigns for the employment of merely temporal sanctions to the law, he mentions "the intellectual and moral character of the Jewish nation, which was totally incapable of that pure and rational faith in the sanctions of a future state, without which these sanctions cannot effectually promote the interests of piety and virtue. Their desires and ideas being confined to the enjoyments of a present world, they would pay little attention to the promises of a future retribution, which they could never be sure of being fulfilled" (Works, II, p. 222). No doubt, *if* their desires and ideas were, and must have been, confined to a present world;—but why such a necessity? Would it not have been the most likely way to give their desires and ideas a loftier direction, to lay open to their view something of the good and evil to be inherited in the world to come? And if it had consisted with the divine plan to impart this, is it to be imagined, that the Israelites, who were so immeasurably superior to all the nations of antiquity in the knowledge of divine truth, should on this point alone have been incapable of entertaining ideas, which the very rudest of these were found in some measure to possess?

But not to spend farther time in the disproof of a notion so manifestly incredible and absurd, we must refer more particularly to what Dean Graves, in common with many British divines, regards as the great reason for the silence observed by Moses in respect to a future state. "I contend," he says (Works, II, p. 208), "that the reality of an extraordinary providence (*i. e.* an administration of present rewards and punishments) being established by unquestioned authority, and by the general nature of the Mosaic code, we can thence satisfactorily account for the omission of a future sanction, and that this is the *only way* in which it can be accounted for." The present administration of rewards and punishments the only way of accounting for the omission of future rewards and punishments! This might have been said with some degree of truth, if it had been meant, that through the present the future might be descried; but not in the sense understood by Dr Graves, as if

the one had been to some extent incompatible with the other. The truth and reality of the temporal sanction should rather have been viewed as the necessary foundation and undoubted evidence of a future retribution. On this point Hengstenberg forcibly remarks, "Where this foundation—that, namely, of a moral government on earth, a temporal recompense—is not laid, there the building of a faith in immortality is raised on sand, and must fall before the first blast. He who does not recognise the temporal recompense must necessarily find in his heart a response to the scoff of Vanini at the revelation, 'which indeed, promises retributions for good and bad actions, but only in the life to come, lest the fraud should be discovered.' There is to be found in Barth on Claudian, p. 1078 sq., a rich collection from heathen authors, in which despair as to a future recompense is raised on the ground of unbelief as to a present one. And does not the history of our own age render it clear and palpable, how closely the two must hang together? The doubt was first directed against the temporal recompense; and it seemed, as if the belief of immortality was going to rise, in consequence of this very misapprehension, to a higher significance and greater stability. Supranaturalistic theologians themselves, such as Knapp and Steudel, derived one of their leading proofs of a future retribution from deficiencies of the present one. But the *real* consequence was not long in discovering itself. The doctrine of reward, driven from the lower region, could not long maintain its ground in the higher. It became manifest that the hope of immortality had fed itself with its own heart's blood. 'If ye enjoy not such a recompense on earth,' says Richter justly, according to the conceptions of the age, 'God is by no means truly righteous, and you find yourselves in opposition to your own doctrine.' Where the sentiment, that the world's history is a world's judgment, is first of all heartily received in the true, the scriptural sense, there the advance becomes certain and inevitable to faith in *the* (final) judgment of the world." (Pent. II, p. 573.)

Earlier and more appalling illustrations than those referred to in this extract, might have been produced of the certainty with which disbelief in a present, tends to beget disbelief also in a future recompense. In those great and sweeping calamities, in which all distinctions seem to be lost between the good and the bad, all alike standing in jeopardy of life, or ruthlessly mowed down by the destroyer, it is seldom long till a general relaxation of principle, and even total regardlessness of future consequences, comes to prevail. It seems at such times as if the very foundations of religion and virtue were destroyed, and nothing remained but a selfish and convulsive struggle for the interests of the moment: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." This is the right reading of the account given by Thucydides of the plague at Athens, formerly adverted to, in which the historian tells us, "men were restrained neither by fear of the gods, nor by human law; deeming it all one whether they paid religious worship or not, since they saw that all perished alike, and not expecting they should live till judgment should be passed on their offences here." Similar visitations in later times have always been observed to produce similar effects, excepting where religious principle has been so deeply rooted and so generally diffused, as to triumph over present appearances. During the plague of Milan in 1630,

deeds of savage cruelty and wholesale plunder were committed that would never have been thought of in ordinary times. Even in London during the great plague in 1665, while there were not wanting proofs of sincere devotion and living principle, there was also a terrific display of the worst passions of human nature—a general dissolution of principle and rioting of iniquity, that struck the more thoughtful with dismay, and added immensely to the horrors of the time. The lurid light reflected from such apparent temporary suspensions of God's moral government, abundantly shews what results might be anticipated, if its ordinary sanctions did not exist, and the present recompenses of good and evil were withdrawn. It would no longer be the utterance merely of the fool, but the general sentiment of mankind, that there is no God—none judging in the earth now, and therefore none to judge in eternity hereafter. For, as Hengstenberg remarks again, "what God does not do here, neither will he do hereafter. If he is indeed the living and the righteous God, he cannot merely send forth letters of credit for blessing, nor terrify with simple threatenings of future evil."¹

The ground, on which we here rest the natural expectation of a future state of reward and punishment, is precisely that which has been so solidly laid by Bishop Butler in the second and third chapters of his Analogy; and it may well excite our wonder, that English divines especially, who must be well acquainted with the train of thought there pursued, should suppose an extraordinary providence, or an exact distribution of reward and punishment on earth, to militate against either the revelation, or the belief of a future state. It is simply the want, the apparent or real want, of exactness in these temporal distributions in the usual course of Providence, which mars the completeness of Butler's argument. Yet as things actually stand, he does not hesitate to draw from the present aspect and constitution of Providence the following conclusions:—*First*, That the Author of nature is not indifferent to virtue and vice; *secondly*, that if God should reward virtue and punish vice, as such, so that every one may upon the whole have his deserts, this distributive justice would not be a thing different in *kind*, but only in *degree*, from what we experience in his present government. It would be that in *effect*, toward which we now see a *tendency*. It would be no more than the *completion* of that moral government, the *principles* and *beginning* of which have been shewn, beyond all dispute, discernible in the present constitution and course of nature. And from hence it follows, *thirdly*, that as under the *natural* government of God, our experience of those kinds and degrees of happiness and misery, which we do experience at present,

¹ How strongly the more thinking portion of heathen antiquity clung to the doctrine of a retributive providence as the abiding ground of hope amid appearances fitted to shake it, may be seen alone from the train of argument pursued by Juvenal in his xiiiith book, where, treating of the prosperities of bad men, he finds consolation in the thought, that they suffer from the inflictions of an evil conscience, itself the heaviest of punishments; that hence, things naturally pleasant and agreeable, such as delicious food and wines, fail to give them satisfaction; that their sleep is disturbed; that they are frightened with thunder and disease, seeing in such things the signs of an offended deity; and that they go on to worse stages of iniquity, till they are overwhelmed with punishment; and concludes, that if these things are considered,

—— Poena quædæm amara
 Numinis invisî tandemque fatebere lætus,
 Nec surdum, nec Tiresiam quemquam esse Deorum.

gives just ground to hope for and to fear higher degrees and other kinds of both in a future state, supposing a future state admitted; so, under his *moral* government, our experience that virtue and vice are actually rewarded and punished at present, in a certain degree, gives just ground to hope and to fear, that they may be rewarded and punished in a higher degree hereafter. And there is ground to think that they actually *will* be so, from the good and bad tendencies of virtue and vice, which are essential, and founded in the nature of things; whereas the hindrances to their becoming effect are, in numberless cases, not necessary, but artificial only. And it is much more likely that these tendencies, as well as the actual rewards and punishments of virtue and vice, which arise directly out of the nature of things, will remain hereafter, than that the accidental hindrances of them will.

The solid foundation which these considerations lay for the expectation of a future state of reward and punishment, and which, growing out of the observation of what is constantly taking place here, must be felt in thousands of bosoms that never thought of turning it into the form of an argument, is entirely overlooked by Archbishop Whately in the essay formerly referred to. He does not, indeed, like Warburton and Graves, place the temporal rewards and punishments in direct antagonism to the disclosure of a future state; but neither does he make any account of the one as constituting a proper ground for the expectation of the other, and forming a kind of natural stepping-stone to it. His line of argument rather implies that it would have the reverse tendency, and that the Jews were only prepared to receive the doctrine of immortality when their present temporal blessings ceased. (§ 10.) He deems it absolutely incredible that the Israelites, as a people, should have looked for an after state of being, seeing that their attention was so very rarely, if at all, directed to such a state, and seeing also that they so seldom believed what was of much easier credence, the temporal promises and threatenings held out to them. The presumption against it he thinks greatly strengthened by the difficulty still experienced in getting people to realise the prospect of a future world, notwithstanding the comparative clearness and frequency with which it is pressed on their notice in the Gospel. In this, however, two things are evidently confounded together—the speculative knowledge or notional belief, and the practical faith of a future state of happiness and misery. For, on the same ground that Dr Whately denies the hope of immortality to those who lived under the Jewish dispensation, he might hold it to be very doubtfully or darkly propounded to believers now. Besides, he is obliged after all to admit, that somehow the doctrine and belief of a future state *did* become prevalent among the Jews long before the revelations of the Gospel—an admission which is totally subversive of his main positions; for, beyond all dispute, this prevalent belief arose without the doctrine being frequently and directly inculcated in any book of authoritative Scripture. It is fatal, also, to the argument from 2 Tim. i. 10, “Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.” For, if the knowledge of a future state existed at all before Christ, this could not have been brought to light by him, as a thing till then wrapt in utter darkness and obscurity. Nor does the statement of the Apostle imply that. It merely declares, that by means of Christ’s Gospel

a clear light has been shed on the concerns of a future life ; they have been brought distinctly into view, and set in the foreground of his spiritual kingdom. And we have no more reason to maintain, from such a declaration, that all was absolute darkness before, than to argue from Christ being called "the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John ii. 9), that a total ignorance reigned before his coming in regard to the things of God's kingdom.

In truth, it is no more the specific object of the Christian, than it was of the earlier dispensations, to disclose and formally establish the doctrine of a future state. They both alike take it for granted, and have it for their grand business to prepare men for entering on its realities. Only, in the dispensation of the Gospel, as there the ultimate provision for eternity is made, and the way laid open into its abiding mansions, a light shines upon its momentous interests, which, from the nature of things, could not be imparted previously, without confounding shadow and substance together, and merging the preparatory in the final. But still the existence of a future state of reward and punishment was implied from the very first in the history of the divine dispensations, and is not doubtfully indicated in many of the earlier notices of Scripture as among the settled beliefs of God's people. It was implied even in the first institution of a religion of mercy and hope for fallen man ; since, connecting with God's worship the prospect of a recovery from the ruin of sin, it would have only mocked the worshippers with false expectations, unless an immortal state of blessedness had been the issue it contemplated for such as faithfully complied with the appointed services. It was implied in the special dealings of God with his more honoured servants—such as Abel and Enoch before the flood, and after it Abraham and the patriarchs—whose history, in many of its bearings, is an inexplicable riddle, if viewed apart from the hope of better things to come in their future destiny. It is implied again as an object of well-grounded faith and expectation, to such persons and their spiritual seed, in the relation which God acknowledged himself to hold towards them, as their God and their Father—titles that manifestly bespoke for them an abiding interest in his eternal power and Godhead (Gen. vi. 2 ; Ex. iii. 6 ; iv. 22 ; Matt. xxii. 32 ; Heb. xi. 16). Could such special dealings and revelations have been made to the ancestors of the Jewish race without awakening a response in the bosoms of those that received them ? Could they have failed to stimulate and call forth that instinctive belief in a future state, which even common providences were sufficient to evoke in all other nations of the earth ? The idea is utterly incredible ; and scanty as the notices are, which are given us of their feelings and prospects (for a supernatural restraint was laid upon the sacred penmen in this respect), they yet tell us of a hope in death, which was enjoyed by the good—a hope, which it was the highest wish of Balaam in his better moods to possess as his own last heritage—the hope of being gathered, in the first instance, to their fathers in the peaceful chambers of Sheol, and of ultimately attaining to a better resurrection (Gen. xxv. 8 ; xlix. 33 ; Numb. xxiii. 10 ; Heb. xi. 13, 35).

These views respecting the earlier dispensations, as connected with the doctrine and belief of a future state, are strongly confirmed by the argument

maintained in the epistle to the Romans, and that to the Hebrews. The professed object of these epistles is to prove the necessity of the Christian religion, and its superiority over even the true, though imperfect, forms of religion that existed before it. And if there had been such an utter lack of any just ground for the expectation of a future state in the Old Testament dispensations, as is supposed by those we are now contending against, the chief stress would naturally have been laid upon the great omission in this respect which had been supplied by the Gospel. But is it so in reality? So far from it, that the reverse is frequently stated, and uniformly assumed. Ancient as well as present believers looked and hoped for a better existence after this. The main discussion in both epistles turns on man's relation to the law of God, and (to use the words of Coleridge, "Aids to Reflection," vol. i. p. 293,) "to the point, of which this law, in its own name, offered no solution—the mystery which it left behind the veil, or in the cloudy tabernacle of types and figurative sacrifices. It was not whether there was a judgment to come, and souls to suffer the dread sentence; but rather, what are the means of escape? where may grace be found and redemption? Not, therefore, that there is a life to come, and a future state; but what each individual soul may hope for itself therein; and on what grounds: and that this state has been rendered an object of aspiration and fervent desire, and a source of thanksgiving and exceeding great joy; and by whom, and through whom, and for whom, and by what means, and under what conditions—these are the peculiar and distinguishing fundamentals of the Christian faith. These are the revealed lights and obtained privileges of the Christian dispensation. Not alone the knowledge of the boon, but the precious inestimable boon itself, is the *grace and truth* that came by Jesus Christ."

To return, however, to our main theme—we hold it to be a great and unhappy oversight that has been committed by many, who, in overlooking the connection between a present and a future recompense, have thereby left out of view the very strongest of nature's grounds for anticipating an hereafter of weal or woe. But it is quite possible to err on the one side as well as on the other. "There is no error so crooked as not to have in it some lines of truth." And it seems to us, that Hengstenberg, in the treatise already quoted from, has to some extent overlooked the lines of truth which are in the error he controverts. It is quite true, as he has correctly and vigorously stated, that the temporal is the necessary basis of the future recompense; and that it is from what God does here, men are to argue, and in fact do argue and infer, regarding what he will do hereafter. It is also true, as farther stated by him, that a clear knowledge of the breadth and purity of God's law, and of the various spiritual ends God aims at in his dealings with men on earth, are sufficient to explain many seeming irregularities in his outward providence; as it discovers enough of imperfection in the righteousness of the good to account for their liability to sufferings, and enough of evil in the prosperity of the bad to render their condition destitute of real blessing. All this is admitted, and yet one cannot but feel that there is something which is left unexplained by it, or not thoroughly met. The assertion of a perfect administration of right holds in the full sense, only when eternity is added to time; that is, when the point now

under consideration is virtually taken for granted. Looking simply to a present world, it is impossible to maintain that the administration is perfect; the more impossible, the clearer and more spiritual our views are of the law of righteousness. For, how then could the doers of righteousness be found to suffer, as is sometimes the case, for their good deeds? or, how could prosperity of any kind be accorded to the enemies of righteousness? True, their prosperity may prove in the long run their punishment; but only in respect to its bearing on the issues of a coming eternity; and even then only as abused on their part, not as given on the part of God. In themselves his gifts are all good; and the commonest bounties of providence, if conferred on the unworthy, mark a relative imperfection, at least, in the administration of justice on earth. Without some measure, even of real imperfection, where would there be room for the cry of an oppressed church, "Lord, how long?" Or, where again the necessity for the righteous looking so much away from the present world, and fixing their expectations on what is to come? In truth, a certain degree of imperfection here is as much to be expected, and, in a sense also, as necessary as in all the preparatory dispensations of God. For it is the feeling of imperfection within definite limits, which more especially prompts the soul to look and long for a more perfect future.

To bring the discussion to a close—it is indispensably necessary, in order to ground the conviction and belief of a future state of reward and punishment, that there should be in the present course of the divine administration palpable and undoubted evidences of a moral government of the world. And in furnishing these in such manifold variety, and with such singular clearness, consisted the peculiar service rendered by the Mosaic dispensation to the doctrine of a future state. But enough being seen in the providence of God to establish this doctrine in the convictions of men, the appearance, along with that, of anomalies and imperfections, must naturally tend to confirm its hold on serious minds, and foster the expectation of its future realities; as they cannot but feel convinced, that a righteousness, which gives such indubitable marks of its stringent operation, shall sometime remove every defect and perfect its work. They deem it certain, that under the government of a God, to whom such righteousness belongs, the apparent must at length be adjusted to the real state of things, and that all instances of prosperous villany and injured worth must be brought to an end. "There is much, therefore," to use the words of Dr Chalmers, "in the state of our present world, when its phenomena are fully read and rightly interpreted, to warrant the expectation, that a time for the final separation of all those grievous unfitnesses and irregularities is yet coming—when the good and the evil shall be separated into two distinct societies, and the same God, who, in virtue of his justice, shall appear to the one in the character of an avenger, shall, in virtue of his love, stand forth to the other as the kind and magnificent Father of a duteous offspring, shielded by his paternal care from all that can offend or annoy in mansions of unspotted holiness."¹ Were it not, he justly adds, for the element of justice visible in God's administration, we

¹ Institutes, vol. i. p. 131.

should have no stepping-stone to arrive at this conclusion. And yet the partial defects and imperfections apparent in its present exercise have their share in contributing to the result; as they materially tend, when once the conclusion itself is established in the mind, to nourish the expectation of another and more perfect state to come.

APPENDIX D.

ON SACRIFICIAL WORSHIP.—P. 261.

THE great, and we may say, fundamental mistake in the sounder portion of English theologians, who have written upon primitive sacrifice, has been their holding the necessity of a divine command to prove the existence of a divine origin. They have conceived, that the absence of such a command would inevitably imply the want of such an origin. And hence the whole strength of the argument, as it has been usually conducted, is directed to shew, that though no command is actually recorded, yet the facts of the case prove it to have been issued. As a specimen of this style of reasoning, we take the following from Delany:—"Nothing but God's command could create a right to take away the lives of his creatures. And it is certain, that the destruction of an innocent creature is not in itself an action acceptable to God; and therefore nothing but duty could make it acceptable, and nothing but the command of God could make it dutiful" (*Revelation examined with Candour*, vol. i. p. 136). And so generally. Uncommanded sacrifice, it has been presumed, would necessarily have been unwarranted and unacceptable; and therefore the right to kill animals for clothing, but still more the duty of sacrificing their lives in worship, has appeared conclusively to argue the prior existence of a divine command to use them in acts of worship.

The opponents of this view, on the other hand, have maintained, and, we think, have maintained successfully, that if such a command, expressly and positively enjoining the sacrifice of animal life in worship, had actually been given, it is unaccountable that it should not have been recorded—since, to drop it from the record, if so certainly given, and so essentially necessary, as is alleged on the other side, was like leaving out the foundation of the whole edifice of primitive worship. The only warrantable conclusion we can be entitled to draw from the silence of Scripture in such a case, is, that no command of the kind was really given. So with some reason it is alleged; but when the persons, who argue and conclude thus, proceed, as they invariably do, to the farther conclusion, that, since there was no command, there was nothing properly divine in the offerings of sacrificial worship, they unduly contract the boundaries of the divine in human things, and betray, besides, an entire misapprehension of the nature of the first dispensation of God toward fallen man. This, as we have said, is distinguished by the absence of

command in every thing ; throughout, it exhibits nothing of law in the strict and proper sense ; and yet it would surely be a piece of extravagance to maintain that there were not, in the procedure of God, and in the relation man was appointed to hold toward him, the essential grounds and materials of divine obligation. How readily these were discovered in the divine operations, where still there was no divine command, may be inferred from what is written of the formation of Eve, " And Adam said, ' This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh : she shall be called woman (*Isha*), because she was taken out of man (*Ish*). " He had come to know the manner of her formation ; the divine act had been disclosed to him, as it had, doubtless, been in all others in which he was personally interested, because in the act there was contained a revelation of God, involving responsibilities and duties for his creatures. " Therefore, " it is added, by way of inference from the act of God, and an inference, if not drawn on the spot by Adam, yet undoubtedly expressing the mind of God, as to what might even then have been drawn, and what actually was drawn, by the better portion of his immediate descendants, " Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife : and they shall be one flesh. " The act of God alone, without any accompanying command, laid the foundation for all coming time of the conjugal relation, and not only entitled, but bound men to hold, as of divine appointment, its virtual incorporation of persons, and corresponding obligations of mutual love and fidelity.

The principle that *ought* to be laid as the foundation of all just reasoning on such subjects, is, that whatever man can plainly learn from the revelations God gives of himself, to be in accordance with the divine mind and will, *that* is of God, and it is man's duty to believe and act accordingly. But the issuing of authoritative commands is not the *only* way God has of revealing his mind and will ; nor, to creatures made after his own image, and as such, capable of understanding and imitating his procedure, is it even the first and most natural way of doing so. It is rather the manifestations which God gives of himself in his works and ways, in which they might be expected to find the primary grounds of their faith and practice ; and only, when such had proved to be inadequate, might they require to be supplemented by explicit commands and stringent enactments. Holding, therefore, as we do, that the command to sacrifice was not necessary to establish the divine authority of the rite of sacrifice—holding, moreover, that in the divine act of covering man's person by the skins of slain beasts, as the symbol of his guilt being covered before God, there was an actual revelation of the mind of God in regard to his purposes of mercy and forgiveness to the sinful, precisely such as was afterwards embodied in animal sacrifice—we can satisfactorily account for the absence of the command, and, at the same time, maintain the essentially divine origin of the rite. And the reasoning of Davison and others, on the principle of no command, therefore no divine authority, falls to the ground of itself as a false deduction.

Of course the soundness of our own view, respecting the essentially divine origin of sacrifice and its properly expiatory character, depends upon the correctness of the interpretation we have put upon the divine act referred to. Davison, in common with British divines generally, regards it in a merely

natural light. He sees in it simply "an instance of the divine wisdom and philanthropy; interposing, by the dictation and provision of a more durable clothing, to veil the nakedness, and cherish the modesty of our fallen nature, by sin made sensible to shame," (p. 24.) This he deems an object worthy of a special intervention of God, worthy also of a sacrifice of animal life to secure its accomplishment; and being so secured, he thinks it quite natural that the first pair might afterwards have felt themselves perfectly at liberty to use, for the sacred purposes of worship, what they had been taught to consider at their service for the lower purposes of corporeal clothing. This inference might certainly have been legitimate, if the premises on which it is founded had been accurately stated. But there we object. If corporeal clothing alone had been the intention of the act, it would have been the fruit of a needless interposition—the more so, as our first parents were themselves powerfully prompted to seek for clothing, and had already found a temporary relief. When the instincts and feelings of nature were manifestly so alive to the object, is it to be conceived that the ingenuity and skill which proved sufficient to accomplish so many other operations for their natural support and comfort, should have been incompetent here? It is altogether incredible. On simply natural grounds, the action admits of no adequate explanation, and must ever appear above the occasion, consequently unworthy of God. Besides, how anomalous, especially in a historical revelation, which ever gives the foremost place to the *moral* element in God's character and ways, if he should have appeared thus solicitous about the decent and comfortable clothing of men's bodies, and yet have left them wholly in the dark as to the way of getting peace and quietness to their consciences? Such must have been the case with our first parents, if they were thrown entirely upon their own resources in the presentation of sacrificial offerings. And so Davison, himself, substantially admits. For, while he endeavours to account naturally, and by means of the ordinary principles and feelings of piety, for the offering of animal life in sacrifice to God, considered simply as an expression of penitence in the offerer, or of his sense of deserved punishment for sin, he denies it could properly be regarded as an expiation or atonement of guilt; and hence postpones this higher aspect of sacrifice altogether, till the law of Moses, when he conceives it was for the first time introduced. Up till that period, therefore, sacrificial worship was but a species of natural religion; and man had no proper ground from God to expect, in answer to his offerings, the assurance of divine pardon and acceptance. But this, we contend, had it been real, would have been anomalous. It would have been to represent God as caring originally more for the bodies than for the souls of his people; and as utterly ignoring at one period of his dealings, what at another he not only respects, but exalts to the highest place of importance. How could we vindicate the pre-eminently moral character of God's principles of dealing, and the unchangeable nature of his administration, if he actually had been at first so indifferent in regard to the removal of guilt from the conscience, and afterwards so concerned about it, as to make all religion hinge on its accomplishment? Any satisfactory vindication, in such a case, must necessarily be hopeless. But we are convinced,

it is not needed. The moral element *is* pre-eminent in God's dealings toward men. It was this which gave its significance and worth to his act of clothing our first parents, as painfully conscious of guilt, with the skins of living creatures, whose covering of innocence was in a manner put on them. And on the ground alone of what was moral in the transaction, symbolically disclosing itself (as usual in ancient times) through the natural and corporeal, can we account for the sacrifice of slain victims becoming so soon, and continuing so long, the grand medium of acceptable communion with God? If, in so clothing man, God did mean to give indication respecting the covering of man's guilt, and men of faith understood him to do so, all becomes intelligible, consistent, and even comparatively plain. But if otherwise, all appears strange, irregular, and mysterious.¹

We are not disposed, in a matter of this kind, to lay much stress upon philological considerations. Yet it is not unimportant to notice, that the technical and constantly recurring expression under the law, for the design of expiatory offerings (לְכַפֵּר עֲלֵי־יָ), seems to have its most natural explanation by reference to that fundamental act of God, considered in respect to its moral import. *To cover upon him*, as the words really mean, is so singular an expression for making an atonement for guilt, that it could scarcely have arisen without some significant fact in history naturally suggesting it. We certainly have such a fact in the circumstance of God's covering upon our first parents with the skins of animals, slain for them, if that was intended to denote the covering of their guilt and shame, as pardoned and put away by God. The first great act of forgiveness in connection with the sacrifice of life, would thus not unfitly have supplied a sacrificial language, as well as formed the basis of a sacrificial worship.

But if some collateral support may be derived from this quarter to the view we have advanced, we certainly must disclaim being indebted to another philological consideration, more commonly urged by the advocates of the divine origin of sacrifice. We refer to the argument so much pressed by Lightfoot, Magee, and others still in the present day, and based on what is regarded as a more exact rendering of Gen. iv. 7, as if it should be, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, a *sin-offering lieth at the door.*" Magee calls this "the plain, natural, and significant interpretation" of the words, and vindicates it at great length—more especially on three grounds, 1. That the word translated sin (חַטָּאת) is very frequently used in the sense of sin-offering; 2. That when so used, it is usually coupled (though a feminine noun) with a verb in the masculine; and, 3. That the verb connected with it here, properly has respect to an animal (יָבֵשׁ), and literally denotes, *couching* or *lying down*—quite appropriately said of a beast, but not so of sin. A single fact is perfectly suffi-

¹ Davison's *internal* reason, as he calls it (p. 84), against the atoning character of the ante-legal oblations—that such oblations, even under the law, atoned only for ceremonial offences, which of necessity had no existence in earlier times, scarcely deserves any notice in the present day. It proceeds on a complete misconception of the law of Moses, which was fundamentally and pervasively moral in its character; so that there was never simply a ceremonial, but always along with that a moral element in the duties it required, and the sins it condemned. If its oblations did not atone for guilt of a moral kind, they atoned for nothing. But on this we refer to what is said of the law in our second volume.

cient to put the whole to flight; the fact, namely, that the Hebrew term for sin never bears the import of sin-offering till the period of the law, and could not indeed do so, as till then what were distinctively called *sin-offerings* were unknown. To give the passage this turn, therefore, is to put an arbitrary and unwarranted seuse upon the principal word, as there used, and nothing but the high authority of such men as Lightfoot and Magee could have given it the currency which it has so long obtained in this country. The real explanation of the feminine noun being coupled with a masculine verb, is to be found in the personification of sin as a wild beast, or cunning tempter to evil. And the whole passage, indeed, bears respect to the circumstances of the first temptation, and can only be correctly understood, when these are kept in view: "And Jehovah said unto Cain, why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? Shall there not, if thou doest good, (viz. in regard to the sacrifice), be acceptance (or, lifting up)? and if thou doest not good, sin coucheth at the door—and unto thee shall be its desire, and thou shalt rule over it." The last words are simply a transference to sin, in its relation to Cain, of what was originally said of Eve, in her relation to Adam (Gen. iii. 16); and many Jewish (see, for example, the exposition of Sola, Lindenthall, and Raphall) as well as Christian interpreters, have discerned the allusion, and had respect to it in their exposition. Our translators, however, have unhappily understood the parties spoken of to be Cain and Abel, instead of Cain and sin, and thereby greatly obscured the meaning. The object of the divine expostulation with Cain is evidently to shew him, in the first instance, that the evil he frowned at really lay with himself, in his refusing to acknowledge and serve God, as his brother did. If he would still take this course, the ground of complaint should be removed; he would find acceptance, as well as his brother. But if he refused, then there was but one alternative—he could not get rid of sin—like an evil genius, it lay couching at the door, ready to prevail over him; but it was for him to do the manly part, and assert his superiority over it. In short, he is reminded by a silent reference to the sad circumstances of the fall, that giving way to sin, as he was doing, was allowing the weaker principle of his nature (represented by the woman in that memorable transaction), to gain the ascendant, while it became him, by cleaving to the right, to keep it in subjection; and it was implied, that if he failed in this, a second fall should inevitably follow—instead of rising, he must sink.

While, however, we reject the argument commonly derived from this passage in behalf of the divine origin of sacrifice, we derive an argument from it of another kind—viz. from the explicit manner in which it connects doing good with the acceptable presentation of sacrifice, and its representing sin as unforgiven, unsubdued, reigning in the heart and conduct, if sacrifice was not so performed. Had sacrifice not been essentially of God; had it not required the humble and childlike heart of faith to present it aright; had it not carried along with it, when so presented, the blessing of forgiveness and grace from Heaven, we cannot understand how such singular importance should have been attached to it. Like the sacrifice of Christ now, it has all the appearance of having then been the great touchstone of an accepted and

blessed, or a sinful and condemned condition; not one of many, like a work of man, but standing comparatively alone as an all-important ordinance of God.

APPENDIX E.

DOES THE ORIGINAL RELATION OF THE SEED OF ABRAHAM TO THE LAND OF CANAAN AFFORD ANY GROUND FOR EXPECTING THEIR FINAL RETURN TO IT?—P. 357.

THIS question very naturally suggests itself in connection with the subject discussed in the text, although, from its involving matter of controversy, we deemed it better not to enter upon it there. The view presented, however, of the relations of the covenant-people, as connected with the occupation of Canaan, leads naturally to the conclusion, that their peculiar connection with that territory has ceased with the other temporary expedients and shadows to which it belonged. The people had certain ends of an immediate kind to fulfil, by means of their residence in the land—being placed there as representatives and bearers of the covenant, more fully to exhibit its character and tendencies, and to operate with more effect upon the nations around. But while intended to serve this present purpose, their possession of the land was also designed to be to the eye of faith an earnest and a pledge of the final occupation of a redeemed and glorified earth by Christ, and his elect seed of blessing. This is the proper antitype to the possession of the inheritance by the natural seed, in so far as that could justly be accounted typical.

One can easily perceive, therefore, that the representation entirely fails in its foundation, which is often made by recent writers on unfulfilled prophecy, viz. that the original possession of the land of Canaan by the seed of Jacob, was “only a token and earnest of a more glorious occupation of the land hereafter to be enjoyed by them.” It is contrary to the nature of prophecies of this sort, as determined by the history of previous fulfillments, to make an event foreshadow itself—to make one occupation of the land of Canaan the type of another and future occupation of it. As well might it be alleged, that the natural Israel having eaten manna in the desert, was a type of their having to eat it again, or that their former killing of the pass-over-lamb foreshadowed their doing so hereafter in some new style, as that their ancient occupation of the land of Canaan typified a future and better possession of it.

It is possible enough, however, that what we have put here in the form of extravagant suppositions, will be readily embraced by many, who believe in the future restoration of Israel to Canaan. An entire re-production of the old is now contended for, as necessary to establish the literal truthfulness of

Scripture. And among other things to be expected, we are told, in connection with the return of Israel to Canaan, is the building anew, and on a style of higher magnificence, of the material temple, the resuscitation of the Levitical priesthood, and the re-institution of the fleshly sacrifices and pompous ceremonial of the ancient worship. To hold this, indeed, is only to follow to its legitimate results the idea, that the former possession of Canaan was typical of another; since, if that earlier possession gave promise of a later one, the establishment of the religious economy connected with it must have foreshadowed its future restoration. But the notion, in this form of it, stands in direct antithesis to the whole genius of the New Testament dispensation, and to some of the most explicit statements also of New Testament Scripture. If any thing be plain in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it is, that every thing there assumes a spiritual character and a universal aspect, as contradistinguished from the local and fleshly. Foreseeing this, the prophet Malachi had said, that in the coming age, "incense and a pure offering should in every place be offered to the Lord;" and our Lord himself announced to the woman of Samaria the approaching abolition of all local distinctions. "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, shall men worship the Father;" that is, shall not regard worship rendered in these places as more sacred or more acceptable than worship paid elsewhere. The law with all its limitations of time and place, its bodily lustrations and prescribed services, was for the nonage of the church, and in form falls away, remains only in spirit, when the church reaches her maturity. Such, unquestionably, is the argument of the Apostle in his epistle to the Galatians; and it would surely be to run counter to all sense and reason, if, when the furthest extreme from the nonage condition is attained, the nonage food and discipline should return. As well might one expect to hear of angels being put into leading-strings! Nay, it is expressly declared, that the abolition of the outward forms and services of Judaism was on account of its "weakness and unprofitableness" (Heb. vii. 18); and that the law, which ordained such things, was *of necessity* changed or disannulled with the introduction of a new priesthood made after the order of Melchizedec (Heb. vii. 12). And hence those who, in the apostolic age insisted on the continued observance of the now antiquated rites of Judaism, were expostulated with by the Apostle as virtually making void the work of Christ, and acting as if the church stood at where it was before he came into the world (Gal. v. 2-4; Col. ii. 14-23).

Where such scriptural testimonies, so plain in their terms, and so conclusive in their import, have failed to produce conviction, it would be vain to expect any thing from further argumentation. It may be proper, however, to present briefly, and more formally than has yet been done, what we deem the proper view of Israel's typical relations, with respect more immediately to the subject now under consideration. The natural Israel, then, as God's chosen people from among the peoples of the earth, were types of the elect seed, the spiritual and royal priesthood, whom Christ was to choose out of the world, and redeem for his everlasting kingdom. When this latter purpose began to be carried into effect, the former, as a matter of course, began to give way—precisely as the shedding of Christ's blood upon the cross an-

tiquated the whole sacrificial system of Moses. Hence, to indicate that the type in this respect has passed into the antitype, believers in Christ, of Gentile as well as of Jewish origin, are called Abraham's seed (Gal. iii. 29); Israelites (ch. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 12, 19); comers unto mount Zion (Heb. xii. 22); citizens of the free or heavenly Jerusalem (Ib. Gal. iv. 26); the circumcision (Phil. iii. 3; Col. ii. 11); and in the Apocalypse, which is written throughout in the language of symbol and type, they are even called Jews (ch. ii. 9); while the sealed company, in ch. vii., who undoubtedly represent the whole multitude of the redeemed, are identified with the sealed of the twelve tribes of Israel. Further, this spiritual Israel of the New Testament are expressly declared to be "heirs according to the promise" (Gal. iii. 29)—the promise, namely, given to Abraham; for it is as Abraham's seed that they are designated heirs; and, of course, the possession of which they are heirs can be no other than that given by promise to Abraham. But then, as the antitypical things have now entered, not the old narrow and transitory inheritance is to be thought of, but that which it typically represented—"the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away," which now takes its place as an object of hope. Accordingly, when the higher things of the Gospel are fairly introduced, it is to this nobler inheritance, as alone remaining, that the desires and expectations of the heirs of salvation are pointed. The apostles never allude to any other, when handling the case either of believing Jews or converted Gentiles; and when that inheritance of endless blessing and glory, the inheritance, as we believe it to be, of this earth itself in a state of heavenly perfection, when this shall become the possession of a redeemed and glorified church, then shall the promise contained in the Old Testament type be fully realised.

But may not something specially belonging to Israel be included in the antitype?—something to distinguish the natural line of believers from those who belong to the seed only by spiritual ties? So, sometimes, it is argued, as in *Israel Restored*, p. 193:—"Do they tell us the literal Israel was a type of the spiritual? We instantly grant it. Do they tell us again, that therefore there is a spiritual fulfilment of the covenant to believers? We grant it also. But all this, we say, is nothing to the point. You must go farther. What you need to prove is, that Israel of old, whose descendants still exist, was so a type of the spiritual Israel, that they were finally to merge, and be lost in them whom they typified." There is no need for any such proof; the point in question is implied in the very fact of their being types; for, *as such*, they of necessity merged and became lost in the antitype. Was not the paschal lamb merged and lost in Christ? And the veil of the temple in Christ's body? And David in the Son of Mary? Every type must, as a matter of necessity, share the same fate; and if any thing peculiar is reserved for the land or people, who served a typical purpose, it must be on some other account than this that it shall belong to them.

More commonly, however, the stress of the argument, as connected with the original position of the Israelites, is laid upon the terms of the covenant with Abraham, in which Canaan is spoken of as their sure and abiding possession. So, among many others, Kurtz (*Geschichte des Alten Bundes*, p. 128), who says—"In the renewed promise (Gen. xvii. 8), the possession

of the land is called an everlasting possession, as the covenant also is called an everlasting covenant (v. 7, 13). That the covenant should be called an everlasting one, cannot appear strange, as it is a covenant that must reach its end. If the fruit of the covenant is of a permanent kind, such also must be the covenant itself, of which it is the fulfilment. The promise of an everlasting possession of the land had respect primarily to the pilgrim-condition of Abraham, which was such as not to admit of his possessing a single foot-breadth in it as his own. But the land of promise is the inheritance and possession of his seed, and remains so for ever, though Israel may have been exiled from the land, and whether the exile may have lasted seventy or two thousand years." True, no doubt, if the relative position of things continues substantially the same during the longer, as during the shorter period of exile; but not, surely, if they have undergone an essential change. The seed of Abraham has become unspeakably ennobled in Christ, and it is but natural to infer, that the inheritance also should be correspondingly ennobled. The peculiar distinction of Canaan, and that which most of all rendered it an inheritance of blessing, was its being God's land. And if in Christ the whole earth becomes in the same sense the Lord's, that Canaan was of old claimed to be his, then the promise will embrace the earth; nor will it be, in such a case, as if Canaan were lost to any portion of the seed, but rather as if Canaan were indefinitely widened and enlarged to receive them. In like manner, believers have the promise, that they shall worship God in his heavenly temple; and yet, when the heavenly appears to John in its glory, he sees no temple in it. Does the promise therefore fail? On the contrary, it is in the highest sense fulfilled. The no-temple simply means, that all has become temple, alike sacred and glorious; just as we may say, the no-Canaan in Christ has become all-Canaan. The inheritance is not lost; it has only ceased to become a part, and extends as far and wide as Christ's peculiar possession reaches (Ps. ii.) Here, however, we tread on the confines of prophecy, a field on which at present we do not mean to enter, leaving it for another occasion. We simply add, in confirmation of what has now been advanced regarding the Abrahamic covenant, that as the covenant is called everlasting, and the land also an everlasting possession, so circumcision is called everlasting: "My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant" (v. 13). But we know for certain, that this was not intended to be in the strict sense perpetual. Baptism, the Apostle tells us, is Christ's circumcision; and circumcision outwardly *should* have been dropped when Christ appeared. It is the sin of the Jews to continue it, and it cannot now be the pledge of blessing to them.

THE
TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE:
VIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH THE ENTIRE SCHEME OF
THE DIVINE DISPENSATIONS.

BY
PATRICK FAIRBAIRN,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

In vetere Testamento novum latet, et in novo vetus patet.
AUGUST. QUÆST. IN EX. LXXIII.

SECOND EDITION,
MUCH ENLARGED AND IMPROVED.

VOLUME II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO. DUBLIN: HODGES & SMITH,
AND JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCLIV.

PRINTED BY STEVENSON AND COMPANY,
32 THISTLE STREET, EDINBURGH.

	Page
SECT. V. The Most Holy Place, with its Furniture, and the Great Annual Service connected with it, on the Day of Atonement,	299
... VI. The Holy Place—the Altar of Incense—the Table of Shew-Bread—the Candlestick, . . .	318
... VII. The Offerings and Services connected with the Brazen Altar in the Court of the Tabernacle—Sin-Offerings—Trespass-Offerings—Burnt-Offerings—Peace or Thank-Offerings—Meat-Offerings,	334
... VIII. Special Rites and Institutions chiefly connected with Sacrifice—the Ratification of the Covenant—the Trial and Offering of Jealousy—Purgation from an uncertain Murder—Ordinance of the Red Heifer—the Leprosy and its Treatment—Defilements and Purifications connected with Corporeal Issues and Childbirth—the Nazarite and his Offerings—Distinctions of Clean and Unclean Food,	365
... IX. The stated Solemnities and Feasts—the weekly Sabbath—the Feast of the Passover—of Pentecost—of Trumpets (New Moons)—the Day of Atonement—the Feast of Tabernacles—the Sabbatical year, and year of Jubilee,	399
CHAP. IV. Historical Developements,	428
SECT. I. The Conquest of Canaan,	428
... II. The Period of the Judges,	439
... III. The Kingly Institution,	445
... IV. The Prophetical Order,	449
... V. The Babylonish Exile and its Results,	455

	Page
APPENDIX A. Views of the Reformers regarding the Sabbath,	461
APPENDIX B. Bähr's View of the Doctrine of the Atonement,	476
APPENDIX C. On the term Azazel,	484

 ERRATA.

- At p. 12, line 5 of note, delete "others mingling straw in it,"
 — 19, — 17, for "and" read "than"
 — 23, — 1, for "CHAPTER" read "SECTION"
 — 153, — 5, for "Deut. v." read "Deut. vi."
 — 306, — 5, for "Ex." read "Ez."

CONTENTS.

BOOK THIRD.

	Page
The Dispensation with and under the Law,	1
CHAP. I. The Divine Truths embodied in the Historical Transactions connected with the Redemption from Egypt, viewed as preliminary to the Symbolical Religion brought in by Moses,	1
SECT. I. The Bondage,	1
... II. The Deliverer and his Commission,	23
... III. The Deliverance,	34
... IV. The March through the Wilderness—Manna—Wa- ter from the Rock—the Pillar of Cloud and Fire,	58
... II. The direct instruction given to the Israelites before the erection of the Tabernacle, and the Institution of its Sym- bolical Services—the Law,	86
SECT. I. What properly, and in the strictest sense, termed the Law, viz. the Decalogue—its perfection and completeness both as to the order and substance of its precepts,	86
... II. The Law continued—apparent exceptions to its perfection and completeness as the Permanent and Universal Standard of Religious and Moral Obligation—its references to the special circum-	

	Page
stances of the Israelites, and representation of God as jealous,	109
SECT. III. The Law continued—further exceptions—the Weekly Sabbath,	118
... IV. What the Law could not do—the Covenant- standing and privileges of Israel before it was given,	145
... V. The purposes for which the Law was given, and the connection between it and the Symbolical Institutions,	159
... VI. The relation of Believers under the New Testa- ment to the Law—in what sense they are free from it—and why it is no longer proper to keep the Symbolical Institutions connected with it,	176
CHAP. III. The Religious Truths and Principles embodied in the Sym- bolical Institutions and Services of the Mosaic Dispensa- tion, and viewed in their Typical reference to the better things to come,	195
SECT. I. Introductory—On the question why Moses was instructed in the Wisdom of the Egyptians, and what influence this might be expected to exercise on his future Legislation,	195
... II. The Tabernacle in its general structure and design,	220
... III. The Ministers of the Tabernacle—the Priests and Levites,	244
... IV. The Division of the Tabernacle into two apart- ments—the Fore-court with its Laver and Altar of Sacrifice—the fundamental idea of Sacrifice by Blood, and the import of the three main points connected with it, viz. the Choice of the Victims—the Imposition of Hands—and the Sprinkling of the Blood,	276

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE.

BOOK THIRD.

THE DISPENSATION WITH AND UNDER THE LAW.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE DIVINE TRUTHS EMBODIED IN THE HISTORICAL TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE REDEMPTION FROM EGYPT, VIEWED AS PRELIMINARY TO THE SYMBOLICAL RELIGION BROUGHT IN BY MOSES.

SECTION I.

THE BONDAGE.

THE history of what is called the Patriarchal religion may be said to terminate with the descent of the children of Israel into Egypt, or at least with the prosperous circumstances which attended the earlier period of their sojourn there. For the things which afterwards befel them in that land, rather belong to the dispensation of Moses. They tended, in various respects, to prepare the way for this new dispensation, more especially by furnishing the facts in which its fundamental ideas were to be embodied, and on which its institutions were to be based. The true religion, as formerly noticed, has ever distinguished itself from impostures, by being founded on great facts, which, by bringing prominently out the character of God's purposes and government, provide the essential elements of the religion he prescribes to his people. This

characteristic of the true religion, like every other, received its highest manifestation in the gospel of Christ, where every distinctive element of truth and duty, is made to grow out of the facts of his eventful history. The same characteristic, however, belongs, though in a less perfect form, to the Patriarchal religion, which was based upon the transactions connected with man's fall, his expulsion from the garden of Eden, and the promise then given of a future deliverer ;—these formed, in a manner, the ground-floor of the symbolical and typical religion, under which the earlier inhabitants of the world were placed. Nor was it otherwise with the religious dispensation, which stood midway between the Patriarchal and the Christian—the dispensation of Moses. For here also the groundwork was laid in the facts of Israel's history, which were so arranged by the controlling hand of God, as clearly to disclose the leading truths and principles that were to pervade the entire dispensation, and that gave to its religious institutions their peculiar form and character.

When we speak of fundamental truths and principles in reference to the Mosaic religion, it will be readily understood that these necessarily required to be somewhat more full and comprehensive than those which constitute the foundation of the first and simplest form of religion. The Mosaic religion did not start into being as something original and independent ; it grew out of the Patriarchal, and was just, indeed, the Patriarchal religion in a farther state of progress and developement. So much was this the case, that the mission of Moses avowedly begins where the communications of God to the patriarchs end ; and, resuming what had been for a time suspended, takes for its immediate object the fulfilment of the purpose which the Lord had, ages before, pledged his word to accomplish.¹ Its real starting-point is the covenant made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with an especial reference to that part of it which concerned the occupation of the land of Canaan. And as the one dispensation thus commenced with the express design of carrying out and completing what the other had left unfinished, the latter of the two must be understood to have recognised and adopted as its own all the truths and principles of the first. What might *now* be regarded as fundamental,

¹ Ex. iii. 7-17.

and required as such to be interwoven with the historical transactions by which the dispensation of Moses was brought in, must have been, to a considerable extent, super-additional,—including those, indeed, which belonged to the Patriarchal religion, but coupling with them such others as were fitted to constitute the elements of a more advanced state of religious knowledge and attainment.

We are not to imagine, however, that the additional religious truths and principles, which were to be historically brought out at the commencement of the Mosaic dispensation, must have appeared there by themselves, distinct and apart from those which descended from Patriarchal times. We would rather expect, from the common ground on which the true religion always erects itself, and the common end it aims at, that the new would be intermingled with the old ; and that the ideas, on which the first religion was based, must re-appear and stand prominently forth in the next, and indeed in every religious dispensation. The Patriarchal religion began with the loss of man's original inheritance, and pointed in all its institutions of worship and providential dealings, to the recovery of what was lost. It was the merciful provision of heaven to light the way, and direct the steps of Adam's fallen family to a paradise restored. The religion brought in by the ministry of Moses began with an inheritance, not lost, indeed, but standing at an apparently hopeless distance, though conferred in free grant, and secured by covenant-promise for a settled possession. As an expression of the good-will of God to men, and the object of hope to his church, the place originally held by the garden of Eden, with the way barred to the tree of life, but ready to be opened whenever the righteousness should be brought in, for which the church was taught to wait and strive, was now substantially occupied by that land flowing with milk and honey, which had become the destined inheritance of the heirs of promise. It was the immediate design and object of the mission of Moses to conduct the church, as called to cherish this new form of hope, into the actual possession of its promised blessings ; and to do this, not simply with the view of having the hope turned into reality, but so as at the same time, and in accordance with God's general plan, to unfold the great principles of his character and government, and raise his church to a higher position in all

religious knowledge and experience. In a word, God's object, then, was, as it has ever been, not merely to bring his church to the possession of a promised good, but to furnish by his method of doing it the elements of a religion, corresponding in its nature and effects to the inheritance possessed or hoped for, and thus to render the whole subservient to the highest purposes of his moral government.

When we speak, however, of the inheritance of Canaan being in the time of Moses the great object of hope to the church, and the boon which his mission was specially designed to realise, we must take into account what, we trust, was satisfactorily established concerning it, in the earlier part of our investigations.¹

1. The earthly Canaan was never designed by God, nor could it from the first have been understood by his people, to be the ultimate and proper inheritance which they were to occupy—things having been spoken and hoped for concerning it, which plainly could not be realised within the bounds of Canaan, nor on the earth at all, as at present constituted. 2. The inheritance, in its full and proper sense, was one which could be enjoyed only by those who had become children of the resurrection, themselves fully redeemed in soul and body from the effects and consequences of sin. 3. The occupation of the earthly Canaan by the natural seed of Abraham, in its grand and ultimate design, was a type of the occupation by a redeemed church of her destined inheritance of glory. Hence everything concerning the entrance of Israel on that temporary possession had necessarily to be ordered, so as fitly to represent and foreshadow the things which belong to the church's establishment in her final and permanent possession. The matter may thus be briefly stated: God selected a portion—probably at that time the fairest portion of the earth,² which he challenged as his own in a peculiar sense, that he might convert it into a suitable habitation and inheritance for the people whom he had already chosen to be peculiarly his own. On this people, settled in this possession, he purposed to bestow the highest earthly tokens of his gracious presence and blessing. But what he was going to do for them in temporal and earthly things, was only a representa-

¹ Vol. I. see section on the hope of the inheritance.

² Ez. xx. 6.—“A land that I had espied for them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands.”

tion and a pledge of what, from before the birth of time, he had purposed to do in heavenly things, when the period should come for gathering into one his universal church, and planting her in his everlasting inheritance of life and glory. There is, therefore, a twofold object to be kept in view, while we investigate this part of the divine procedure and arrangements, as in these also there was a twofold design. The whole that took place between the giving of the hope to the patriarchs, and its realization in their posterity, we must, in the first instance, view as demonstrating on what principles God could, consistently with his character and government, bestow upon them such an inheritance, or keep them in possession of its blessings. But we must, at the same time, in another point of view, regard the whole as the shadow of higher and better things to come. We must take it as a glass, in which to see mirrored the form and pattern of God's everlasting kingdom, and that with an especial reference to the grand principles on which the heirs of salvation were to be brought to the enjoyment of its future and imperishable glories.

We are furnished at the very outset with no doubtful indication of the propriety of keeping in view this twofold bearing, in the condition of the heirs of promise. These, when the promise was first given, and for two generations afterwards, were kept in the region of the inheritance; and if the purposes of God respecting them had simply been directed to their occupation of it as a temporal and earthly good, the natural, and in every respect the easiest plan, would manifestly have been, to give them a settled place in it at the first, and gradually to have opened the way to their complete possession of the promised territory. But instead of this, they were absolutely prohibited from having then any fixed habitation within its borders; and by God's special direction and overruling providence, were carried altogether away from the land, and planted in Egypt. There they found a settled home and dwelling-place, which they were not only permitted, but obliged to keep for generations, before they were allowed to possess any interest in the promised inheritance. And it was precisely their long-continued sojourn in that foreign country, the relations into which it brought them, the feelings and associations which there grew upon them, and the interests with which they became connected, that so greatly embarrassed the mission of

Moses, and rendered the work given him to do so peculiarly difficult and complicated. Had nothing more been contemplated by their settlement in Canaan than their simply being brought to the possession of a pleasant and desirable inheritance, after the manner of this world, nothing could have been more unfortunate and adverse than such a deep and protracted entanglement with the affairs of Egypt. Considered merely in that point of view, there is much in the divine procedure, which could neither be vindicated as wise, nor approved as good; and the whole plan would manifestly lie open to the most serious objections. But matters present themselves in a different light, when we understand that every thing connected with the earthly and temporal inheritance, was ordered so as to develop the principles on which alone God could righteously confer upon men even that inferior token of his regard,—and this again, as the type or pattern according to which he should afterwards proceed in regulating the concerns of his everlasting kingdom:—Viewed thus, as the whole ought to be, it will be found in every part consistent with the highest reason, and, indeed, could not have been materially different, without begetting erroneous impressions of the mind and character of God. So that in proceeding to read what belongs to the work and handwriting of Moses, we must never lose sight of the fact, that we are tracing the footsteps of One, whose ways on earth have ever been mainly designed to disclose the path to heaven, and whose procedure in the past was carefully planned to prepare the way for the events and issues of “the world to come.”

The first point to which our attention is naturally turned, is the one already alluded to, respecting the condition of the Israelites, the heirs of promise, when this new stage of God's proceedings began to take its course. We find them not only in a distant country, but labouring there under the most grievous hardship and oppression. When this adverse position of affairs took its commencement, or how, we are not further told, than in the statement that “a new king arose up over Egypt, who knew not Joseph”—a statement which has not unfrequently been thought to indicate a change of dynasty in the reigning family of Egypt. This ignorance, it would seem, soon grew into estrangement, and that again, into jealousy and hatred; for afraid lest the Israelites, who were increasing with great rapidity in num-

bers and influence, should become too powerful, and should usurp dominion over the country, or, at least, in time of war, prove a formidable enemy within the camp, the then reigning Pharaoh took counsel to afflict them with heavy burdens, and to keep them down by means of oppression.

It is quite possible there may have been peculiar circumstances connected with the civil affairs of Egypt, which tended to foster and strengthen this rising enmity, and seemed to justify the harsh and oppressive policy in which it shewed itself. But we have quite enough to account for it, in the character which belonged to the family of Jacob, when they entered Egypt, coupled with the extraordinary increase and prosperity which attended them there. It was as a company of shepherds they were presented before Pharaoh, and the land of Goshen was assigned them for a dwelling-place, expressly on account of its rich pasturage.¹ But "every shepherd," it is said, "was an abomination to the Egyptians;" and with such a strong feeling against them in the national mind, nothing but an overpowering sense of the obligation under which the Egyptians lay to the Israelites, could have induced them to grant to this shepherd race such a settlement within their borders. Nor can it be wondered at, that when the remembrance of the obligation ceased to be felt, another kind of treatment should have been experienced by the family of Jacob

¹ Gen. xlvii. 11, "And Joseph gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses." "The land of Goshen," says Robinson, in his *Biblical Researches*, "was the best of the land; and such, too, the province of Esh-Shürkiyeh has ever been, down to the present time. In the remarkable Arabic document translated by De Sacy, containing a valuation of all the provinces and villages of Egypt in the year 1376, this province comprises 383 towns and villages, and is valued at 1,411,875 *dinars*—a larger sum than is put on any other province, with one exception. During my stay in Cairo, I made many inquiries respecting this district; to which the uniform reply was, that it was considered the best province in Egypt, There are here more flocks and herds than any where else in Egypt, and also more fishermen." Wilkinson also states, that no soil is better suited to many kinds of produce than the irrigated edge of the desert (where Goshen lay), even before it is covered by the fertilizing deposit of the inundation."—*Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, i. p. 222. How such a rich and fertile region should have been so little occupied at the time of Jacob's descent into Egypt, as to afford room for his family settling in it, and enlarging themselves as they did, need occasion no anxiety, as the fact itself is indisputable. And Robinson states that even at present there are many villages wholly deserted, and that the province is capable of sustaining another million.

than what they at first received, and that the native, deep-seated repugnance to those who followed their mode of life, should begin to break forth. That there *was* such a repugnance is a well ascertained fact, apart altogether from the testimony of Scripture. The monuments of Egypt furnish ample evidence of it, as they constantly exhibit shepherds in an inferior or despicable point of view, sometimes even as the extreme of coarseness and barbarity, and the objects of unmingled contempt.¹ We cannot suppose this hatred towards shepherds to have arisen simply from their possessing flocks and herds; for we have the clearest evidence in the Pentateuch, that Pharaoh possessed these, and that they existed in considerable numbers throughout the land.² It seems rather to have been occasioned by the general character and habits of the nomade or shepherd tribes,³ who have ever been averse to the arts of cultivation and civilized life, and most unscrupulous in seizing, when they had the opportunity, the fruits that have been raised by the industry and toil of others. From the earliest times the rich and fertile country of Egypt has suffered much from these marauding hordes of the desert, to whose incursions it lies open both on the east and on the west. And as the land of Goshen skirted the deserts of Arabia, where especially the Bedouin or wandering tribes from time immemorial have been accustomed to dwell, we can easily conceive how the native Egyptians would watch with jealousy and dread the rising power and importance of the Israelites. By descent they were themselves allied with those shepherd tribes, and by the advantage of their position they held the key on an exposed side to the heart of the kingdom; so that, if they became strong enough, and chose to act in concert with their Arab neighbours, they might have overspread the land with desolation. Indeed, it is a historical fact, that "the Bedouin Arabs settled in Egypt have always made common cause with the Arabs (of the Desert) against the communities that possessed the land. They fought against the Saracen dynasty in Egypt, against the Turkomans, as soon as

¹ Rossellini, vol. i. p. 178. Wilkinson, vol. ii. p. 16; also Heeren's Africa, ii. p. 146, Trans.

² Gen. xlvii. 6, 16, 17. Ex. ix. 3, &c.

³ See Heeren's Africa, ii. p. 157. Rossellini, Mon. dell' Eg. i. p. 177, &c. Hengstenberg, Beitr., ii. p. 437.

they had acquired the ascendancy, against the Mamlook Sultans, who were the successors of the Turkomans, and they have been at war with the Osmanlis without intermission, since they first set foot upon Egypt more than 300 years ago.”¹

Hence, when the Israelites appeared so remarkably to flourish and multiply in their new abode, it was no unnatural policy for the Egyptians to subject them to hard labour and vexatious burdens. They would thus expect to repress their increase, and break their spirit—and, by destroying what remained of their pastoral habits, and training them to the arts and institutions of civilized life, as these existed in Egypt, to lessen at once their desire and their opportunities of leaguings for any hostile purpose with the tribes of the desert. At the same time, while such reasons might sufficiently account for the commencement of a hard and oppressive policy, there were evidently other reasons connected at least with the severer form, which it ultimately reached, and such as argued some acquaintance with the peculiar prospects of Israel. It was only *one* ground of Pharaoh’s anxiety respecting them, that they might possibly join hands with an enemy and fight against Egypt; another fear was that they “might get them up out of the land.”² This seems to bespeak a knowledge of the fact, that some other region than Goshen belonged to the Israelites as their proper home, for which they were disposed, at a fitting time, to leave their habitations in Egypt. Nor, indeed, would it be difficult for the king of Egypt to obtain such knowledge, as, in the earlier period of their sojourn, the Israelites had no motive to hold it in concealment. Then, the announcement of Jacob’s dying command to carry up his remains to the land of Canaan, of which the whole court of Pharaoh was apprized, and afterwards the formal withdrawal of Joseph

¹ Prokesch, *Erinnerungen aus Eg.* as quoted by Hengstenberg in his *Eg.* and the books of Moses, p. 78. If Egypt had previously been overrun, and for some generations held in bondage by one of these nomade tribes of Asia, there would have been a still stronger ground for exercising toward the family of Jacob the jealous antipathy in question. Of the fact of such an invasion, and possession of Egypt by a shepherd race, later investigations into the antiquities of Egypt have left little room to doubt; but the period of its occurrence, as connected with the history of the Israelites, is still a matter of uncertainty.

² Ex. i, 10.

and his family from the families and affairs of Egypt, to identify themselves with the state and prospects of their kindred, were more than sufficient to excite the suspicion of a jealous and unfriendly government, that they did not expect to remain always connected with the land and fortunes of Egypt. "It is clear that Pharaoh knew of a home for these stranger-Israelites, while he wished to have the thought of it banished from his mind; and that though his forefather had treated them to a possession in the land of Egypt, he now considered them as his servants, whom he was determined not to lose. It is precisely because he would know nothing of freedom and a home for Israel, that the increase of Israel was so great an annoyance to him. The seed of Abraham were, according to the promise, to be a blessing to all nations, and should, therefore, have been greeted with joy by the king of Egypt. But, since the reverse was the case, we can easily see, at this first aspect of Israel's affairs, that the further fulfilment of the promise could not develop itself by the straightest and most direct road, but would have to force its way through impediments of great strength and difficulty."¹

The kinds of service which were imposed with so much rigour upon the Israelites, though they would doubtless comprehend the various trades and employments which were exercised in the land, consisted chiefly, as might be expected in such a country, in the several departments of field labour. It was especially "in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field, that their lives were made bitter with hard bondage."² The making of bricks formed of clay and straw appears, during the later period of the bondage, to have been the only servile occupation in which they were largely engaged, and, of course, along with that, the erection of the buildings for which the bricks were made. As the hard and rigorous service to which they were subjected in this department of labour, did not seem to answer the end intended, but the more they were afflicted the more they multiplied and grew, the gloom and distress that hung around their condition were fearfully deepened by the issuing of a cruel edict, commanding that their male children should be killed as soon as they were born. This was too atrocious an edict even for the despot of a

¹ Baumgarten, Theol. Com. i. p. 393.

² Ex. i. 14; v.

heathen land to enforce, as he could not find instruments at his command wicked enough to carry it into execution. In all probability it was soon recalled, or allowed gradually to fall into abeyance; for though it was in force at the birth of Moses, we hear nothing of it afterwards; and its only marked effect, so far as we are informed, was to furnish the occasion of opening a way for that future deliverer into the temples and palaces of Egypt. So marvellously did God, by his overruling providence, baffle the design of the enemy, and compel "the eater to give forth meat!" The only evil in their condition which seems to have become general and permanent, was the hard service in brick-making and collateral kinds of servile labour, and which, so far from suffering relaxation by length of time, was rather, on slight pretexts, increased and aggravated. It became at last so excessive, that one universal cry of misery and distress arose from the once happy land of Goshen—a cry which entered into the ear of the God of Abraham, and which would no longer permit him to remain an inactive spectator of a controversy, which, if continued, must have made void his covenant with the father of the faithful.¹

¹ A modern infidel (Von Bohlen, *Einleitung zur Genesis*) has attempted to throw discredit on the above account of the hard service of the Israelites, by alleging that the making of bricks at that early period belonged only to the region of Babylonia, and that the early Egyptians were accustomed to build with hewn stone. "We can scarcely trust our own eyes," says Hengstenberg, "when we read such things," and justly, as all well informed writers concerning ancient Egypt, whether of earlier or of later times, have concurred in testifying that building with brick was very common there—so common, indeed, that private edifices were generally of that material. Herodotus mentions a pyramid of brick, which is thought to be one of those still standing (ii. 136). Modern inquirers, such as Champollion, Rossellini, and Wilkinson, speak of tombs, ruins of great buildings, lofty walls and pyramids, being formed of bricks, and found in all parts of Egypt. (See the quotations in Hengstenberg's *Eg. and books of Moses*, p. 2, 80). Wilkinson says (*Ancient Egyptians*, ii. p. 57), "The use of crude brick, baked in the sun, was universal in Upper and Lower Egypt, both for public and private buildings; and the brick-field gave abundant occupation to numerous labourers throughout the country. . . . Inclosures of gardens, or granaries, sacred circuits encompassing the courts of temples, walls of fortifications and towns, dwelling-houses, and tombs, in short, all but the temples themselves were of crude brick; and so great was the demand, that the Egyptian government, observing the profit which would accrue from a monopoly of them, undertook to supply the public at a moderate price, thus preventing all unauthorized persons from engaging in the manufacture. And in order the more effectually to obtain this end, the seal of the king, or of some privileged person, was stamped upon the bricks at the time they were made." He says further, "It is worthy of remark, that more bricks bearing the name of Thothmes II. (whom I suppose to have been king of

So much for the condition itself of hard bondage and oppressive labour to which the heirs of the inheritance were reduced, before the time came for their being actually put in possession of its blessings. And situated as they were within the bounds of a foreign kingdom, at first naturally jealous, and then openly hostile towards them, it is not difficult to account for the kind of treatment inflicted on them, viewing the position they occupied merely in its worldly relations and interests. But what account can we give of it in its religious aspect—as an arrangement settled and ordained on the part of God? Why should he have ordered such a state of matters concerning his chosen seed? For, the Egyptians—“though their hearts thought not so”—were but instruments in his hands, to bring to pass what the Lord had long before announced to Abraham as certainly to take place, viz. “that his seed should be strangers in a land that was not theirs, and should serve them, and be afflicted by them four hundred years.”

1. Considered in this higher point of view, the first light in which it naturally presents itself is that of a doom or punishment, from which, as interested in the mercy of God, they needed redemption. For the aspect of intense suffering, which it latterly assumed, could only be regarded as an act of retribution for their past unfaithfulness and sins. We would be perfectly warranted to infer this, even without any express information on the subject, from the general connection in the divine government between sin and suffering. And when placed by the special appointment of heaven in circumstances so peculiarly marked by what was painful and afflicting to nature, the Israelites should then, no doubt, have read in their marred condition, what their posterity were, in like circumstances, taught to read by the prophet—“that

Egypt at the time of the Exodus), have been discovered than of any other period.” And not only have multitudes of bricks been thus identified with the period of Israel's bondage, and these always made of clay mingled with chopped straw, but a picture has been discovered in a tomb at Thebes, which so exactly corresponds with the delineation given by Moses of the hard service of the Israelites—some carrying the clay in vessels, others mingling straw in it, others again adjusting the clay to the moulds, or placing the bricks in rows, the labourers, too, being of Asiatic, not Egyptian aspect, but amongst them four Egyptians, two of whom carry sticks in their hands, taskmasters—that Rosellini did not hesitate to call it “a picture representing the Hebrews as they were engaged in making brick.”

it was their own wickedness which corrected them, and their backslidings which reformed them." But we are not simply warranted to draw this as an inference. It is matter of historical certainty brought out in the course of the Mosaic narrative by many and painful indications, that the Israelites were not long in Egypt till they became partakers in Egypt's sins, and that, the longer their stay was protracted there, they only sunk the deeper into the mire of Egyptian idolatry and corruption, and became the more thoroughly alienated from the true knowledge and worship of God. Not only had they, as a people, completely lost sight of the great temporal promise of the covenant, the inheritance of the land of Canaan, but God himself had become to them as a strange God ; so that Moses had to inquire for the name, by which he should reveal him to their now dark and besotted minds.¹ The very same language is used concerning their connection with the abominations of Egyptian idolatry, while they sojourned among them, as is afterwards used of their connection with those of Canaan ; " they served other Gods," " went a whoring after them," and even long after they had left the region, would not " forsake the idols of Egypt," but still carried its abominations with them, and in their hearts turned back to it.² Of the truth of these charges they gave too many affecting proofs in the wilderness ; and especially by their setting up, so recently after the awful demonstrations of God's presence and glory on Sinai, and their own covenant-engagements, the worship of the golden calf, with its bacchanalian accompaniments. Their conduct on that occasion was plainly a return to the idolatrous practices of Egypt in their most common form.³ And, indeed, if their bondage

¹ Ex. iii. 13.

² Josh. xxiv. 14 ; Lev. xvii. 7 ; Ez. xxiii. 3 ; xx. 8 ; Amos, v. 25, 26 ; Acts, vii. 39.

³ It is admitted on all hands, that the worship of the gods under symbolical images of irrational creatures, had its origin in Egypt, and was especially cultivated there in connection with the cow, or bovine form. It was noticed by Strabo, l. xvii. as singular, that " no image formed after the human figure was to be found in the temples of Egypt but only that of some beasts (*τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων τινός*). And no images seem to have been so generally used as those of the calf or cow—though authors differ as to the particular deity represented by it. It would rather seem that there were several deities worshipped under this symbol. Most of the available learning on the subject has been brought together by Bochart, Hieroz. Lib. ii. chap. 34 ; to which Hengstenberg has made some additions in his Beit. ii. p. 155-163. The latter would connect the worship

and oppression in its earlier stages did not, as a timely chastisement from the hand of God, check their tendency to imitate the manners and corruptions of Egypt, as it does not appear to have done, it could scarcely fail to be productive of a growing conformity to the evil. For it destroyed that freedom and elevation of spirit, without which genuine religion can never prosper. It robbed them of the leisure they required for the worship of God and the cultivation of their minds (their Sabbaths seem altogether to have perished), and it brought them into such close contact with the proper possessors of Egypt, as was naturally calculated to infect them with the grovelling and licentious spirit of Egyptian idolatry. So that probably true religion was never at a lower ebb, in the family of Abraham, than toward the close of their sojourn in Egypt; and the swelling waves of affliction, which at last overwhelmed them, only marked the excessive strength and prevalence of that deep under-current of corruption which had carried them away.

Now this condition of the heirs of promise, viewed in reference to its highest bearing, its connection with the inheritance, was made subservient to the manifestation of certain great principles, necessarily involved in this part of the divine procedure, in respect to which it could not properly have been dispensed with. (1.) It first of all clearly demonstrated, that, apart from the covenant of God, the state and prospects of those heirs of promise were in no respect better than those of other men—in some respects it seemed to be worse with them. They were equally far off from the inheritance, being in a state of hopeless alienation from it; they had drunk into the foul and abominable pollutions of the land of their present sojourn, which were ut-

of the golden calf in the desert with the worship of Apis; Wilkinson connects it with that of Mnevis (*Manners of Ancient Eg.* 2d series, ii. p. 96), and Jerome had already given it as his opinion, that Jeroboam set up the two golden calves in Dan and Bethel, in imitation of the Apis and Mnevis of Egypt (*Com. on Hos.* iv. 15). But however that may be, there can be no doubt, that if the Israelites were disposed to Egyptize in their worship, the most likely and natural method for them to do so, was by forming to themselves the image of a golden cow or calf, and then by engaging in its worship with noisy and festive rites. For it is admitted by those (for example, Creuzer, *Symbol.* i. p. 448) who are little in the habit of making any concessions in favour of a passage of Scripture, that the rites of the Egyptians partook much of the nature of orgies, and that the fundamental character of their religion was bacchanalian.

terly at variance with an interest in the promised blessing ; and they bore upon them the yoke of a galling bondage, at once the consequence and the sign of their spiritual degradation. They differed for the better only in having a part in the covenant of God. (2.) Therefore, secondly, whatever this covenant secured for them of promised good, it must have secured purely of grace. In so far as they looked to themselves, they could see no ground of preference—they saw, indeed, the very reverse of any title to the blessing, which must hence descend upon them as heaven's free and undeserved gift. This, they were afterwards admonished by Moses, to keep carefully in remembrance : "Speak not thou in thy heart, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land. Not for thy righteousness or for the uprightness of thine heart dost thou go to possess the land, but that the Lord may perform the word which he sware unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."¹ (3.) Hence, finally, the promise of the inheritance could be made good in their experience only by the special kindness and interposition of God, vindicating the truth of his own faithful word, and in order to this, executing in their behalf a work of redemption. While the inheritance was sure, because the title to it stood in the mercy and faithfulness of God, they had of necessity to be redeemed before they could actually possess it. Having become the victims of corruption, they were also the children of wrath ; sin had brought them into bondage ; and before they could escape to the land of freedom and rest, the snare must be broken. But the hand of Omnipotence alone could do it. If nature had been left to itself, the result would only have been a fouler corruption and a deeper ruin. It was simply as the Lord's chosen people that they held the promise of the inheritance, and they could enter on its possession, only as those who had been ransomed by his power and goodness. So that the great principles of their degenerate and lost condition, of the sovereignty and freedom of their election to the promised good, of redemption by the grace and power of God in order to obtain it, were interwoven as essential elements with this portion of their history, and imprinted as indelible lines upon the very foundations of their national existence.

¹ Deut. ix. 4-6.

The parallel here, in each particular, between the earthly and the spiritual, the temporal and the eternal, or, as we more commonly term it, between the type and the antitype, must so readily present itself to all who are conversant with New Testament Scripture, that we need do nothing more than indicate the agreement. It is most expressly declared, and indeed is implied in the whole plan of redemption unfolded in the Gospel, that those who become heirs of salvation, are in their natural state no better than other men,—they are members of the same fallen family,—the same elements of corruption work in them,—they are children of wrath even as others.¹ When, therefore, it is asked, who makes them to differ, so that while others perish in their sins, they obtain the blessed hope of everlasting life? the only answer that can be returned is, the free and sovereign riches of the grace of God. The confession of Paul for himself, is equally suited to the whole company of the redeemed: “By the grace of God I am what I am;” nor is there a blessing of salvation here, or a ray of glory hereafter, that any of them may experience, of which he shall have another account to give, than that it has flowed from the undeserved mercy and goodness of God.² And when this distinguishing grace of God comes down to develop itself in the personal history of men, and to bring them to the possession of its elevated prospects, how can it proceed otherwise than by the execution in their behalf of a supernatural deliverance? The difference is so great between what they naturally are, and what through grace they are to become, that a redemption-process must of necessity form the bridge between the two. As the everlasting inheritance, to the hope of which they are begotten, is entirely the gift of God, so the way which leads to it can be that only which his own outstretched arm has laid open to them; and if, as God’s elect, they are called to the inheritance, it is as his redeemed that they go to possess it.³

2. We have as yet, however, mentioned only one ultimate reason for the oppressed and suffering condition of the Israelites in

¹ Eph. ii. 1-3; Rom. iii. 9-20; vii.; Matth. ix. 13; Luke, xiii. 3, &c.

² 1 Cor. iv. 7; xv. 10; Eph. i. 4; John iii. 27; vi. 44; Matth. xi. 25; Phil. i. 29, &c.

³ Eph. i. 6, 7, 18, 19; Col. i. 12-14; 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; Heb. ii. 14, 15; 1 Pet. i. 3-5, &c.

Egypt, though in that one were involved various principles bearing upon their relation to the inheritance. But there was another also of great importance—it formed an essential part of the preparation which they needed for occupying the inheritance. This preparation, in its full and proper sense, must, of course, have included qualities of a religious and moral kind—and of these we shall have occasion to speak at large afterwards ;—but apart from these, there was needed what might be called a natural preparation ; and that especially consisting of two parts—a sufficient desire after the inheritance, and a fitness in temper and habit for the position which, in connection with it, they were destined to occupy.

(1.) It was necessary by some means to have a desire awakened in their bosoms toward Canaan ; for this had vanished from their sight, amid the pleasures and advantages of Goshen. The Lord had never intended that Goshen should be to them as a home, or more than a temporary place of sojourn. But, following the native tendency of the heart, which is ever prone to abuse the gifts of divine Providence, and pervert them to ends the very reverse of those for which they are conferred, this pleasant habitation soon became a snare to them. The fulness of its natural delights by degrees took off their thoughts from their high calling and destiny as the church of God ; and the more they degenerated into the corrupt and sensual spirit of Egypt, the more would they always be disposed to sit down “in measureless content,” with their present comforts. So much had this actually become the case with them, that they could scarcely be kept from returning back to it, notwithstanding the hard service and crying afflictions with which their lives had latterly been made bitter in it. What must have been their views and feelings if no such troubles had been experienced, and all had continued to go well with them in Egypt ? How vain would have been the attempt to inspire them with the love of Canaan, and especially to make good their way to it through formidable difficulties and appalling dangers ?

The affliction of Israel in Egypt is a testimony to the truth, common to all times, that the kingdom of God must be entered through tribulation. The tribulation may be ever so varied in its character and circumstances. But in some form it must be experienced, so as to prevent the mind from settling down upon its temporal portion, and kindle within it a sincere desire for the

better part, which is reserved in heaven for the heirs of salvation. Hence it is so peculiarly hard for those who are living in the midst of fulness and prosperity to enter into the kingdom of God. And hence, also, must so many visitations of trouble be sent even to those who have entered the kingdom, to wean them from earthly things, and hedge up their way toward their home and portion in heaven.

(2.) But if we look once more to the Israelites, we shall see that something besides longing desire for Canaan was needed to prepare them for what was in prospect. For that land, though presented to their hopes as a land flowing with milk and honey, was not to be by any means a region of inactive repose—where every thing was to be done for them, and they had only to take their rest, and feast themselves with the abundance of peace. The natural imagination delights to riot in the thought of such an untaxed existence, and such a luxurious home. But He who made man, and knows what is best suited to the powers and capacities of his nature, never destined him for such a state of being. Even the garden of Eden, the lovely region of his first inheritance, replenished as it was with the tokens of divine beneficence, was, to some extent, a field of active exertion: the garden had to be kept and dressed by its possessor as the condition of his partaking of its fruitfulness. And now, when Canaan took for a time the place of Eden, and the church was directed to look thither for its present home and inheritance, while she was warranted to expect there the largest amount of earthly blessing, she was by no means entitled to look for a state of lazy inaction and uninterrupted rest. There was much to be done, as well as much to be enjoyed, and she could neither have fulfilled, in regard to other nations, the elevated destiny to which she was appointed, as the lamp and witness of heaven, nor reaped in her own experience the large measure of good which was laid up in store for herself, unless she had been prepared by a peculiar training of vigorous action, and even compulsive labour, to make the proper use of all her advantages. Now, in this point of view, the period of Israel's childhood as a nation in Egypt, might be regarded as, to some extent, a season of preparation for their future manhood. It would not have done for them to go and take possession of Canaan as a horde of ignorant barbarians, or as a company of

undisciplined and roving shepherds. It was fit and proper that they should carry with them a taste for the arts and manners of civilized life, and habits of active labour, suited to the scenes of usefulness and glory which awaited them in the land of their proper inheritance. But how were such tastes and habits to become theirs? They did not naturally possess them, nor, if suffered to live at ease, would they probably ever have attained to any adequate knowledge of them. They must be brought, in the first instance, under the bonds of a strong necessity; so that it might be no doubtful contingency, but a certain and general result, that they left Egypt with all the learning, the knowledge of art and manufacture, the capacity for active business and useful employment, which it was possible for them there to acquire. And thus they went forth abundantly furnished with the natural gifts, which were necessary to render them, not only an independent nation, but also, fit instruments of God for his work and service, in the new and not less honourable and arduous position they were destined to occupy.¹

¹ The view given in the text may be said to strike a middle course between that of Kitto, in his *History of Palestine*, vol. i. p. 150, &c., and that of Hengstenberg, in his *Authen.* I. p. 431, &c. (We mention these two writers, chiefly as being among the last, who have held respectively the views in question, not as if there was anything substantially new in either. Deyling has a clear, and in the main, well-conducted argumentation for the view adopted by Hengstenberg, and against the opposite, at the end of P. I. of his *Obs. Sac.*) The former regards the Israelites, at the period of their descent into Egypt, as distinguished by all the characteristics of the wandering and barbarous shepherd tribes, and not improbably giving occasion at first, by some overt acts of plunder, to the Egyptian government to adopt harsh measures toward them. Most German writers of the rationalist school, not only go to the full length of maintaining this, but, apparently forgetting the discipline to which the Israelites were subjected in Egypt, consider it to have been their condition also when they left the country; and object to the account given of the erection of the tabernacle in the wilderness, as implying too much skill in various kinds of arts and manufacture for a simple shepherd race. So, in particular, Winer and Vatke. Hengstenberg, on the other hand, maintains that the roughness and barbarity properly distinguishing the shepherd tribes, never belonged to the Hebrews—that their possessing the character of shepherds at all, arose chiefly from the circumstances in which they were placed during their early sojourn in Canaan—that they were glad to abandon their wandering life and dwell in settled habitations, whenever an opportunity offered—that, set down, as they afterwards were, in one of the most fertile and cultivated regions of Egypt, which they held from the first as a settled possession (*Gen.* xlvii. 11, 27), their manner of life was throughout different from the nomadic, was distinguished by possessions in lands and houses, and by the various employments and comforts peculiar to Egyptian society. This view must be adopted, with

The correspondence here between the type and the antitype has been too much overlooked, and even the more direct intimations of New Testament Scripture, respecting the state and employment of saints in glory, have too seldom been admitted to their full extent, and followed out to their legitimate practical results, as regards the condition of believers on earth. The truth, in this respect, however, has been so finely developed, by one living author, that we must take leave to present it in his own words. "Heaven, the ultimate and perfected condition of human nature, is thought of, amidst the toils of life, as an elysium of quiescent bliss, exempt, if not from action, at least from the necessity of action. Meanwhile, every one feels, that the ruling tendency and the uniform intention of all the arrangements of the present state, and almost all its casualties, is to generate and to cherish habits of strenuous exertion. Inertness, not less than vice, is a seal of perdition. The whole course of nature, and all the institutions of society, and the ordinary course of events, and the explicit will of God, declared in his Word, concur in opposing that propensity to rest, which belongs to the human mind; and combine to necessitate submission to the hard, yet salutary conditions, under which alone the most extreme evils may be held in abeyance, and any degree of happiness enjoyed. A task and duty is to be fulfilled, in discharging which the want of energy is punished even more immediately and more severely than the want of virtuous motives."

He proceeds to shew that the notices we have of the heavenly world, imply the existence there of intelligent and vigorous agents:—

some modification as to the earlier periods of their history; for, though the Israelites never entered fully into the habits of the nomade tribes, yet they were manifestly tending more and more in that direction, toward the time of their descent into Egypt. The tendency was there gradually checked, and the opposite extreme at last reached—as it appears, that at the time of the Exodus they had all houses with door-posts (Ex. xii. 4, 7, &c.), lived to a considerable extent intermingled with the Egyptians in their cities (Ex. iii. 20-22; xi. 1-3; xii. 35, 36), were accustomed to the agricultural occupations peculiar to the country (Deut. xi. 10), took part even in its finest manufactures, such as were prepared for the king (1 Chron. iv. 21-23), and enjoyed the best productions both of the river and the land (Num. xi. 5; xx. 5). It is but natural to suppose, however, that some compulsion was requisite to bring them to this state of civilization and refinement; and as it was a state necessary to fit them for setting up the tabernacle and occupying aright the land of Canaan, we see the overruling hand of God in the very compulsion that was exercised.

“ But if there be a real and necessary, not merely a shadowy agency in heaven, as well as on earth ; and if human nature is destined to act its part in such an economy, then its constitution, and the severe training it undergoes, are at once explained ; and then also the removal of individuals in the very prime of their fitness for useful labour, ceases to be impenetrably mysterious. This excellent mechanism of matter and mind, which, beyond any other of his works, declares the wisdom of the Creator, and which, under his guidance, is now passing the season of its first preparation, shall stand up anew from the dust of dissolution, and then, with freshened powers, and with a store of hard-earned and practical wisdom for its guidance, shall essay new labours in the service of God, who by such instruments chooses to accomplish his designs of beneficence. That so prodigious a waste of the highest qualities should take place, as is implied in the notions, which many Christians entertain of the future state, is indeed hard to imagine. The mind of man, formed as it is to be more tenacious of its active habits, than even of its moral dispositions, is, in the present state, trained often at an immense cost of suffering, to the exercise of skill, of forethought, of courage, of patience ; and ought it not to be inferred—unless positive evidence contradicts the supposition, that this system of education bears some relation of fitness to the state for which it is an initiation ? Shall not the very same qualities, which here are so sedulously fashioned and finished, be actually needed and used in that future world of perfection ? Surely the idea is inadmissible, that an instrument wrought up at so much expense, to a polished fitness for service, is destined to be suspended for ever on the palace-walls of heaven, as a glittering bauble, no more to make proof of its temper ?

“ Perhaps a pious, but needless jealousy, lest the honour due to Him, ‘ who worketh all in all,’ should be in any degree compromised, has had influence in concealing from the eyes of Christians the importance attributed in the Scriptures to subordinate agency ; and thus, by a natural consequence, has impoverished and enfeebled our ideas of the heavenly state. But assuredly, it is only while encompassed by the dimness and errors of the present life, that there can be any danger of attributing to the creature the glory due to the Creator. When once with open eye

that excellent glory has been contemplated, then shall it be understood that the divine wisdom is incomparably more honoured by the skilful and faithful performances, and by the cheerful toils of agents who have been fashioned and fitted for service, than it could be by the bare exertions of irresistible power ; and then, when the absolute dependence of creatures is thoroughly felt—may the beautiful orders of the heavenly hierarchy, rising and still rising toward perfection, be seen and admired, without hazard of forgetting Him, who alone is absolutely perfect, and who is the only fountain and first cause of whatever is excellent.”¹

It is only further to be noticed here, that, as preparation of this kind is necessary, for the future occupations and destinies of God's people, so in their case now, as in that of the Israelites in Egypt, a method of dealing may even in that respect require to be taken with them very different from what they themselves desire, and such as no present considerations can satisfactorily explain. When so dealt with, they should remember the word of Christ to Peter :—“ What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.” The way by which they are led, appears strange perhaps, and more encompassed with hardship and difficulty than is meet ; but it is so, only because they cannot trace with sufficient clearness the many threads of connection between the present and the future—between the course of preparation in time, and the condition awaiting them in eternity. Let them trust the paternal guidance and sure foresight of Him, who can trace it with unerring certainty, and they shall doubtless find at the last, that every thing in their lot has been arranged with infinite skill to adapt them to the state, the employments, and services of heaven.

¹ Natural History of Enthusiasm, p. 150-154.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE DELIVERER AND HIS COMMISSION.

THE condition to which the heirs of promise were reduced in the land of Egypt, we have seen, called for a deliverance, and this again for a deliverer. Both were to be pre-eminently of God—the work itself, and the main instrument of accomplishing it. In the execution of the one there was not more need for the display of divine power than for the exercise of divine wisdom in the selection and preparation of the other. It is peculiar to God's instruments, that, though commonly at first they appear the least suited for the service, they are found on trial to possess the highest qualifications. "Wisdom is justified of all her children," and especially of those who are appointed to the most arduous and important undertakings.

But in the extremity of Israel's distress, where was a deliverer to be found with the requisite qualifications? From a family of bondsmen, crushed and broken in spirit by their miserable servitude, who was to have the boldness to undertake their deliverance, or the wisdom, if he should succeed in delivering them, to make suitable arrangements for their future guidance and discipline? Who was likely at such a time even to gain *their* confidence as appearing in any measure equal to the task? If such a person was anywhere to be found, he must evidently have been one who had enjoyed advantages very superior to those which entered into the common lot of his brethren—who had found time and opportunity for the meditation of high thoughts, and the acquirement of such varied gifts as fitted him to transact, in behalf of his oppressed countrymen, with the court of the proud and the learned Pharaohs, and amidst the greatest difficulties and

discouragements to lay the foundation of a system, which was to nurture and develop through coming ages the religious life of God's covenant people. Such a deliverer was needed for this peculiar emergency in the affairs of God's kingdom, and the very troubles, which seemed from their long continuance and crushing severity to preclude the possibility of obtaining what was needed, were made to work toward its accomplishment.

It is not the least interesting and instructive point in the history of Moses, the future hope of the church, that his first appearance on the stage of this troubled scene, was in the darkest hour of affliction, when the adversary was driving things to the uttermost. His first breath was drawn under a doom of death, and the very preservation of his life was a miracle of divine mercy. But the Lord "made the wrath of man to praise him," and the bloody decree, which, by destroying the male children as they were born, was designed by Pharaoh to inflict the death-blow on Israel's hopes of honour and enlargement, was rendered subservient, in the case of Moses, to prepare and fashion the living instrument, through whom these hopes were soon to be carried forth into victory and fruition. Forced by the very urgency of the danger, on the notice of Pharaoh's daughter, and thereafter received, under her care and patronage, into Pharaoh's house, the child Moses possessed, in the highest degree, the opportunity of becoming "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and grew up to manhood in the familiar use of every advantage which it was possible for the world at that time to confer. But with such extraordinary means of advancement for the natural life, with what an atmosphere of danger was he there encompassed for the spiritual! He was exposed to the seductive and pernicious influence of a palace, where not only the world was met with in its greatest pomp and splendour, but where also superstition reigned, and a policy was pursued directly opposed to the interests of God's kingdom. How he was enabled to withstand such dangerous influences, and escape the contamination of so unwholesome a region, we are not informed; nor even how he first became acquainted with the fact of his Hebrew origin, and the better prospects which still remained to cheer and animate the hearts of his countrymen. But the result shews, that

somehow he was preserved from the one, and brought to the knowledge of the other ; for when about forty years of age, we are told, he went forth to visit his brethren, and that, with a faith already so fully formed, that he was not only prepared to sympathize with them in their distress, but to hazard all for their deliverance.¹ And, indeed, when he once understood and believed that his brethren were the covenant-people of God, who held in promise the inheritance of the land of Canaan, and whose period of oppression he might also have learned was drawing near its termination, it would hardly require any special revelation, besides what might be gathered from the singular providences attending his earlier history, to conclude that he was destined by God to be the chosen instrument for effecting the deliverance.

But it is often less difficult to get the principle of faith, than to exercise the patience necessary in waiting God's time for its proper and seasonable exercise. Moses shewed he possessed the one, but seems yet to have wanted the other, when he slew the Egyptian whom he found smiting the Hebrew. For though the motive was good, being intended to express his brotherly sympathy with the suffering Israelites, and to serve as a kind of signal for a general rising against their oppressors, yet the action itself appears to have been wrong. He had no warrant to take the execution of vengeance into his own hand ; and that it was with this view, rather than for any purpose of defence, that Moses went so far as to slay the Egyptian, seems not obscurely intimated in the original narrative, and is more distinctly implied in the assertion of Stephen, who assigns this as the reason of the deed, "for he supposed they would have understood, how that God by his hand would deliver them." The consequence was, that by anticipating the purpose of God, and attempting to accomplish it in an improper manner, he only involved himself in danger and difficulty ; his own brethren misunderstood his conduct, and Pharaoh threatened to take away his life. On this occasion, therefore, we cannot but regard him as acting unadvisedly with his hand, as on a future one, he spake unadvisedly with his lips. It was the hasty and irregular impulse of the flesh, not the enlightened and heavenly guidance of the Spirit, which prompted him

¹ Ex. ii. 11-15 ; Acts vii. 23 ; Heb. xi. 24.

to take the course he did ; and without contributing in the least to improve the condition of his countrymen, he was himself made to reap the fruit of his misconduct in a long and dreary exile.¹

We cannot, therefore, justify Moses in the deed he committed, far less say of him with Buddeus (*Hist. Eccles. Vet. Test. i. p. 492*), Patrick, and others, that he was stirred up to it by a divine impulse, nor regard the impulse of any other kind than that which prompted David's men to counsel him to slay Saul, when stretched helpless and alone in the cave (*1 Sam. xxiv.*)—an impulse of the flesh presuming upon, and misapplying a word of God. The time for deliverance was not yet come. The Israelites as a whole were not sufficiently prepared for it. Their affliction, indeed, had already become almost intolerable ; but as the then reigning monarch of Egypt was probably the first who had treated them with any extreme degree of harshness, they would endure through his reign in the hopes of seeing better days, when another should ascend the throne ; and it would only be, when they saw that successor determined to pursue the same cruel policy, with an aggravation rather than an abatement of its rigour, that they would be disposed to hail the prospect of a deliverance. But Moses himself also yet wanted much to complete his preparation. Other and

¹ We can scarcely have a better specimen of the characteristic difference between the stern impartiality of ancient inspired history, and the falsely coloured partiality of what is merely human, than in the accounts preserved of the first part of Moses' life in the Bible and Josephus respectively. All is plain, unadorned narrative in the one, a faithful record of facts as they took place, while in the other, everything appears enveloped in the wonderful and miraculous. A prediction goes before the birth of Moses to announce how much was to depend upon it—a divine vision is also given concerning it to Amram—the mother is spared the usual pains of labour—the child when discovered by Pharaoh's daughter refuses to suck any breast but that of its mother—when grown a little, he became so beautiful that strangers must needs turn back and look after him, &c. But with all these unwarranted additions, in the true spirit of Jewish, or rather human partiality, not a word is said of his killing the Egyptian ; he is obliged to flee, indeed, but only because of the envy of the Egyptians for his having delivered them from the Ethiopians (*Antiq. ii. 9, 10, 11.*) In Scripture his act in killing the Egyptian, is not expressly condemned as sinful ; but, as often happens there, this is clearly enough indicated by the results in providence growing out of it. Many commentators justify Moses in smiting the Egyptian, on the ground of his being moved to it by a divine impulse. There can be no doubt, that he *supposed* himself to have had such an impulse, but that is a different thing from his actually having it ; and Augustine judged rightly, when he thought Moses could not be altogether justified, “ *quia nullam adhuc legitimam potestatem gerebat, nec acceptam divinitus, nec humana societate ordinatam.*”—*Quaest. in Exodus, § ii.*

very different elements required to mingle in his previous training, besides such as he could acquire in Egypt. Before he was qualified to take the government of such a people, and be a fit instrument for executing the manifold and arduous part he had to discharge in connection with them, he needed to have trial of a kind of life precisely the reverse of what he had been accustomed to in the palaces of Egypt,—to feel himself at home amid the desolation and solitudes of the desert, and there to become habituated to solemn converse with his God, and formed to the requisite gravity, meekness, patience, and subduedness of spirit. Thus God overruled his too rash and hasty interference with the affairs of his kindred, to the proper completion of his own preparatory training, and provided for him the advantage of as long a sojourn in the wilderness to learn divine wisdom, as he had already spent in learning human wisdom in Egypt. We have no direct information of the manner in which his spirit was exercised during this period of exile, yet the names he gave to his children shew, that it did not pass unimproved. The first he called Gershom, “Because he was a stranger in a strange land,”—implying, that he felt in the inmost depths of his soul the sadness of being cut off from the society of his kindred, and perhaps also at being disappointed of his hope in regard to the promised inheritance. The second he named Eliezer, saying, “The God of my father is my help,”—betokening his clear, realizing faith in the invisible Jehovah, the God of his fathers, to whom his soul had now learnt more thoroughly and confidently to turn itself, since he had been compelled so painfully to look away from the world. And now having passed through the school of God in its two grand departments, and in both extremes of life obtained ample opportunities for acquiring the wisdom which was peculiarly needed for Israel’s deliverer and lawgiver, the set time for God was come, and he appeared to Moses at the bush for the special purpose of investing him with a divine commission for the task.

But here a new and unlooked for difficulty presented itself in his own reluctance to receive the commission. We know how apt, in great enterprises, which concern the welfare of many, while one has to take the lead, a rash and unsuccessful attempt to accomplish the desired end, is to beget a spirit of excessive caution and timidity—a sort of shyness and chagrin—especially if the failure

has seemed in any measure attributable to a want of sympathy and support on the part of those, whose co-operation was most confidently relied on. Something not unlike this appears to have grown upon Moses in the desert. Remembering how his precipitate attempt to avenge the wrongs of his kindred, and rouse them to a combined effort to regain their freedom, had not only provoked the displeasure of Pharaoh, but was met by insult and reproach from his kindred themselves, he could not but feel, that the work of their deliverance was likely to prove both a heartless and a perilous task—a work, that would need to be wrought out, not only against the determined opposition of the mightiest kingdom in the world, but also under the most trying discouragements, arising from the now degraded and dastardly spirit of the people. This feeling, of which Moses could scarcely fail to be conscious even at the time of his flight from Egypt, may easily be conceived to have increased in no ordinary degree, amid the deep solitudes and quiet occupations of a shepherd's life, in which he was permitted to live till he had the weight of fourscore years upon his head. So that we cannot wonder at the disposition he manifested to start objections to the proposal made to him to undertake the work of deliverance, but are only surprised at the unreasonable and daring length, to which, in spite of every consideration and remonstrance on the part of God, he persisted in urging them.

The symbol in which the Lord then appeared to Moses, the bush burning but not consumed, was well fitted on reflection to inspire him with encouragement and hope. It pointed, Moses could not fail to remember, when he came to meditate on what he had seen and heard, to “the smoking furnace and the burning lamp,” which had passed in vision before the eye of Abraham, when he was told of the future sufferings of his posterity in the land that was not theirs (Gen. xv. 17.) Such a furnace now again visibly presented itself, but the little thorn-bush, emblem of the covenant-people, the tree of God's planting, stood uninjured in the midst of the flame, because the covenant God himself was there. Why, then, should Moses despond on account of the afflictions of his people, or shrink from the arduous task now committed to him? Especially when the distinct assurance was given to him of all needful powers and gifts to furnish him aright

for the undertaking, and the word of God was solemnly pledged to conduct it to a successful issue.

It is clear from the whole interview, at which Moses received his commission, that the difficulties and discouragements which pressed most upon his mind, were those connected with the sunk and degenerate condition of the covenant-people themselves, who appeared to him hopelessly dead to the promise of the covenant, and even estranged from the knowledge of the God of their Fathers. His concern on the latter point led him to ask what he should say to them, when they inquired for the name of the God of their fathers, in whose name he was to go to them? His question was met with the sublime reply, "I AM THAT I AM; thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, JEHOVAH, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."¹ When God thus claims to him-

¹ Ex. iii. 14, 15. "From this passage we learn, 1. That יהוה (Jehovah) is to be derived from היה, which is the same with יהי (to be). 2. That it is the third person of the future. For it is certain, that אהיה (I am) which God uses when speaking in his own person, is the first person future, and not less so, that יהוה (Jehovah) which he delivers to his people to be used when speaking of him, is the third. 3. We further learn that the name is to be taken in the signification of The Being, The Existing One; as the LXX. already render it by *ὁ ὢν*; and that the ground for the choice of this name, is that which is given by John Damascene, viz. that it is the most suitable name of God, 'since he comprehends in himself everything that is, like a certain boundless and infinite ocean of being.' . . . If God is who he is, i. e. constantly the same, the unchangeable, so is he also the Existing One, or the absolute Being, and if he is the absolute Being, he is also the unchangeable; as Malachi (ch. iii. 6.), from the expression, 'I am Jehovah,' draws the conclusion, 'I change not.' Of everything, which relatively is not being, it may be said: I am not that I am. Whatever is made does not continue uniformly alike, but in certain circumstances is unlike itself. Only God properly is, because the BEING is constantly the same, and because the constantly the same is the Being."—HENGSTENBERG, Authen. i. p. 244-6. The meaning of the term Jehovah, is given in Rev. i. 4, 8, Heb. xiii. 8, and being applied to Christ, the passages assert in the strongest language his essential Godhead. The explanation of Baumgarten and Delitzsch, who take, not *being*, but *becoming*, as the radical idea, and understand the name Jehovah to designate God, "as the one, who is always discovering himself anew to men, revealing himself through all ages, the God, in short, of the historical revelation," is by no means so natural as that of Hengstenberg, and is liable to some serious objections, which Hengstenberg has pressed in his Commentary on the Apocalypse.

self, and commands his servant to make him known to others, by a name which so peculiarly expresses his eternal being and Godhead, how immeasurably does he raise himself to the view of his people above the idolatrous atmosphere of Egypt! Nor was the idea, as some have alleged, too abstract and sublime for those to whom it was at first presented. For while unquestionably it is fitted to suggest thoughts of God, which the most enlightened and elevated mind must ever feel itself inadequate fully to comprehend, it at the same time presented him in a character peculiarly suited to the circumstances in which they were then placed. The name here, as usual in Scripture, was not assumed as an arbitrary, or even as a general designation, but as a particular, distinctive appellation, expressive of what God was in reference to them, for whose immediate behoof it was assumed. It was the manifestation of his peculiar and distinguishing character, with special reference to that covenant-relation, which, since the time of Abraham, he held toward them. It told them, that however changed *their* condition now was from what it had been in the time of their fathers, and however far they were from having received the fulfilment of the promises then made to them as a family, the God of their fathers remained, according to his essential nature, without the least variableness or shadow of turning, of the same mind and purpose as when he first entered into covenant with them. And not only so—but in the development of this most essential and characteristic name, as there would be in their experience a glorious fulfilment of covenant love and faithfulness, so there would be a higher manifestation than had yet been given of his eternal power and Godhead, a deeper insight afforded into his blessed nature, and the righteous principles of his government; so that in comparison of what was now to be done, it might even be said, that the earlier patriarchs “had not known him by his name Jehovah,” but only as “El Shaddai,” God Almighty.¹

¹ Ex. vi. 3-8. In the view we have given of this passage, it is implied, that the want of knowledge ascribed to the patriarchs in respect to the name JEHOVAH, was not absolute, but relative. Literally they did know God by that name, for he frequently used it in his addresses to them, and they again in their addresses to him;—and, as men taught of God, they could not but possess some knowledge of his nature and character, as indicated by this name. But it was so imperfect and limited, that it might be represented

With such strong encouragements and exalted prospects, was Moses sent forth to execute in the name of God the commission given to him. And as a pledge, that nothing would fail of what had been promised, he was met at the very outset of his arduous course by Aaron his brother, who came from Egypt at God's instigation to concert with him measures for the deliverance of their kindred from the now intolerable load of oppression, under which they groaned.

The personal history of the deliverer and his commission, viewed in reference to the higher dispensation of the Gospel, exhibits the following principles, on which it will be unnecessary to offer any lengthened illustration. 1. The time for the deliverer appearing and entering on the mighty work given him to do, as it should be the one fittest for the purpose, so it must be the one chosen and fixed by God. It might seem long in coming to many, whose hearts groaned beneath the yoke of the adversary, and they might sometimes have been disposed, if they had been able, to hasten forward its arrival. But the Lord knew best when it should take place, and with unerring precision, determined it beforehand. Hence we read of Christ's appearance having occurred "in due time," or "in the fulness of time." There were many lines then meeting in the state of the church and the world, which rendered that particular period above all others suitable for the manifestation of the Son of God. Then for the first time were all things ready for the execution of heaven's grand purpose, and the vast issues that were to grow out of it.

2. The deliverer, when he came, must arise within the church itself. He must be, in the strictest sense, the brother of those whom he came to redeem; bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh; partaker not merely of their nature, but also of their infir-

as nothing, compared with what was presently to be given—like the glory of the Mosaic dispensation, which is declared to have been no glory, "by reason of that which excelleth" in Christ.—We trust it is not necessary to do more than notice, that Warburton, in the true spirit of Spencer and Le Clerc, finds in the whole of this communication about the name Jehovah, only an accommodation to Egyptian usage regarding the religion of names affirmed to have been prevalent then: "I before condescended to have a name of distinction, but now in compliance to another prejudice I condescend to have a name of honour."—(Div. Leg. B. iv. s. 6.) A notable discovery, truly! to use the Bishop's own language to an opponent—but certainly little fitted to throw light on the words of God, or to administer comfort to the Israelites.

mities, their dangers, and their sufferings. Though he had to come from the highest heavens to accomplish the work, still it was not as clad with the armoury, and sparkling with the glory of the upper sanctuary, that he must enter on it, but as the seed of the vanquished woman, the child of promise in the family of God, and himself having experience of the lowest depths of sorrow and abasement, which sin had brought upon them. Only, however, as of that family, not of the world at large. For the church, though ever so depressed and afflicted in her condition, cannot be indebted to the world for a deliverer ; the world must be indebted to her. With her is the covenant of God ; and she alone is the mother of the divine seed, that overcomes the wicked one.

3. Yet the deliverance, even in its earlier stages, when existing only in the personal history of the deliverer, is not altogether independent of the world,—the blessing of Israel was interwoven with acts of kindness derived from the heathen,—and the child Moses, with whom their very existence as a nation and all its coming glory was bound up, owed his preservation to a member of Pharaoh's house, and in that house found a fit asylum and nursing-place. Thus the earth "helped the woman," as it has often done since. The captain of our salvation had in like manner to be helped. For, though born of the tribe of Judah, he had to seek elsewhere the safety and protection which "his own" denied him, and partly—not because absolutely necessary to verify the type, but to render its fulfilment more striking and palpable—was indebted for his preservation to that very Egypt which had sheltered the infancy of Moses. So that in the case even of the author and finisher of our faith, the history of redemption links itself closely with the history of the world.

4. Still the deliverer, as to his person, his preparation, his gifts and calling, is peculiarly of God. That such a person as Moses was provided for the church in the hour of her extremity, was entirely the result of God's covenant with Abraham ; and the whole circumstances connected with his preparation for the work, as well as the commission given him to undertake it, and the supernatural endowments fitting him for its execution, manifestly bespoke the special and gracious interposition of God. But the same holds true in each particular, and still more illustriously appears in Christ. In his person, pre-eminently the father's gift—a gift of

peerless value, and bestowed solely from regard to the everlasting covenant, which secured the redemption of the world ; in his office as Mediator called and appointed by the Father ; prepared also for entering on it, first by familiar converse with the world, and then by a season of wilderness-seclusion and trial ; replenished directly from above with gifts adequate to the work, even to his being filled with the whole fulness of the Godhead :—Everything, in short, to beget the impression, that while the church is honoured as the channel through which the deliverer comes, yet the deliverer himself is in all respects the peculiar gift of God, and that here especially it may be said, “of him, and through him, and to him are all things.”

SECTION III.

THE DELIVERANCE.

WE have now come to the actual accomplishment of Israel's deliverance from the house of bondage. One can easily imagine that various methods might have been devised to bring it about. And had the Israelites been an ordinary race of men, and had the question simply been, how to get them most easily and quickly released from their state of oppression, a method would probably have been adopted very different from the one that was actually pursued. It is by viewing the matter thus, that shallow and superficial minds so often form an erroneous judgment concerning it. They see nothing peculiar in the case, and form their estimate of the whole transactions, as if only common relations were concerned, and nothing more than worldly ends were in view. Hence, because the plan from the first savoured so much of judgment,—because, instead of seeking to have the work accomplished in the most peaceful and conciliatory manner, the Lord rather selected a course that was likely to produce bloodshed,—nay, is even represented as hardening the heart of Pharaoh, that an occasion might be found for pouring a long series of troubles and desolations on the land,—because the plan actually chosen was of such a kind, many have not scrupled to denounce it as unworthy of God, and more befitting a cruel and malignant than a wise and beneficent being.

Now, in rising above this false ground, and the erroneous conclusions that naturally spring from it, it is first of all to be borne in mind that higher relations were here concerned, and more important objects at stake, than those of this world. The Israelites were the chosen people of God, standing in a covenant-relation to him, his church. However far most of them had been living beneath their obligations and their calling, they still occupied a

position which was held by no other family on earth. With them was identified, in a peculiar sense, the honour of God and the cause of heaven ;—and the power that oppressed and afflicted them, was trampling at every step on rights which God had conferred, and provoking the execution of a curse which he had solemnly denounced. If the cause and blessing of heaven were bound up with the Israelites, then Pharaoh, in acting toward them as an enemy and oppressor, must of necessity have espoused the interest and become liable to the doom of Satan.

Besides, it must be carefully borne in mind, that here especially, where God had immediately to work, his dealings and dispensations were of a preparatory nature. They were planned and executed in anticipation of the grand work of redemption, which was afterwards to be accomplished by Christ, and were consequently directed in such a manner as to embody on the comparatively small scale of their earthly transactions and interests, the truths and principles which were afterwards to be developed in the affairs of a divine and everlasting kingdom.¹ This being the case, the deliverance of Israel from the land of Egypt must have been distinguished at least by the following features :—1. It must, in the first instance, have appeared to be a work of peculiar difficulty—requiring to be accomplished in the face of very great and powerful obstacles—rescuing the people from the strong grasp of an enemy, who though a cruel tyrant and usurper, yet, on account of their sin, had acquired over them a lordly dominion, and by means of terror kept them subject to bondage. 2. Then, from this being the case, the deliverance must necessarily have been effected by the execution of judgment upon the adversary ; so that as the work of judgment proceeded on the one hand, the work of deliverance would proceed on the other, and the freedom of the covenant people be completely achieved, only when the principalities and powers which held them in bondage were utterly spoiled and vanquished. 3. Finally, this twofold process of salvation with destruction, must have been of a kind fitted to call forth the peculiar powers and perfections of Godhead, so that all who witnessed it, or to whom the knowledge of it should come, might be constrained to own and

¹ Vol. I. Book I. c. 3.

admire the wonder-working hand of God, and instinctively, as it were, exclaim, "Behold what God hath wrought ! It is his doing, and marvellous in our eyes."—We say, all this *must* have been on the supposition of the scriptural account of the work being taken ; and excepting on that supposition we have no right to give any judgment concerning it, or if we do, we shall certainly judge amiss.

On this scriptural ground we take our stand, when proceeding to examine the affairs connected with this method of deliverance, and we assert them not only to be capable of a satisfactory vindication, but to have been incapable of serving the purposes which they were designed to accomplish, if they had not been ordered substantially as they were. It is manifestly impossible that here, any more than in what afterwards befel Christ, the order of events should have been left to any lawless power, working as it pleased, but that all must have been arranged "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," and arranged precisely as they occurred. The outstretching of the divine arm to inflict the most desolating judgments on the land of Egypt, the slaying of the first-born, and the overthrow of Pharaoh and his host, were essential parts of the divine plan. But since these appear as the result of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, this also must have formed an essential element in the plan ; and was therefore announced to Moses from the first as an event that might certainly be expected, and which would give a peculiar direction to the whole series of transactions.¹ For this hardening of the heart of Pharaoh was the very hinge, in a sense, on which the divine plan turned, and could least of all be left to chance or uncertainty. It presents itself, not simply as an obstacle to be removed, but as a circumstance to be employed for securing a more illustrious display of the glorious attributes of God, and effecting the redemption of his people in the way most consistent with his righteous purposes. It could not, therefore, be allowed to hang merely upon the will of Pharaoh ; somehow the hand of God *must* have been in the matter, as it belongs to him to settle and arrange all that concerns the redemption of his people, and the manifestation of his own glory. Nor, otherwise, could there

¹ Ex. iii. 19 ; iv. 21.

have been any security for the divine plan proceeding to its accomplishment, or for its possessing such features as might render it a fitting preparation for the greater redemption that was to come.

It seems to us impossible to look at the hardening of Pharaoh's heart in the connection which it thus holds with the entire plan of God, or to consider the marked and distinct manner in which it is ascribed to his agency, and yet to speak of Pharaoh being simply allowed to harden his own heart, as presenting a sufficient explanation of the case. It is true, he is often affirmed also to have himself hardened his heart; and in the very first announcement of it (ch. iii. 19, "I am sure, or rather, I know that the King of Egypt will not let you go,") as acutely remarked by Baumgarten, "the Lord characterizes the resistance of Pharaoh as an act of freedom, existing apart from the Lord himself; for I *know* that which objectively stands out and apart from me."¹ At the same time, it is justly noticed by Hengstenberg, that as the hardening is ascribed to God, both in the announcement of it beforehand, and in the subsequent recapitulation (Ex. iv. 21, vii. 3, xi. 10), "Pharaoh's hardening appears to be enclosed within that of God's, and to be dependent on it. It seems also to be intentional, that the hardening is chiefly ascribed to Pharaoh at the beginning of the plagues, and to God toward the end. The higher the plagues rise, the more does Pharaoh's hardening assume a supernatural character, and the reference was the more likely to be made to its supernatural cause."²

The conclusion, indeed, is inevitable. It is impossible, by any fair interpretation of Scripture, or on any profound view of the transactions referred to, to get rid of the divine agency in the matter. Even Tholuck says, "That the hardening of the Egyp-

¹ Commentary on Ex. iii. 19, 20.

² *Authentic*, ii. p. 462. Some stress is laid by Hengstenberg on the hardening being ascribed *seven* times to Pharaoh, and the same number of times to God, as indicating that it has respect to the covenant of God, of which seven is the sign. Baumgarten also lays some stress on the numbers, but finds each to be *ten* times repeated, the sign of completeness. Both have to deal arbitrarily with the sacred text to make out their respective numbers (for example, Hengstenberg leaves out the three hardenings of God in ch. xiv. and Baumgarten treats ch. vii. 13 and 14, as if they spoke of two distinct hardenings.) It is also against the simplicity of the Scripture narrative to draw from the mere form of its historical statements such hidden meanings.

tian was, on one side, ordained by God, no disciple of Christian theology can deny. It is an essential doctrine of the Bible, that God would not permit evil, unless he were Lord over it; and that he permits it, because it cannot act as a check upon his plan of the world, but must be equally subservient to him as good—the only difference being, that the former is so compulsorily, the latter optionally.¹ That God had no hand in the sin, which mingles itself with evil, is clearly implied in the general doctrine of Scripture; since he everywhere appears there as the avenger of sin, and hence cannot possibly be in any sense its author. In so far, therefore, as the hardening of Pharaoh's heart partook of sin, it must have been altogether his own; his conduct, considered as a course of heady and high minded opposition to the divine will, was pursued in the free, though unrighteous exercise of his own judgment. This, however, does not hinder, that there should have been a direct and positive agency of God in the matter, to the effect of determining both the manner and extent of the opposition. "It is in the power of the wicked to sin," says St Augustine, "but that in sinning they do this or that by their wickedness, is not in their own power, but in God's, who divides and arranges the darkness."² To the same purpose, and still more distinctly, the Westminster Confession of Faith: "God's providence extendeth itself to all sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing them, in a manifold dispensation, unto his own holy ends; yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature, and not from God." It is wholly chargeable on man himself, if there is a sinful disposition at work in his bosom; but that disposition existing there, and resisting the means which God employs to subdue it, the man has no longer any control over the course and issue of events. This is entirely in the hands of God, to be directed by him in the way, and turned

¹ On Rom. ix. 19, note furnished to English translation, Bib. Cab. xii. p. 249. Bush, however, in his notes on Exodus, still speaks of the mere permission as sufficient: "God is said to have done it, because he permitted it to be done." His criticism on the words does not in the least contribute to help this meaning. Dean Graves, as Arminian writers generally, holds the same view. (Works, Vol. III. p. 321, &c.)

² Liber, de Prædestinatione Sanctorum, § 33.

into the form and channel which is best adapted to promote the ends of his righteous government. "He places the sinner in such situations, that precisely this or that temptation shall assail him—links the thoughts to certain determinate objects of sinful desire, and secures their remaining attached to these, and not starting off to others. The hatred in the heart belonged to Shimei himself; but it was God's work that this hatred should settle so peculiarly upon David, and should shew itself in exactly the manner it did. It was David's own fault that he became elated with pride; the course of action which this pride was to take, was accidental, so far as he was concerned; it belonged to God, who turns the hearts of kings, like the rivers of waters. Hence it is said, 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, 'The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.' Yet was he not thereby in the least justified, and therefore, v. 10, he confesses that he had sinned greatly, and prays the Lord to take away his iniquity."¹

Now, applying these views to the case of Pharaoh, it was certainly his own proud and wicked heart which prompted him to refuse the command of God to let Israel go. But he might have retained that disposition in all its force, and yet have acted differently from what he did. Mere selfishness, or considerations of policy, might have induced him to restrain it, as from like motives, not from any proper change of heart, his magicians first, and afterwards his counsellors, appear to have wished. (Ex. viii. 19; x. 7.) But the hand of God exerted such control over him, so bounded and hedged him in, that while he clung to the evil principle, he must pursue his infatuated and fool-hardy course; this one path lay open to him. And for his doing so, two things were necessary, and in these the action of Omnipotence was displayed:—1. First, the strong and courageous disposition capable of standing fast under formidable dangers, and grappling with gigantic difficulties—a natural endowment, which could only have been derived from God. That such a disposition should have

¹ *Authentic*, II. p. 466. See also Calvin's *Institutes*, B. I. c. 18, and B. II. c. 4, for the proof, rather than the explanation, of the fact, that "bare permission is too weak to stand, and that it is the merest trifling to substitute a bare permission for the providence of God, as if he sat in a watch-tower, waiting for fortuitous events, his judgments meanwhile depending on the will of man."

been possessed in so eminent a degree by the Pharaoh who then occupied the throne of Egypt, was the result of God's agency, though Pharaoh alone was responsible for its abuse. 2. But, besides, there was needed such a disposal of circumstances as might tend to prompt and stimulate to the utmost this disposition of Pharaoh; for otherwise it might have lain comparatively dormant, or, at least, might have been far from running such a singularly perverse and infatuated course. Here also the hand of God manifested its working. It was he who, in the language of Tholuck, "brought about those circumstances, which made the heart disposed to evil still harder." Many writers, who substantially admit this, limit the circumstances tending to produce the result in question to the lenity and forbearance of God, in so readily and frequently releasing Pharaoh from the execution of judgment. There can be no doubt that this was one of the circumstances which, on such a mind as his, would be fitted to produce a hardening effect; but it was not the only, nor the chief one; there were others, which must have had a still more powerful tendency in the same direction, and which were also more properly judicial in their character. Such, in the first instance, and most evidently, was the particular kind of miracles which Moses was instructed to work at the commencement of his operations—the transforming of his rod into a serpent, and back again to a rod; for this was precisely the field on which Pharaoh might be tempted to think he could successfully compete with Moses, and might rival, at least, if not outdo, the pretended messengers of heaven. However inexplicable the fact may be, of the fact itself there can be no question, that, from time immemorial the art of working extraordinary, and to all appearance supernatural effects on serpents, has been practised by a particular class of persons in Egypt. Many of the ancients have written of the wonderful exploits of the *Psylli*, as they are called, and celebrated their magical power, both to charm serpents at their will, and to resist unharmed the bites of the most venomous species. And it would seem by the accounts of some of the most recent inquirers, that descendants of the ancient brotherhood still exist in Egypt, forming an association by themselves, and able, by some means unknown to any but themselves, to handle without fear or injury the most noxious serpents, to walk abroad with numbers of them coiling around

their necks and arms, and to make certainly one species of them rigid like a rod, and feign themselves dead.¹ It is also certain, that when they do these wonders, they are in a sort of phrenzied or ecstatical condition, and are believed by the multitude to be under divine influence. That this charming influence was, at least in its origin and earlier stages, the offspring to some extent of demoniacal power, is not inconsistent with what Scripture testifies concerning the workings of that power generally, and is most naturally implied in the particular statements made respecting the magicians when contending with Moses. For although we might, without much violence to the interpretation of the text, suppose it to represent that as being done, which to all appearance was done, without being understood positively to affirm that the effect was actually produced ; yet the language used of their changing the rods into serpents, and on a small scale also turning water into blood, and producing frogs, does in its proper import indicate something supernatural—corresponding, as we conceive, to the wonders of the demoniacal possessions of our Lord's time, and still more closely perhaps to "the working of Satan with all power, and signs and lying wonders," which is made to characterize the coming of Antichrist (Matt. xxiv. 23 ; 2 Thess. ii. 9 ; Rev. xiii. 13). But even without pressing this, the mere fact of there being then a class of persons in the service of Pharaoh, who themselves pretended, and were generally believed to be possessed of a divine power to work the wonders in question, must evidently have acted as a temptation with Pharaoh to resist the demands of Moses, being confident of his ability to contend with him on this peculiar field of prodigies. And having fairly ventured on the field of conflict, we can easily understand how, with a proud and heaven-defying temper like his, he would scorn to own himself vanquished ; even though the miraculous working of Moses clearly established its superiority to any act or power possessed by the magicians, and they themselves were at last compelled to retire from the field, owning the victory to be Jehovah's.

¹ See the quotations from the ancients in Bochart, Hieroz. ii. p. 393 and 4 ; and for the accounts of the moderns, Hengstenberg's Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 98-103. Among these are the testimonies of the French savants, who were quite incredulous before they investigated the affair, as to there being any thing more than common sleight-of-hand in it, but who were obliged to confess that "they saw things so wonderful that they could no longer consider the art as entirely chimerical."

This, however, was only one class of the circumstances which were arranged by God, and fitted to harden the heart of Pharaoh. To the same account we must also place the progressive nature of the demands made upon him, in beginning first with a request for leave of three days' absence to worship God; then, when this was granted for all who were properly capable of taking part in the service, insisting on the same liberty being extended to the wives and children; and, again, when even this was conceded, claiming to take with them also their flocks and herds: so that it became evident an entire escape from the land was meditated. There was no deceit, as the adversaries of revelation have sometimes alleged, in this gradual opening of the divine plan; nor, when the last and largest demand was made, was more asked than Pharaoh should from the first have voluntarily granted. But so little was sought at the beginning, to make the unreasonableness of his conduct more distinctly apparent, and the gradual and successive enlargement of the demand was intended to act as a temptation, to prove him, and bring out the real temper of his heart.

Finally, of the same character also was the last movement of heaven in this marvellous chain of providences—the leading of the children of Israel, as into a net, between the Red Sea and the mountains of the wilderness, fitted, as it so manifestly was, to suggest the thought to Pharaoh, when he had recovered a little from his consternation, and felt the humiliation of his defeat, that now an opportunity presented itself of retrieving his lost honour, and with one stroke avenging himself on his enemies. He was thus tempted, in the confidence of victory, to renew the conflict, and, when apparently sure of his prey, was led, by the opening of the sea for the escape of the Israelites, and the removal of the divine cloud to the rear, so as to cover their flight, into the fatal snare which involved him in destruction. In the whole, we see the directing and controlling agency of God, not in the least interfering with the liberty of Pharaoh, or obliging him to sin, but still, in judgment for his sinful oppression of the church of God, and unjust resistance to the claims of heaven, placing him in situations which, though fitted to influence aright a well constituted mind, were also fitted, when working on such a temperament as his, to draw him into the extraordinary course he took,

and to render the series of transactions, as they actually occurred, a matter of moral certainty.¹

But to return to the wonders which Moses was commissioned to perform: it is to be borne in mind, that the humiliation of Pharaoh was not their only design, nor even the redemption of Israel their sole end. The manifestation of God's own glory was here, as in all his works, the highest object in view; and this required that the powers of Egyptian idolatry, with which the interest of Satan was at that time peculiarly identified, should be brought into the conflict, and manifestly confounded. For this reason, also, it was that the first wonders wrought had such distinct reference to the exploits of the magicians or serpent-charmers, who were the wonder-workers connected with that gigantic system of idolatry, and the main instruments of its support and credit in the world. They were thus naturally drawn, as well as Pharaoh, into the contest, and became, along with him, the visible heads and representatives of the "spiritual wickednesses" of Egypt. And since they refused to own the supremacy, and accede to the demands of Jehovah, on witnessing that first, and as it may be called, harmless triumph of his power over theirs—since they resolved, as the adversaries of God's and the instruments of Satan's interest, in the world, to prolong the contest, there remained no alternative but to visit the land with a series of judgments, such as might clearly prove the utter impotence of its fancied deities to protect their votaries from the might and vengeance of the living God. It is when considered in this point of view, that we see the agreement in principle between the wonders proceeding from the instrumentality of Moses, and those wrought by the hand of Christ. They seem at first sight to be entirely opposite in their character, the one being severe and desolating plagues, the other,

¹ We have spoken of Pharaoh himself having perished in the overthrow at the Red Sea; and such seems the natural import of Scripture on the subject, although it is not expressly asserted. Wilkinson thinks the escape of Israel was made in the fourth year of Thothmes III., who reigned in all 39 years. If so, of course he was not personally drowned; but we question whether the interpretation of the hieroglyphics is yet far enough advanced to admit of such definite information being drawn from them in regard to so remote a period. That learned and accomplished individual himself, so far from speaking dogmatically on the subject, gives Lord Prudhoc's reasons for assigning a considerably later period, and leaves the decision to the learned, as a point regarding which absolute certainty is not attainable.

miracles of mercy and healing. This seeming contrariety arises from their having been wrought on entirely different fields—those of Moses on an avowedly hostile territory, those of Christ on a land and among a people that were peculiarly his own. But as in both cases alike there was a mighty adversary, whose power and dominion were to be brought down, so the display given in each of miraculous working, told with the same effect on his interest, though somewhat less conspicuously in the one case than in the other. While Christ's works were, in the highest sense, miracles of mercy, supernatural acts of beneficence towards "his own," they were, at the same time, triumphant displays of divine over satanic agency. "The Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil." As often as his hand was stretched out to heal, it dealt a blow to the cause of the adversary; and the crowning part of the Redeemer's work on earth, his dying the accursed death of the cross, was that which at once perfected the plan of mercy for the faithful, and judged and spoiled the prince of darkness. In like manner, we see mercy and judgment going hand in hand in the wonders that were done by the instrumentality of Moses on the "field of Zoan"—only from that being the field of the adversary, and the wonders being done directly upon him, the judgment comes more prominently into view. It was essentially a religious contest between the God of heaven on the one side, and the powers of Egyptian idolatry on the other, as represented by Pharaoh and his host; and as one stroke after another was inflicted by the arm of Omnipotence, there was discovered the nothingness of the divinities whose cause Pharaoh maintained, and in whose power he trusted, while "the God of Israel triumphed gloriously, and in mercy led forth the people whom he had redeemed, to his holy habitation."

It is not necessary that we should shew, by a minute examination of each of the plagues, how excellently they were fitted to expose the futility of Egyptian idolatry, and to shew how entirely everything there was at the disposal of the God of Israel, whether for good or evil. The total number of the plagues was ten, indicating their completeness for the purposes intended by their infliction. The first nine were but preparatory, like the miraculous works which Christ performed during his active ministry; the last was the great act of judgment, which was to carry with it the

complete prostration of the adversary, and the deliverance of the covenant people. It was, therefore, from the first announced, as the grand means to be employed for the accomplishment of Israel's redemption (Ex. iv. 22, 23). But the preceding miracles were by no means unnecessary, as they tended to disclose the absolute sovereignty of Jehovah over the whole province of nature, as well as over the lives of men (which came out in the last plague), and his power to turn whatever was known of natural good in Egypt into an instrument of evil, and to aggravate the evil into tenfold severity. This was manifestly the general design; and it is not necessary to prove, either that these plagues were quite different in their nature from anything commonly known in Egypt, or that each one of them struck upon some precise feature of the existing idolatry. In reference to the first of these points, we by no means think, with Hengstenberg, that in the natural phenomena of Egypt there was a corresponding evil to each one of the plagues, and that the plague only consisted in the supernatural degree to which the common evil was carried; nor can any proof be adduced in support of this at all satisfactory. But as the evil principle (Typhon) was worshipped in Egypt not less than the good, and worshipped, doubtless, because of his supposed power over the hurtful influences of nature,¹ we might certainly expect that *some* at least of the plagues, would appear to be only an aggravation of the natural evils to which that land was peculiarly exposed; so that these, as well as its genial and beneficent properties, might be seen to be under the control of Jehovah. Of this kind unquestionably was the third plague (that of lice, or, as is now generally agreed, of the gnats, with which Egypt peculiarly abounds, and which all travellers, from Herodotus to those of the present day, concur in representing as a source of great trouble and annoyance in that country).² Of the same kind, also, was the plague of flies, which swarm in Egypt, of all sorts, and that also of the locusts;³ to which we may add the plague of boils,

¹ Plutarch, de Iside et Osiride, p. 362, 380. See also the note of Mosheim to Cudworth's Intellectual System, vol. i. p. 353. Tegg's ed., and Bechart, Hieroz. Lib. ii. c. 34.

² See the note in the Pictorial Bible on Ex. viii. 17. Also Hengstenberg's Eg. and Books of Moses, for quotations from various authorities.

³ Ibid.

which Scripture itself mentions as of frequent occurrence in Egypt (Deut. xxviii. 27). But while we can easily account for the production, on a gigantic scale, of these natural evils, the same object, viz. the executing of judgment upon the gods of Egypt, would also lead us to expect other plagues of an entirely different kind, in which the natural good was restrained, and even converted into a source of evil. For in this way alone could confusion be poured upon the worship of the good principle, and which, there as elsewhere, took the form of a deification of the genial and productive powers of nature. Some of these belonged to Egypt in a quite extraordinary degree, and were regarded as constituting its peculiar glory. Such especially was the Nile, which was looked upon as identical with Osiris, the highest god, and to which Pharaoh himself is evidently represented as paying divine honours, in Ex. vii. 15 ; viii. 20.¹ Such, also, are its almost cloudless sky and ever-brilliant sun, rendering the climate so singularly clear and settled, that a shade is seldom to be seen ; and not only the more violent tempests, but even the gentlest showers of rain are a rarity. Hence, of the earlier plagues, the two first—those of the turning of the water into blood, and the frogs—took the form of a judgment upon the Nile, converting it from being the most beneficial and delightful, into the most noxious and loathsome of terrestrial objects ; while in the later plagues, of the tempest and the thick darkness, the Egyptians saw their crystal atmosphere and resplendent heavens suddenly compelled to wear an aspect of indescribable terror and appalling gloom. So that whether nature were worshipped there, in respect to her benignant or her hurtful influences, the plagues actually inflicted were equally adapted to confound the gods of Egypt—in the one case by changing the natural good into its opposite evil, and in the other by imparting to the natural evil a supernatural force and intensity.²

¹ Hengstenberg, p. 109, where the authorities are given. Also Vossius, *de Origine et Prog. Idolatriæ*, L. ii. c. 74, 75.

² We are surprised that Hengstenberg did not see the necessity of the one class of wonders as well as of the other, for the object in view. He has hence laboured to find a corresponding natural evil to *all* the plagues, and in some of the cases has most palpably laboured in vain. He is at pains to prove, that the Nile, when swollen, has somewhat of a reddish colour, and that it is not without frogs—the wonder, indeed, would be, if it were otherwise in either respect ; but he has not produced even the shadow of proof, that these things belonged to it to such an extent as to render it nauseous or unwhole-

Taking this general and comprehensive view of the preliminary plagues, it will easily be seen that there is no need for our seeking to find in each of them a special reference to some individual feature of Egyptian idolatry. If they struck at the root of that system in what might be called its leading principles, there was obviously no necessity for dealing a separate and successive blow against its manifold shades and peculiarities of false worship. For this an immensely greater number than nine or ten would have been required. And as it is, in attempting to connect even these ten with the minutiae of Egyptian idolatry, much that is fanciful and arbitrary must be resorted to. So long as we keep to the general features and design, the bearing of the wonders wrought can be made plain enough ; but those who would lead us more into detail, take for granted what is not certain, and sometimes even affirm what is manifestly absurd. To say, for example, that the plague of flies had any peculiar reference to the worship of Baal-zebul, the Fly-god, assumes a god to have been worshipped there, who is not known for certain to have had a place in the mythology of Egypt. It is equally arbitrary to connect the plague of locusts with the worship of Serapis. And it is surely to draw pretty largely on one's credulity, to speak of the miracle on the serpents as intended to destroy these, on account of their being the objects of worship,—or to set forth the plague on cattle as aimed at the destruction of the entire system of brute worship, as if no cattle were killed in Egypt, because the Deity was there worshipped under that symbol !¹ The general argument is weakened by being

some, or so much as to suggest the idea of a plague. On the contrary, the redness of the water is rather a sign of its becoming again fit for use. (See Pictorial Bible on Ex. vii. 17.) Then, a great array of authorities is produced (p. 117) to show, that it has sometimes been known to thunder, and does occasionally rain in Egypt. The proof only amounts to this, that the elements there are capable of assuming such appearances, and in some very partial and trifling instances, actually do so. But no one would scarcely think, on that account, of representing them as natural evils existing there ; and short of that, any proof is beside the purpose. The authorities he refers to on the subject of the darkness and the slaying of the first-born, are scarcely less unsatisfactory.

¹ The contrary needs no proof, as every one knows, who is in the least acquainted with ancient Egypt, that "oxen generally were used both for food and sacrifice" (Heeren, Af. ii. p. 147), and evidence has even been found among the ancient documents, of a company of curriers, or leather-dressers (Ib. p. 137). It is not less absurd to represent the plague of lice or gnats as done on purpose to afflict Egyptian idolatry, which permitted no priest to enter a temple with these creatures on him. There was not much

coupled with such puerilities, and the grand impression also, which the wonders were designed to produce, would have been frittered down and impaired, rather than deepened, by so many allusions to the mere details of the system.

But now, when God had by the first nine plagues vindicated his power over all that was naturally good or evil in Egypt, and had thus smitten with judgment their nature-worship in both of its leading characteristics, the adversary being still determined to maintain his opposition, it was time to inflict that last and greatest judgment, the execution of which was from the first designed to be the death-blow of the adversary, and the signal of Israel's deliverance. This was the slaying of the first-born, in which the Lord manifested his dominion over the highest region of life. Indeed, in this respect, there is clearly discernible, as was already noticed by Aben-ezra and other Jewish writers,¹ a gradual ascent in the plagues from the lower to the higher provinces of nature, which also tends to confirm the view we have presented of their character and design. The first two come from beneath—from the waters, which may be said to be under the earth; the next two from the ground or surface of the earth; the murrain of beasts and the boils on men belong to the lower atmosphere, as the tempest, the showers of locusts, and the darkness, to the higher; so that one only remains, that which is occupied by the life of man, and which stands in immediate connection with the divine power and glory. And, as in the earlier plagues, God separated between the land of Goshen and the rest of Egypt, to shew that he was not only the Supreme Jehovah, but also the covenant God of Israel, so in this last and crowning act of judgment, it was especially necessary, that while the stroke of death fell upon every dwelling of Egypt, the habitations of Israel should be preserved in perfect peace and safety. But two questions naturally arise here: why in this judgment upon the life of man should precisely the first-born have been slain? and if the judg-

less care to keep the person clean in the Jewish than in the Egyptian religion, and the plague might as well be said to reflect in that respect on the Jewish as the Egyptian rites. Bryant, in his book on the plagues, led the way to these weak and frivolous opinions, and he has been followed by many without examination. See, for example, the *Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation*, chapter iii.

¹ See in Baumgarten's Commentary, i. p. 459.

ment was for the overthrow of the adversary and the redemption of Israel, why should a special provision have been required to save Israel also from the plague?

1. In regard to the first of these points, there can be no doubt that the slaying of the first-born of Egypt had respect to the relation of Israel to Jehovah: "Israel," said God, "is my son, my first-born—if thou refuse to let him go, I will slay thy son, thy first-born" (Ex. iv. 20–22). But in what sense could Israel be called God's first-born son? Something more is plainly indicated by the expression, though no more is very commonly found in it, than that Israel was peculiarly dear to God, had a sort of first-born's interest in his regard. It implies this, no doubt, but it also goes deeper, and points to the divine origin of Israel as the seed of promise—in their birth the offspring of grace, as contra-distinguished from nature. Such pre-eminently was Isaac, the first-born of the family, the type of all that was to follow; and such now were the whole family, when grown into a people, as contra-distinguished from the other nations of the earth. They were not the whole that were to occupy this high and distinctive relation; they were but the beginning of the holy seed—the first-born of Jehovah—the first fruits of a redeemed world, which in the fulness was to comprehend "all kindreds, peoples, and tongues." Hence the promise to Abraham was, that he should be the father, not of one, but "of many nations." But these first-fruits represent the whole, and, themselves alone existing as yet, might now be said to comprehend the whole. If they were to be destroyed, the rest cannot come into existence—for a redeemed Israel was the only seed-corn of a redeemed world—but if they should be saved, their salvation would be the pledge and type of the salvation of all. And, therefore, to make it clearly manifest, that God was here acting upon the principle, which connects the first-fruits with the whole lump, acting not for that one family merely, and that moment of time then present, but for his people of every kindred and of every age, he takes that principle for the very ground of his great judgment on the enemy, and the redemption thence accruing to his people. As the first-born in God's elect family is to be spared and rescued, so the first-born in the house of the enemy, the beginning of his increase, and the heir of his substance, must be destroyed—the one a proof, that the whole

family were appointed to life and blessing, the other, in like manner, a proof that all who were aliens from God's covenant of grace, equally deserved, and should certainly in due time inherit the evils of perdition.

2. In regard to the other question which concerns Israel's liability to the judgment which fell upon Egypt, this arose from Israel's natural relation to the world, just as their redemption was secured by their spiritual relation to God. For, whether viewed in their individual, or in their collective capacity, they were in themselves of Egypt—collectively, a part of the nation, still without a separate and independent existence of their own, vassals of the enemy, and inhabitants of his doomed territory—individually, also, partakers of the guilt and corruption of Egypt. It is the mercy and grace alone of God's covenant which makes them to differ from those around them; and therefore, to show that while, as children of the covenant, the plague should not come nigh them, not a hair of their head should perish, they still were in themselves no better than others, and had nothing whereof to boast, it was, at the same time, provided that their exemption from judgment should be secured only by the blood of atonement. This blood of the lamb, slain and sprinkled upon their door-posts, was the sign between them and God—the sign on his part, that, according to the purport of his covenant, he accepted a ransom in their behalf, in respect to which he would spare them, “as a man spareth his son;”—and the sign on their part, that they owned the God of Abraham as their God, and claimed a share in the privileges which He so freely vouchsafed to them. Thus, in their case, “mercy rejoiced against judgment,”—yet, so as clearly to manifest, that had they been dealt with on the score of merit, and with respect merely to what they were in themselves, they too must have perished under the rebuke of heaven.

It was in consideration of the perfectly gratuitous nature of this salvation, and to give due prominence and perpetuity to the principle on which the judgment and the mercy alike proceeded, that the Lord now claimed the first-born of Israel as peculiarly his own (Ex. xiii). The Israelites in their collective capacity were his first-born, and as such were saved from death, the just desert and doom of sin which others inherited; but within that election there was henceforth to be another election—a first-born

among these first-born, who, as having been the immediate subjects of the divine deliverance, were to be peculiarly devoted to him. They were to be set apart, or literally, "to be made to pass over to God" (Ex. xiii. 12), leaving what might be called the more common ground of duty and service, and connecting themselves with that which belonged exclusively to himself. It implied that they had in a sense derived a new life from God—lived out of death, and, consequently, were bound to show that they did so, by living in a new manner, in a course of holy consecration to the Lord. This was strikingly taught in the ordinance regarding the first-born of cattle and beasts, of which the clean were to be presented as an offering to the Lord, that is, wholly given up to him by death (Ex. xxii. 29, 30 ; xxxiv. 19, 20), while in the case of the unclean, such as the ass, a lamb was to be sacrificed in its stead. The meaning evidently was, that the kind of consecration to himself which the Lord sought from the first-born, as it sprung from an act of redemption, saving them from guilt and death, so it was to be made good by a separation, on the one hand, from what was morally unclean, and, on the other, by a self-dedication to all holy and spiritual services. But, then, as the redemption in which they had primarily participated was accorded to them in their character as the first-fruits, the representatives of their respective households, and all the households equally shared with them in the deliverance achieved, so it was manifestly the mind of God, that their state and calling should be regarded as substantially belonging to all, and that in them were only to be seen the more eminent and distinguished examples of what should characterise the whole body. Hence the people were in one mass presently addressed as "a kingdom of priests and an holy nation" (Ex. xix. 6)—called to be universally what the first-born were called to be pre-eminently and peculiarly. In short, as these first-born had been as to their redemption the proxies, in a manner, of the whole, so were they in their subsequent consecration to be the symbolical lights and patterns of the whole. Nor was any change in this respect made by the substitution of the tribe of Levi in their room (Num. iii. 12). For this, as will appear in its proper place, was only the supplanting of a less by a more perfect arrangement, which was also done in such a way as to render most distinctly manifest the representative character of the tribe, which

entered into the place of the first-born ;—so that we see here, at the very outset, what was God's aim in the redemption of his people, and how it involved, not simply their release from the thralldom and the oppression of Egypt, but also their standing in a peculiar relation to himself, and their call to show forth his glory. We perceive in this act of redemption the kernel of all that was afterwards developed, as to do duty and privilege, by the revelations of law and the institutions of worship. And we see also what a depth of meaning there is in the expression used in Heb. xii. 23, where it is represented as the ennobling distinction of Christians, that they have “come to the church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven.” To designate the church as that of the first-born, is to present it to our view in its highest character as being in a state of most blessed nearness to God, having a peculiar interest in his favour, and a singular destination to advance his kingdom and glory. United to such a company, we are in a manner told, nothing shall be wanting that is needed to secure our well-being ; redemption is ours, with its sure deliverance from evil, and its rich inheritance of life and blessing ; the destroyer cannot hurt us, for we dwell beneath the shade of the Almighty—dwell there as the heirs of his fulness, enrolled members of his everlasting kingdom, who have been ransomed from the yoke of servitude, to live henceforth to his glory, and minister and serve before him.¹

When we come to consider the commemorative institution of the Passover, we shall see how admirably its services were adapted to bring out and exhibit to the eye of the church the great principles of truth and duty, which were involved in the memorable event in providence we have now been reviewing. But before we

¹ It is singular how entirely commentators generally have missed the proper force of this passage in Hebrews. The first-born to which Christians are come, says Whitby, are the apostles, who have received the first-fruits of the spirit. But it is of the New Testament church generally, of which the apostles were a part, that the declaration is made ; and the explanation amounts simply to this :—Ye who have the first-fruits of the spirit are come to those who have the first-fruits of the spirit ! Macknight is no better : —“ The first-born of man and beast being reckoned more excellent than the subsequent births, were appropriated to God. Hence the Israelites had the name of God's *first-born* given them, to show that they belonged to God, and were more excellent than the rest of the nations.” Is that all ? Is it on *such* a distinction that God made the Church's redemption and the Christian's hopes to turn ?

leave the consideration of it as an act of providence, there is another point connected with it, at which we would briefly glance, and one in which the Egyptians and Israelites were both concerned. We refer to what has been not less unscripturally than unhappily called "the borrowing of jewels" from the Egyptians by the Israelites on the eve of their departure.¹ That the sacred text in the original gives no countenance to this false view of the transaction, we have explained in the note below; and, indeed, the whole circumstances of the case render it quite incredible, that there should have been a borrowing and lending in the proper sense of the term. It is not conceivable that now, when Moses had refused to move, unless they were allowed to take with them all their flocks and herds, any thought should have been entertained of their return. Nor could this, at such a time, have been wished by any; for after the land had been smitten by so many plagues on account of them, and when, especially by the last awful judgment every heart was paralyzed with fear and trembling, the desire of the Egyptians must have run entirely in the opposite direction. Such we are expressly told was the case, for "the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men." Besides, what possible use could they have had for articles of gold, silver, and apparel, if they were only to be absent for a few days? The very request must have betrayed the intention, and the utmost credulity on the part of the Egyptians could not have induced them to give on such a supposition. It is farther evident, that this must have been the general understanding

¹ The sense of *borrowing* was, by a mistranslation of the Septuagint on ch. xii. 36, first given to the Hebrew word. This misled the fathers, who were generally unacquainted with Hebrew, and even Jerome adopted that meaning, though possessed of learning sufficient to detect the error. The Hebrew word is לָקַח, which simply means to ask or demand: "Speak now to the ears of the people, and let every man ask of his neighbour jewels (rather, articles) of gold," &c. (ch. xi. 1-3). It is the same word that is used in xii. 36, and which has there so commonly obtained the sense of *lending*. Here it is in the Hiphil or causeform, and strictly means, "to cause another to ask." Rendered literally, the first part of the verse would stand, "And the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians, and they made them to ask or desire." This can only mean, that the Lord produced such an impression upon the minds of the Egyptians in favour of the Israelites, that, so far from needing to be cozened, or constrained to part with the articles of gold, silver, and apparel, they rather invited the Israelites to ask them: take what you will, we are willing to give all.

in Egypt, from the numbers "the mixed multitude," as they are called, who went along with the Israelites, and who must have gone with them under the impression, that the Israelites were taking a final leave of Egypt. Hence the reasoning of Calvin and other commentators, who, under the idea of its being a proper borrowing and lending, endeavour to justify the transaction by resting on the absolute authority of God, who has a right to command what he pleases, falls of itself to the ground. Nor even as a piece of reasoning does it fairly meet the point at issue; for the unchangeably righteous God could never enjoin upon his creatures as a duty, what, as practised between man and man, would involve a manifest dishonesty or injustice.

Now, that this giving on the part of the Egyptians, and receiving on the part of the Israelites, was intimately connected with God's great work of judgment on the one, and mercy to the other, is manifest from the place it holds in the Divine record. It was already foretold to Abraham, that his posterity should come forth from the land of their oppression with much substance. That the prediction should be fulfilled in this particular way, was declared to Moses in God's first interview with him (Ex. iii. 21, 22). And both then, and immediately before it took place, and still again when it did take place, the Lord constantly spoke of it as his own doing, a result accomplished by the might of his outstretched arm upon the Egyptians. We can never imagine, that so much account would have been made of it, if the whole end to be served, had simply been to provide the Israelites with a certain supply of goods and apparel. A much higher object was unquestionably aimed at. As regards the Egyptians, it was a part of the judgment, which God was now visiting upon them for their past misdeeds, and which here, as not unfrequently happened, was made to take a form analogous to the sin it was designed to chastise. Thus, in another age, when the Israelites themselves became the objects of chastisement, they said, "We will flee upon horses; therefore (said God), ye shall flee, and they that pursue you shall be swift" (Isa. xxx. 16). And again, in Jeremiah, "Like as ye have forsaken me, and served strange gods in your land, so shall ye serve strangers in a land that is not yours" (ch. v. 19). In like manner here, the Egyptians had been long acting the part of oppressors of God's people,

seeking by the most harsh and tyrannical measures, to weaken and impoverish them. And now, when God comes down to avenge their cause, he constrains Egypt to furnish them with a rich supply of her treasures and goods. No art or violence was needed on their part to accomplish this ; the thing was in a manner done to their hand. The enemies themselves became at last so awed and moved by the strong hand of God upon them, that they would do anything to hasten forward his purpose. Their proud and stubborn hearts bow beneath his arm, like tender willows before the blast ; and they feel impelled by an irresistible power to send forth, with honour and great substance, the very people they had so long been unjustly trampling under foot. What a triumphant display of the sovereign might and dominion of God over the adversaries of his church ! What a striking manifestation of the truth, that He can not only turn their counsels into foolishness, but also render them unconscious instruments of promoting his cause and glory in the world ! And what a convincing proof of the folly of those, who would enrich themselves at the expense of God's interest, or would enviously prevent his people from obtaining what they absolutely need of worldly means to accomplish the service He expects at their hands !

Yet palpable as these lessons were, and affectingly brought home to the bosoms of the Egyptians, they proved insufficient to disarm their hostility. The pride of their monarch was only for the moment quelled, not thoroughly subdued ; and as soon as he had recovered from the recoil of feeling, which the stroke of God's judgment had produced, he summoned all his might to avenge on Israel the defeat he had sustained—but only with the effect of leaving, in his example, a more memorable type of the final destruction that is certain to overtake the adversaries of God. In a few days more the shores of the Red sea resounded with the triumphant song of Moses : “ I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously ; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea. . . . The Lord is a man of war ; the Lord is his name. Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea ; his chosen captains also are drowned in the Red sea. Thy right hand, O Lord, is become glorious in power ; thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy. And in the greatness of thine excellency thou hast overthrown them that rose up against

thee : thou sentest forth thy wrath which consumed them as stubble. And with the blast of thy nostrils the waters were gathered together," &c. How closely connected the act of victorious judgment here celebrated is with future acts of a like kind—how, especially, it was intended to foreshadow the final putting down of all power and authority, that exalts itself against the kingdom of Christ, is manifest from Rev. xv. 3, where the glorious company above are represented as singing at once the song of Moses and of the Lamb, in the immediate prospect of the last judgments of God, and of all nations being thereby led to come and worship before him. It is also in language entirely similar, and indeed manifestly borrowed from that song of Moses, that the Apostle, in 2 Thess. ii. 8, describes the sure destruction of Antichrist, "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit (or breath) of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Overlooking the Scriptural connection between the earlier and the later here in God's dealings, between the type and the antitype—overlooking, too, the rise that has taken place in the position of the Church, and its relations to the world, by the introduction of Christianity, many writers are now seeking to fasten upon those prophetic passages of the New Testament an interpretation, which is too grossly literal even for the original passage in the Old—as if nothing would fulfil their import, but a corporeally present Saviour, inflicting corporeal and overwhelming judgments on adversaries in the flesh. The work of judgment celebrated in the song of Moses is ascribed entirely to the Lord: It is He who throws the host of Pharaoh into the sea, and by the strength of his arm lays the enemy low. But did He do so, by being corporeally present? or, did He work without any inferior instrumentality? Was there literally a stretching out of His own arm? or, did He actually send forth a blast from His nostrils? But if no one would affirm such things in regard to the overthrow of Pharaoh, how much less should it be affirmed in regard to the destruction of Antichrist, with his ungodly retainers? Here, the Church has to do, not with a single individual, an actual king and his warlike host, as in the case of Pharaoh, but with an antichristian system and its wide-spread adherents; and the real victory must be won, not by acts of violence and bloodshed, but by the spiritual weapons, which shall undermine the strongholds of

error and diffuse the light of divine truth. Whenever the Lord gives power to those weapons to overcome, he substantially repeats anew the judgment of the Red sea; and when all that exalteth itself against the knowledge of Christ shall be put down by the victorious energy of the truth, then shall be the time to sing the song of Moses and of the Lamb.

SECTION IV.

THE MARCH THROUGH THE WILDERNESS—MANNA—WATER FROM THE
ROCK—THE PILLAR OF CLOUD AND FIRE.

THE children of Israel are now in the condition of a ransomed people, delivered from the yoke of the oppressor, and personally in a state of freedom and enlargement. They have been redeemed for the inheritance, but still the inheritance is not theirs; they are separated from it by a great and terrible wilderness, where many trials and difficulties must certainly be encountered, and nature, if left to itself, will inevitably perish. They were not long in feeling this. To the outward eye, the prospect which lay immediately before them, when they marched from the shores of the Red sea, was peculiarly dark and disheartening. The country they had left behind, with all the hardships and oppressions it had latterly contained for them, was still a rich and cultivated region. It presented to the eye luxuriant fields, and teemed with the best of Nature's productions; they had there the most delicious water to drink, and were fed with flesh and bread to the full. But *now*—even now, after the most extraordinary wonders had been wrought in their behalf, and the power that oppressed them had been laid low—every thing assumes the most dismal and discouraging aspect; nothing to be seen but a boundless waste of burning sand and lifeless stones; and a tedious march before them, through trackless and inhospitable deserts, where it seemed impossible to find for such an immense host even the commonest necessaries of life. What advantage was it to them in such a case to have been brought out with a high hand from the house of bondage? They had escaped, indeed, from the yoke of the oppressor, but only to be placed in more appalling circumstances, and exposed to calamities less easy to be borne. And as death seemed inevitable anyhow, it might have been as well, at least, to

have let them meet it amid the comparative comforts they enjoyed in Egypt, as to have it now coming upon them, through scenes of desolation and the lingering horrors of want.

Such were the feelings expressed by the Israelites shortly after their entrance on the wilderness, and more than once expressed again as they became sensible of the troubles and perils of their new position.¹ If they had rightly interpreted the Lord's doings, and reposed due confidence in his declared purposes concerning them, they would have felt differently. They would have understood, that it was in the nature of things impossible for God to have redeemed them for the inheritance, and yet to suffer any inferior difficulties by the way, to prevent them from coming to the possession of it. That redemption carried in its bosom a pledge of other needful manifestations of divine love and faithfulness. For, being in itself the greatest, it implied that the less should not be withheld, and being also the manifestation of a God, who in character, as in being, is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, it bespoke his readiness to give, in the future, similar manifestations of himself, in so far as such might be required.

The Israelites, however, who were still enveloped in much of the darkness and corruption of Egypt, though they were outwardly delivered from its thralldom, understood as yet comparatively little of this. They knew not how much they had to expect from God, as the *JEHOVAH*, the self-existent and unchangeable, who, as such, could not leave the people whom He had redeemed to want and desolation, but must assuredly carry on and perfect what he had so gloriously begun. They readily gave way, therefore, to fears and doubts, and even broke out into open murmuring and discontent. But this only shewed how much they had still to learn in the school of God. They had yet to obtain a clearer insight into God's character, and a deeper consciousness of their covenant-relation to him. And they could not possibly be in a better position for getting this, than in that solitary desert where the fascinating objects of the world no longer came between them and God. *There* they were in a manner forced into intimate dealings with God; being constantly impelled by their necessities, on the one hand, to throw themselves upon his care, and drawn,

¹ Ex. xv. 24; xvi. 2; xvii. 2, 3; Num. xi.; xx.

on the other, by his gracious interpositions in their behalf, into a closer acquaintance with his character and goodness. By the things they suffered, not less than those they heard, they were made to learn obedience, and were brought through a fitting preparation for the calling and destiny that was before them. Even with all the advantages which their course of wilderness-training possessed for this purpose, it proved insufficient for the generation that left Egypt with Moses; and the promise of God required to be suspended, till another generation had sprung up, in whom that training, by being longer continued, was to prove more thoroughly effectual. So again, in later times, when their posterity had fallen from their high calling, the Lord had again to put them through a discipline so entirely similar to the one now undergone, that it is spoken of as a simple repetition of what took place after the deliverance from Egypt.¹ And where is there now a genuine follower of the Lamb of God, having his face steadfastly set toward the heavenly Jerusalem, who does not, in like manner, march to it through the desert? Spiritually he enters upon such a desert the moment he takes up his Master's cross and begins to die to the world; the proper portion of his soul is henceforth in the land of rest and felicity before him. In respect to his higher interests, the world has become to him as a land of drought; and the crosses and trials, perplexities and bereavements, which are so often made to befall him by the way, are so many outward appliances, necessary to help out the deficiency of this heavenly elevation of mind; that by such means, if not otherwise, his heart may be weaned from the world, and suitably disciplined and prepared for the divine presence and glory.

¹ See Ezek. xx. 35, 36, and the beautiful passage, Hos. ii. 14-23, which both describe the course to be adopted for restoring a degenerate church, and God's future dealings with her, as if the whole were to be a re-enacting of the transactions which occurred at the beginning of her history. The same mode of procedure was to be adopted now which had been pursued then, though the actual scenes and operations were to be widely different. As a proof how little it is necessary to suppose the formal recurrence of the past scenes and operations, in order to verify the import of such delineations, and how readily the most unlettered Christians can enter into their true meaning, persons in the humblest rank of life have been often found to find peculiar delight in such figurative delineations, and the author has known one who had a relish for the passage in Hosea above almost any other portion of the Bible, because it so exactly described the nature of God's dealings with herself.

In regard to the Lord's manifestations and dealings toward Israel during this peculiar portion of their history, the general principle unfolded is, that while he finds it needful to prescribe to his ransomed people a course of difficulty, trial, and danger, before putting them in possession of the inheritance, he gives them meanwhile all that is required for their support and well-being, and brings to them discoveries of his gracious nearness to them, and unfeeling love, such as they could not otherwise have experienced.

I. This appeared, first of all, in the supply of food provided for them, and especially in the giving of manna, which the Lord sent them in the place of bread. It is true, that the manna might not necessarily form, nor can scarcely be supposed to have actually formed their only means of subsistence during the latter and longer period of their sojourn in the wilderness. For to say nothing of the quails, of which at first in kindness, and again in anger, a temporary supply was furnished them (Ex. xvi., Numb. xi.), there were within reach of the Israelites not a few resources of a common kind. The regions which they traversed, though commonly designated by the name of desert, are by no means uniform in their character, and contain in many places pasturage for sheep and cattle. Hence considerable tribes have found it possible, from the most distant times, to subsist in them—such as the Ishmaelites, Midianites, Amalekites. That the Israelites afterwards availed themselves of the means of support which the wilderness afforded them, in common with these tribes of the desert, is clear from what is mentioned of their flocks and herds. They are expressly said to have left Egypt with very large property in these (Ex. xii. 38); and that they were enabled to preserve, and even perhaps to increase these possessions, we may gather from the notices subsequently given concerning them,—especially from the mention made of the cattle, when they sought liberty to pass through the territory of Edom (Numb. xx. 19); and from the very large accumulation of flocks and herds by Gad and Reuben, which led to their obtaining a portion beyond the bounds of what was properly the promised land (Numb. xxxii.). The Israelites thus had within themselves considerable resources as to the supply of food; and the sale of the skins and wool, and what they could

spare from the yearly increase of their possessions, would enable them to purchase again from others. Besides, the treasure which they brought with them from Egypt, and the traffic which they might carry on in the fruit, spices, and other native productions of the desert, would furnish them with the means of obtaining provisions in the way of commerce. Nor have we any reason to think that the Israelites neglected these natural opportunities, but rather the reverse. For Moses retained his father-in-law with them, that, from his greater experience of the wilderness-life, he might be serviceable to them in their journeyings and abodes (Numb. x. 31) ; and it would seem that during the thirty-eight years of their sojourn, appointed in punishment for their unbelief, their encampment was in the neighbourhood of Mount Seir, where they had considerable advantages, both for trade and pasturage.¹ So that the period of their sojourn in the wilderness may have been, and most probably *was*, far from being characterised by the inactivity and destitution which is commonly supposed ; for Moses not only speaks of their buying provisions, but also of the Lord having “blessed them in *all the works of their hands*, and suffered them to lack nothing” (Deut. ii. 6, 7).²

It is clear, however, that these natural resources could only become available to the Israelites after they had lived for some time in the desert, and had come to be in a manner naturalized to it. To whatever extent they may have been indebted to such means of subsistence, it could only be during those thirty-eight years that they were doomed by the judgment of God to make the wilderness their home. And as that period formed an arrest in their progress, a sort of moral blank in their history, during which, as we shall see at the close of this chapter, the covenant and its more distinctive ordinances were suspended, we need not wonder if the things properly typical in their condition, should also have suffered a measure of derangement. It is to these things, as they happened to them during their march through the wilderness and

¹ This is only a matter of probability, inferred from the account given of the stations in Numb. xxxv., of which the most southerly during the thirty-eight years appears to have been Eziongeber, at the north point of the gulph of Akabah. From this point they again drew northwards the second time towards Kadesh.

² Vitringa Obs. Sac. Lib. v. c. 15, and Hengstenberg's Bileam, p. 280. The latter, we think, makes them too independent of the manna.

encampment around Sinai, that we are to look for the types (in their stricter sense) of Gospel realities. And there can be no doubt that, with reference to this period, the entire people were dependent upon manna for the chief part of their daily support. With a considerable proportion of the people, those who were in humbler circumstances, it must, indeed, have been so to the last. Therefore the nocturnal supply could not cease, though it may have varied in amount, till the people actually entered the territory of Canaan. It was the peculiar provision of heaven for the necessities of the wilderness.¹

In regard to the manna itself, which formed the chief part of this extraordinary provision, the description given is, that it fell round about the camp by night with the dew; that it consisted of small whitish particles, compared to hoar-frost, coriander-seed, and pearls (for so מַנָּה in Numb. xi. 7, should be rendered not bdellium, see Bochart, Hieroz. P. ii. p. 675-7), that it melted when exposed to the heat of the sun, and tasted like wafers made with honey, or like fresh oil. Now it seems that in certain parts of Arabia, and especially in that part which lies around Mount Sinai, a substance has been always found very much resembling this manna, and also bearing its name—the juice or gum of a kind of tamarisk tree, which grows in that region, called tarfa, oozing out chiefly by night in the month of June, and collected before sunrise by the natives. Such a fact was of course perfectly sufficient to entitle modern rationalists to conclude that there was no miracle in the matter, and that the Israelites merely collected and used a natural production of the region where they sojourned for a period. But even supposing the substance called manna to have been in both cases precisely the same, there was

¹ In Ex. xvi. 35, the supply of manna is spoken of as continuing till the people "came to a land inhabited," or to their reaching "the borders of Canaan." In Josh. v. 12, its actual cessation is said to have taken place only when they had entered Canaan, and ate the corn of the land. Hengstenberg's explanation of the matter does not seem to us quite satisfactory. But why might not the first passage, written in anticipation of the future, indicate generally the period during which the manna was given, viz. the exclusion of the people from a land in such a sense inhabited, that they were still dependent on miraculous supplies of food? Then the passage in Joshua records the fact, that this dependence actually ceased only when they had crossed the Jordan, and lay before Jericho; so that we may conclude their conquests to the east of Jordan, though in lands inhabited, had not sufficed till the period in question to furnish an adequate supply to their wants.

still ample room for the exertion of miraculous power in regard to the quantity ; for the entire produce of the manna found in the Arabian peninsula, even in the most fruitful years, does not exceed 700 pounds, which, on the most moderate calculation, could not have furnished even the *thousandth part* necessary for *one day's* supply to the host of Israel ! Besides the enormous disproportion, however, in regard to quantity, there were other things belonging to the manna of Scripture, which clearly distinguished it from that found by naturalists—especially its falling with the dew and on the ground, as well as on plants ; its consistence rendering it capable of being used for bread, while the natural is rather a substitute for honey ; its corrupting, if kept beyond a day, and its coming in double quantities on the sixth day, and not falling at all on the seventh. If these properties, along with the immense abundance in which it was given, be not sufficient to constitute the manna of Scripture a miracle, and that of the first magnitude, it will be difficult to say where such are to be found.

But this by no means proves the absence of all resemblance between the natural and the supernatural productions in question ; and so far from there being anything in that resemblance to disturb our ideas regarding the truth and reality of the miracle, we should rather see in it something to confirm them. For the supernatural presupposes the natural, and takes that for the ground out of which it rises. In extraordinary circumstances we might expect God, when the higher ends of his government required it, to work miraculously with the elements or productions of a particular region ; but seeing the economy which manifests itself in all his operations, we should not expect him needlessly to increase the miraculous, by working in one region with those properly belonging to another. Thus, when our Lord proceeded to administer a miraculous supply of food to the hungry multitudes around him, he did not call into being articles of food unknown in Judea, but availed himself of the few loaves and fishes that were brought to his hand. In like manner, when Jehovah was going to provide in the desert a substitute for the corn of “cultivated lands,” was it not befitting that he should take some natural production of the desert, and increase, or otherwise modify it, in adaptation to the end for which it was required ? It

is in accordance with all reason and analogy, that this corn of the desert should, to some extent, have savoured of the region with which it was connected; and the few striking resemblances it is found to bear to the produce of the Arabian tamarisk, are the stamp of verisimilitude, and not of suspicion—the indication of such an affinity between the two as might justly be expected, from their being the common production of the same divine hand, only working miraculously in the one case, and naturally in the other.¹

It is obvious that this miraculous supply of food for the desert, was in itself a provision for the bodily, and not for the spiritual nature of the Israelites. Hence, it is called by our Lord, “not the true bread that cometh down from heaven,” because the life it was given to support was the fleshly one, which terminates in death: “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead” (John vi. 32, 49, 50). And even in this point of view the things connected with it have a use for us, apart altogether from any higher, typical, or prospective reference they might also bear to Gospel things. Lessons may be drawn from the giving and receiving of manna in regard to the interests and transactions of our present temporal life—properly and justly drawn; only we must not confound these, as is too commonly done, with the lessons of another and higher kind, which it was intended as part of a preparatory dispensation, to teach regarding the food and nourishment of the soul. For example, the use made of it by the apostle in the second Epistle to the Corinthians (viii. 15), to enforce on the rich a charitable distribution of their means to the

¹ If this had been duly considered, Dr Kitto (Hist. of Palestine, i. p. 212), and other writers, might have saved themselves the trouble of attempting to disprove any proper resemblance between the two kinds of manna—in which respect it is impossible to do more, than to point out certain differences which existed between the qualities of the one and the other. It is also sufficient to expose the fanciful and merely superficial nature of many of the resemblances specified by typical writers between the manna and Christ. For example, the roundness of the manna, which was held to signify his eternal nature—its whiteness, which was viewed as emblematic of his holiness, and its sweetness, of the delight the participation of him affords to believers—these qualities the manna had simply as manna, as possessing to a certain extent the properties of that production of the desert. In such things there was nothing peculiar or supernatural; and it is as unwarrantable to search for spiritual mysteries in them, as it would be for a like purpose to analyze the qualities and appearance of the water which issued from the rock, and which, so applied, would convey in some respects a directly opposite instruction.

needy, so that there might be provided for all a sufficiency of these temporal goods, such as was found by the children of Israel on gathering the manna: this has no respect to any typical bearing in the transaction, as in both cases alike it is the bodily and temporal life alone that is contemplated. In like manner we should regard it, not in a typical, but only in a common or historical point of view, if we should apply the fact of their being obliged to rise betimes and gather it with their own hands, to teach the duty of a diligent industry in our worldly callings; or the other fact of its breeding worms when unnecessarily hoarded and kept beyond the appointed time, to shew the folly of men labouring to heap up possessions which they cannot profitably use, and which must be found only a source of trouble and annoyance. Such applications of the historical details regarding the manna, are in themselves perfectly legitimate and proper, but are quite out of place when put by many writers among its typical bearings. And hence, putting such applications of the history among its typical bearings, they are obliged arbitrarily to shift the relations, when they come to the double portion on the last day of the week, that there might be an unbroken day of rest on the Sabbath; for, if considered, as in the examples given above, with reference merely to what is to be done or enjoyed on earth, the instruction would be false—the day of rest being the season above all others, on which, in a spiritual point of view, men should ply the work and calling of a Christian. They are here, therefore, under the necessity of mixing up the present with the future, making the six days represent time, during which salvation is to be sought, and the seventh eternity, during which it is to be enjoyed. Yet there is an important use of this part also of the arrangement regarding the manna, in reference to the present life, apart altogether from the typical bearing. For, when the Lord sent that double portion on the last day of the week, and none on the next, it was as much as to say, that in his providential arrangements for this world, he had given only six days out of the seven for worldly labour, and that if men readily concurred in this plan, they would find it to their advantage—they would find, that in the long run they got as much by their six days' labour as they either needed or could profitably use, and would have, besides, their weekly day of rest for spiritual refreshment and bodily

repose. Nor can we regard this lesson of small moment in the eye of heaven, when we see no fewer than three miracles wrought every week for forty years to enforce it, viz. a double portion of manna on the sixth day, none on the seventh, and the preservation of the portion for the seventh from corrupting when kept beyond the usual time.

When we come, however, to consider what is written of the manna in its typical bearing, as representative of the higher and better things of the Gospel, we must remember that there are two distinct classes of relations—corresponding, indeed, yet still distinct, since the one has immediate respect only to the seen and the temporal, and the other to the unseen and the eternal. In both cases alike there is a redeemed people, travelling through a wilderness to the inheritance promised to them, and prepared for them, and receiving as they proceed the peculiar provision they require for the support of life, from the immediate hand of God: But in the one case, it is the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh, redeemed from the outward bondage and oppression of Egypt, at the most from bodily death, in the other the spiritual members of an elect church redeemed from the curse and condemnation of sin; in the one the literal wilderness of Arabia, lying between Egypt and Palestine, in the other the figurative wilderness of a present world; in the one manna, in the other Christ. That we are warranted to connect the two together in this manner, and to see the one, as it were, in the other, is not simply to be inferred from some occasional passages of Scripture, but is rather to be grounded on the general nature of the Old Testament dispensation, as intended to prepare the way by means of its visible and earthly relations, for the spiritual and divine realities of the Gospel. Whatever is implied in this general connection, however, is in the case of the manna not obscurely intimated by our Lord in the sixth chapter of St John's gospel, where he represents himself, with evident reference to it, as "the bread which cometh down from heaven;" and is clearly taken for granted by the Apostle Paul, when he calls it "the spiritual meat" of which the Israelites did all eat (1 Cor. x. 3). Not as if in eating that they of necessity found nourishment to their souls; but such meat being God's special provision for a redeemed people, had an ordained connection with the mysteries of God's kingdom, and,

as such, contained a pledge that he who consulted so graciously for the life of the body, would prove himself equally ready to administer to the necessities of the soul, as he did in a measure even then, and does now more fully in Christ. The following may be presented as the chief points of instruction, which in this respect are conveyed by the history of the manna:—

(1.) It was given in consideration of a great and urgent necessity. A like necessity lies at the foundation of God's gift of his Son to the world; it was not possible in the nature of things for any other resource to be found; and the actual bestowment of the gift was delayed, till the fullest demonstration had been given in the history of the church and the world that such a provision was indispensable.

(2.) The manna was peculiarly the gift of God, coming freely and directly from his hand. It fell by night with the dew (Numb. xi. 9), which is itself the gift of heaven, sent to fertilize the earth, and enable it to yield increase for the food of man and beast. But in the wilderness, where, as there is no sowing, there can be no increase, if bread still comes with the dew, it must be, in a sense quite peculiar, the produce of heaven—hence called “the corn,” or “bread of heaven” (Ps. lxxviii. 24, cv. 40). How striking a representation in this respect of Christ, who, both as to his person and to the purchased blessings of his redemption, is always presented to our view as the free gift and offer of divine love!

(3.) But plentiful, as well as free; the whole fulness of the Godhead is in Jesus, so that all may receive as their necessities require; no one needs to grudge his neighbour's portion, but all rather may rejoice together in the ample beneficence of heaven. So was it also with the manna; for when distribution was made, there was enough for all, and even he who had gathered least had no lack.

(4.) Then, falling as it did round about the camp, it was near enough to be within the reach of all; if any should perish for want, it could be from no outward necessity or hardship, for the means of supply were brought almost to their very hand. Nor is it otherwise in regard to Christ, who, in the Gospel of his grace, is laid, in a manner, at the door of every sinner; the word is nigh him; and if he should still perish, he must be without excuse—he perishes in sight of the bread of life.

(5.) The supply of manna came daily, and faith had to be exercised on the providence of God, that each day would bring its appointed provision ; if they attempted to hoard for the morrow, their store became a mass of corruption. In like manner must the child of God pray for his soul every morning as it dawns, " Give me this day my daily bread." He can lay up no stock of grace, which is to save him from the necessity of constantly repairing to the treasury of Christ ; and if he begins to live upon former experiences, or to feel as if he already stood so high in the life of God, that, like Peter, he can of himself confidently reckon on his superiority to temptation, his very mercies become fraught with trouble, and he is the worse rather than the better, for the fulness imparted to him. His soul can be in health and prosperity only while he is every day " living by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him, and gave himself for him."

(6.) Finally, as the manna had to be gathered in the morning of each day, and a double portion provided on the sixth day, that the seventh might be hallowed as a day of sacred rest ; so Christ and the things of his salvation must be sought with diligence and regularity—but only in the appointed way and through the divinely-provided channels. There must be no neglect of seasonable opportunities on the one hand, nor, on the other, any over-valuing of one ordinance to the neglect of another. We cannot prosper in our course, unless it is pursued as God himself authorises and appoints.

There is nothing uncertain or fanciful in such analogies ; for they have not only the correspondence between Israel's temporal and the church's spiritual condition to rest upon, but the character also of an unchangeable God. His principles of dealing with his church are the same for all ages. When transacting with his people now directly for the support of the spiritual life, he must substantially re-enact what he did of old, when transacting with them directly for the support of their bodily life. And, as even then there was an under current of spiritual meaning and instruction running through all that was done, so the faith of the Christian now has a most legitimate and profitable exercise, when it learns from that memorable transaction in the desert the fulness of its privilege, and the extent of its obligations in regard to the higher provision presented to it in the Gospel.

II. But Israel in the wilderness required something more than manna to preserve them in safety and vigour for the inheritance ; they needed refreshment as well as support—" a stay of water," not less than " a staff of bread." And the account given respecting this is contained in the chapter immediately following that which records the appointment of God respecting the manna (Ex. xvii.) Here also the gift was preceded by a murmuring and discontent on the part of the Israelites. So little had they yet learned from the past manifestations of divine power and faithfulness, and so much had slight the ascendancy over faith in their character, that they even spoke as if certain destruction were before them, and caused Moses to tremble for his life. But however improperly they demeaned themselves, as there was a real necessity in their condition, which nothing but an immediate and extraordinary exertion of divine power could relieve, Moses received the command from God, after supplicating his interposition to go with the elders of Israel and smite the rock in Horeb with his rod, under the assurance, which was speedily verified, that water in abundance would stream forth.¹

¹ This occurrence must not be confounded with another somewhat similar, of which an account is given in Numb. xx. This latter occurrence took place at Kadesh, and not till the beginning of the fortieth year of the sojourn in the wilderness—when the period of their abode there was drawing to a close (comp. ch. xx. with ch. xxxiii. 36–39). On account of the rebellious conduct of the people, Moses called the rock smitten, in both cases, by the name of Meribah, or Strife. But as the occasions were far separate, both as to space and time, the last was also unhappily distinguished from the first, in that Moses and Aaron so far transgressed as to forfeit their right to enter the promised land. Aaron was coupled with Moses both in the sin and the punishment ; but it is the case of Moses which is most particularly noticed. His sin is characterized in ch. xx. 12, by his "not believing God," and in v. 24, and ch. xxvii. 14, as a "rebelling against the word of God." Again, in Deut. i. 37 ; iii. 26 ; iv. 21, the punishment is said to have been laid on Moses "for their sakes," or, as it should rather be, "because of their words." The proper account of the matter seems to be this : Moses, through their chiding lost command of himself, and did the work appointed, not as God's messenger, in a spirit of faith and holiness, but in a state of carnal and passionate excitement, under the influence of that wrath which worketh not the righteousness of God. The punishment he received, it may seem, was peculiarly severe for such an offence ; but it was designed to produce a salutary impression upon the people, in regard to the evil of sin ; for when they saw that their misconduct had so far prevailed over their venerable leader as to prevent even him from entering Canaan, how powerfully was the circumstance fitted to operate as a check upon their waywardness in the time to come ! And then, as Moses and Aaron were in the position of greatest nearness to God, and had it as their especial charge to represent God's holiness to the people, even a comparatively small

The Apostle says of this rock, that it followed the Israelites (1 Cor. x. 4.) And some of the Jewish Rabbis have fabled that it did literally move from its place in Horeb and accompany them through the wilderness; so that the rock, which nearly forty years after was smitten in Kadesh, was the identical rock which had been originally smitten in Horeb. We need scarcely say that such was not the meaning of the Apostle.¹ But as the rock at Horeb comes into view, not as something by itself, but simply as connected with the water, which divine power constrained it to yield, it might justly be spoken of as following them, if the waters flowing from it went after them in their course. That this, to some extent, was actually the case, may be inferred from the great profusion with which they are declared to have been given—"gushing out," it is said, "like overflowing streams," "and running like a river in the dry places," (Ps. lxxviii. 20; cv. 41; Isaiah xlvi. 21). It is also the nearly unanimous opinion of interpreters, both ancient and modern, and the words of the apostle so manifestly imply this, that we can scarcely call it any thing but a conceit in St Chrysostom (who is followed, however, by Horsley, on Ex. xvii.), to regard the apostle there as speaking of Christ personally. But we are not thereby warranted in supposing, with some Jewish writers, that the waters flowing from the rock in Horeb, so closely and necessarily connected themselves with the march of the Israelites, that the stream rose with them to the tops of mountains, as well as descended into the valleys.² Considering how nearly related the Lord's miraculous working in regard to the manna stood to his natural working, and how he required the care and co-operation of his people to

backsliding in them was of a serious nature, and required to be marked with some impressive token of the Lord's displeasure.

¹ Yet the charge has been made, and is still kept up (for example, by De Wette, Rückert, Meyer), that the apostle does here fall in with the Jewish legends, and uses them for a purpose. We certainly disavow this, but we cannot with Tholuck (*Das Alte Test. im neue*, p. 39) deny the existence of the Jewish legends, and hold, that the passages usually referred to on the subject, speak only of the water of the well dug by Moses and the princes out of the earth. Some of them certainly do, but not all. Those produced by Schöttgen on 1 Cor. x. 4, clearly shew it to have been a Jewish opinion, that, not the water indeed by itself, but the rock ready to give forth its supplies of water, did somehow follow the Israelites.

² Lightfoot on 1 Cor. x. 4.

concur with his gift in making that miraculous provision effectual to the supply of their wants, we might rather conceive that their course was directed so as to admit of the water easily following them, though not, perhaps, without the application of some labour on their part to open for it a passage, and provide suitable reservoirs. Nor are we to imagine that they would require this water, any more than the manna, always in the same quantities during the whole period of their sojourn in the wilderness. They might even be sometimes wholly independent of it; as we know for certain it had failed them when they reached the neighbourhood of Kadesh, and were on their way to the country of the Moabites (Num. xx. and xxi.) It was God's special provision for the desert—for the land of drought; and did not need to be given in any quantities, or directed into any channel, but such as their necessities when traversing that land might require.¹

Understanding this, however, to be the sense in which the rock followed the Israelites, what does the apostle farther mean by saying, that "that rock was Christ?" Does he wish us to understand, that the rock typically represented Christ? And so represented him, that in drinking of the water which flowed from it, they at the same time received Christ? Was the drink furnished to the Israelites, in such a sense spiritual, that it conveyed Christ to them? In that case the flowing forth and drinking of the water must have had in it the nature of a sacrament, and answered to our spiritually eating and drinking of Christ in the Supper. This, unquestionably, is the view adopted by the ablest and soundest divines; although there are certain limitations which must be understood. The apostle is evidently drawing a parallel between the case of the church in the wilderness and that of the church under the Gospel, with an especial reference to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The passage of the Israelites through the Red sea, under the guidance and direc-

¹ The exact route pursued by the Israelites from Sinai to Canaan, is still a matter of uncertainty. At some of the places, where they are supposed to have rested, there are considerable supplies of water (See Bib. Cyclop. Art. Wandering). It is, however, certain, that the region of Sinai is very elevated, and that not only are the mountain-ridges immensely higher than the south of Palestine, but the ground slopes from the base to a considerable distance all round—so that the water would naturally flow so far with the Israelites—but how far has not been ascertained.

tion of Moses, he represents as a sort of baptism to him ; because in the same manner in which Christian baptism seals spiritually the believer's death to sin, his separation from the world, and his calling of God to sit in heavenly places with Christ, in the very same, outwardly, did the passage through the Red sea seal the death of Israel to the bondage of Pharaoh, their separation from Egypt, and their expectation of the inheritance promised them by Moses. In what he says regarding the manna and the rock, he does not expressly name the ordinance of the Supper ; but there can be no doubt that he has its sacred symbols in view, when he calls the manna the spiritual food of which the Israelites ate, and the water from the rock the spiritual drink of which they drank, and even gives to the rock the name of Christ. Such language, however, cannot have been meant to imply, that the manna and the water directly and properly symbolized Christ, in the same sense in which the bread and wine of the Supper do. For, the gift of the manna and the water had immediate respect to the supply of the people's bodily necessities. For this alone they were directly and ostensibly given ; and hence our Lord, speaking of what the manna was, in itself, depreciates its value in respect to men's higher natures, and declares to the Jews, it was not the true bread of heaven, as was evident alone from the fact, that the life it was sent more immediately to nourish, actually perished in the wilderness. Not, therefore, directly and purposely, but only in a remote, concealed, typical sense, could the apostle intend his expressions of spiritual food and drink to be understood. Still less could he mean, that all who partook of these, did consciously and believingly receive Christ through them to salvation. The facts he presently mentions regarding so many of them being smitten down in the wilderness by the judgments of God for their sins, too clearly proved the reverse of that. The very purpose, indeed, for which he there introduces their case to the notice of the Corinthian Church, is to warn the disciples to beware lest they should fall after the same example of unbelief ; lest, after enjoying the privileges of the Christian Church, they should, by carnal indulgence, lose their interest in the heavenly inheritance, as so many had done in regard to the earthly inheritance, notwithstanding that they had partaken of the corre-

sponding privileges of the Jewish church. But as the bread and wine in the Supper may still be called spiritual food and drink, might even be called by the name of Christ, who is both the living bread and the living water, which they represent, although many partake of them unworthily, and perish in their sins; so manifestly might the manna and the water of the desert be so called, since Christ was typically represented in them, though thousands were altogether ignorant of any reference they might have to him, and lived and died as far estranged from salvation as the wretched idolaters of Egypt.

In perceiving the higher things typically represented by the water flowing from the rock, the Israelites stood at an immense disadvantage compared with believers under the Gospel; and how far any did perceive them, it is impossible for us to determine. In regard to the great mass, who both now and on so many other occasions shewed themselves incapable of putting forth even the lowest exercises of faith, it is but too evident that they did not descry there the faintest glimpse of Christ. But, for such as really were children of faith, we may easily understand how they might go a certain way at least, in rising through the provisions then administered, to the expectation of better things to come. They must, then, have discerned in the inheritance, which they were travelling to inherit, not the ultimate good itself, which God had destined for his chosen, but only its terrestrial type and pledge—something which would be for the present life, what, in the resurrection, the other would be for the spiritual and immortal life. But, discerning this, it could not be difficult for them to proceed one step farther, and apprehend, that what God was now doing to them on their way to the temporal inheritance, by those outward, material provisions for the bodily life, he did not for that alone, but also as a sign and pledge, that such provision as he had made for the lower necessities of their nature, he must assuredly have made, and would in his own time fully disclose for the higher. And thus, while receiving from the hand of their redeeming God the food and refreshment required for those bodily natures which were to enjoy the pleasant mountains and valleys of Canaan, they might at the same time be growing in clearness of view and strength of assurance, as regarded their

interest in the imperishable treasures which belonged to the future kingdom of God—and their relation to Him, who was to be pre-eminently the seed of blessing, and the author of eternal life to a dying world.¹

But, whether or not those for whom the rock poured out its refreshing streams may have attained to any such discernment of the better things to come, for us who can look back upon the past from the high vantage-ground of Gospel light, there is to be learned here something of clear and definite instruction. In seeking for this, however, we must be careful to look to the real and essential lines of agreement, and pay no regard to such as are merely incidental. It is not the rock properly that we have to do with, or to any of its distinctive qualities, as is commonly imagined, but the supply of water issuing from it, to supply the thirst and refresh the natures of the famishing Israelites. No doubt, the apostle, when referring to the transaction, speaks of the rock itself and of its following them, but plainly meaning by this, as we have stated, the water that flowed from it. No doubt, also, Christ is often in Scripture represented as a rock; but when he is so, it is always with respect to the qualities properly belonging to a rock—its strength, its durability, or the protection it is capable of affording from the heat of a scorching sun. These natural qualities of the rock, however, do not come into consideration here; they did not render it in the least degree fitted for administering the good actually derived from it, but rather the reverse. There was not only no *seeming*, but also no *real* aptitude in the rock to yield the water; while in Christ, though he appeared to have no form or comeliness, there still was every thing that was required to constitute him a fountain-head of life and blessing. Then, the smiting of the rock by Moses with the rod, could not suggest the idea of any thing like violence done to it, nor was the action itself done by Moses as the lawgiver, but as the mediator between God and the people; while the smiting of Christ, which is commonly held to correspond with this, consisted in the bruising of his soul with the suffering of death, and that not inflicted, but borne by him as Mediator. There is no real correspondence in these respects be-

¹ For some further remarks on the peculiar language of the apostle in the passage referred to in his first epistle to the Corinthians, see Appendix to Vol. I. on the Old Testament in the New.

tween the type and the antitype ; and the manner in which it is commonly made out, is nothing more than a specious accommodation of the language of the transaction, to ideas, which the transaction itself could never have suggested.¹

The points of instruction are chiefly the following :—

(1.) Christ ministers to his people abundance of spiritual refreshment, while they are on their way to the heavenly inheritance. They need this to carry them onward through the trials and difficulties that lie in their way ; and he is ever ready to impart it. “If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.” What he then did in the region of the bodily life, he cannot but be disposed to do over again in the higher region of the spiritual life ; for there the necessity is equally great, and the interests involved are unspeakably greater. Let the believer, when parched in spirit, and feeling in heaviness, through manifold temptations, throw himself back upon this portion of Israel’s history, and he will see written, as with a sunbeam, the assurance, that the Saviour of Israel, who fainteth not, nor is weary, will satisfy the longing soul, and pour living water upon him that is thirsty.

(2.) In providing and ministering this refreshment, he will break through the greatest hindrances and impediments. If his people but thirst, nothing can prevent them from being partakers of the blessing. “He makes for them rivers in the desert ; the very rock turns into a flowing stream ; and the valley of Baca (weeping) is found to contain its pools of refreshment, at which the travellers to Zion revive their flagging spirits, and go from strength to strength. How often have the darkest providences, events that seemed beforehand pregnant only with evil, become,

¹ This has been done most strikingly by Toplady, in the beautiful hymn, “Rock of ages cleft for me,” which derives its imagery in part from this translation in the wilderness. Considered, however, in a critical point of view, or with reference to the real meaning of the transaction, it is liable to the objections stated in the text ; it confounds things which essentially differ. Ainsworth produces a Jewish comment, which seems to justify the interpretation usually put on it : “The turning of the rock into water, was the turning of the property of judgment, signified by the rock, into the property of mercy, signified by the water.” But Jewish comments on this, as well as most subjects, require to be applied with discrimination, as there is scarcely either an unsound, or a sound view, for confirmation of which something may not be derived from them. Water may as well symbolize judgment as mercy, and indeed was the instrument employed to inflict the greatest act of judgment that has ever taken place—the deluge.

through the gracious presence of the Mediator, the source of deepest joy and consolation !

(3.) "The rock by its water accompanied the Israelites—so Christ by his Spirit goes with his disciples even to the end of the world" (Grotius). The refreshments of his grace are confined to no region, and last through all ages. Wherever the genuine believer is, there they also are. And more highly favoured than even Israel in the wilderness, he has them in his own bosom—he has there "a well of water springing up unto life everlasting," so that "out of his belly can flow rivers of living water."

III. The only other point apart from the giving of the law, occurring in the march through the wilderness, and calling for notice here, was the pillar of fire and cloud, in which from the first the Lord accompanied and led the people. The appearance of this symbol of the divine presence was various, but it is uniformly spoken of as itself one—a lofty column rising toward heaven. By day it would seem to have expanded as it rose, and formed itself into a kind of shade or curtain between the Israelites and the sun, as the Lord is said by means of it to have "spread a cloud for a covering" (Ps. cv. 39), while by night it exchanged the cloudy for the illuminated form, and diffused throughout the camp a pleasant light. At first it went before the army, pointing the way, but after the tabernacle was made, it became more immediately connected with this, though sometimes appearing to rest more closely on it, and sometimes to rise higher aloft.¹ The lucid or fiery form seems to have been the prevailing one, or rather, to have always essentially belonged to it (hence called, not only, "pillar of fire," but "light of fire," אור אש, *i. e.* lucid matter presenting the appearance of fire), only during the day the circumambient cloud usually prevented the light from being seen. Sometimes, however, as when a manifestation of divine glory needed to be given to overawe and check the insolence of the people, or when some special revelation was to be given to Moses, the fire discovered itself through the cloud. So that it may be described, as a column of

¹ Ex. xiii. 21, 22, xiv. 19, xl. 34-38; Numb. ix. 15-23. This subject has been carefully investigated by Vitringa in his *Obs. Sac. L. v. c. 14-17*, to which we must refer for more details than can be given here. What is stated in the text claims to be little more than an abstract of his observations.

fire surrounded by a cloud, the one or the other appearance becoming predominant, according as the divine purpose required, but that of fire being more peculiarly identified with the glory of God. (Numb. xvi. 42.)

(1.) Now, as the Lord chose this for the visible symbol, in which he would appear as the Head and Leader of his people, when conducting them through the wilderness, there must have been, first of all, in the symbol itself, something fitted to display his character and glory. There must have been a propriety and significance in selecting this, rather than something else, as the seat in which Jehovah, or the angel of his presence, appeared, and the form in which he manifested his glory.¹ But fire, or a shining flame enveloped by a cloud, is one of the fittest and most natural symbols of the true God, as dwelling, not simply in light, but “in light that is inaccessible and full of glory,”—light and glory within the cloud. The fire, however, was itself not uniform in its appearance, but according to the threefold distinction of Isaiah (ch. iv. 5), sometimes appeared as *light*, sometimes as a *radiant splendour* or glory, and sometimes again as flaming, or *burning fire*. In each of these respects it pointed to a corresponding feature in the divine character. As light, it represented God as the fountain of all truth and purity (Isa. lx. 1, 19; 1 John i. 5; Rev. xxi. 23, xxii. 5). As splendour, it indicated the glory of his character, which consists in the manifestation of his infinite perfections, and especially in the display of his surpassing goodness, as connected with the redemption of his people—on which account the “shewing of his glory” is explained by “making his goodness pass before Moses” (Ex. xxxiii. 18, 19; comp. also Isa. xl. 5). For, as nothing appears to the natural eye more brilliant than the shining brightness of fire, so nothing to the spiritual eye can be compared with these manifestations of the gracious attributes of God. And as nothing in nature is so awfully commanding and intensely powerful in consuming as the burning flame of fire, so in this respect again it imaged forth the terrible power and majesty of his holiness, which makes him jealous of his own glory, and a consuming fire to the workers of iniquity. Hence

¹ For the essential identity of Jehovah, and the angel of his presence in connection with this symbol, comp. Ex. xiii. 21, xiv. 19, xxiii. 20.

the cloud assumed this aspect, pre-eminently on Mount Sinai, when the Lord came down to give that fundamental revelation of his holiness, the law of the ten commandments (Ex. xxiv. 17; Deut. iv. 24; Isa. xxxiii. 14, 15; Heb. xii. 29). Still, whatever the Lord discovered of himself in these respects to his ancient people, it was with much reserve and imperfection; they saw him, indeed, but only through a veil; and therefore the glory shone forth through a cloud of thick darkness.

It is true, this is the case to a great extent still. God even yet has his dwelling in unapproachable light; and with all the discoveries of the Gospel, he is only seen "as through a glass darkly." This feature, however, of the divine manifestations falls more into the back-ground in the Gospel; since God has now in very deed dwelt with men on the earth, and given such revelations of himself by Christ, that "he who hath seen him," may be said to "have seen the Father." It seems now, comparing the revelations of God in the New with those of the Old Testament, as if the pillar of cloud were in a measure removed, and the pillar of fire alone remained. And in each of the aspects which this fire assumed, we find the corresponding feature most fully verified in Christ. He is the light of men. The glory of the Father shines forth in him as full of grace and truth. He alone has revealed the Father, and can give the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him. Therefore, he is the Word or revelation of God, and the effulgence of his glory. And while merciful and compassionate in the last degree to sinners—the very personification of love, he yet has eyes like a flame of fire, and his feet as of burning brass, and he walks amid the golden candlesticks, as he did in the camp of Israel, to bring to light the hidden works of darkness, and cause his indignation to smoke against the hypocrites.¹

(2.) But besides being a symbol of the Lord's revealed character, the pillar of fire and cloud had certain offices to perform to the Israelites. These were for guidance and protection. It was by this that the Lord directed their course through the dreary and trackless waste, which lay between Egypt and Canaan, shewing

¹ John i. 4, 5, 11, viii. 12, ix. 5; Matt. xi. 27; Eph. i. 17; Heb. i. 3; Rev. i. 14, 15, ii. iii. &c.

them when to set forth, in what direction to proceed, where to abide, and also affording light to their steps, when the journey was by night. For this purpose, when the course was doubtful, the ark of the covenant went foremost (Numb. x. 33), but when there was no doubt regarding the direction that was to be taken, it appears rather to have occupied the centre (Numb. x. 17, 21), in either case alike occupying the place that was most suitable, as connected with the symbol of the Lord's presence. In addition to these important benefits, it also served as a shade from the heat of a scorching sun, and on one occasion, at least—when the Israelites were closely pursued by the Egyptians—it stood as a wall of defence between them and their enemies.

That in all this the pillar of fire and cloud performed externally and visibly the part which is now discharged by Christ toward his people in the spiritual and divine life, is too evident to require any illustration. He reveals himself to them as the Captain of Salvation, who conducts them through the wilderness of life, and brings them in safety to his Father's house. He never leaves them alone, but by his word and Spirit leads them into all the truth—assuring them of his continual nearness to comfort them in their troubles, and support them under their manifold temptations. He presents himself to their view as having gone before them in the way, and appoints them to no field of trial or conflict with evil, through which he has not already passed as their forerunner. Whatever wisdom is needed to direct, whatever grace to overcome, they are entitled to expect it from his hand ; he is their shield, so that the sun shall not be permitted to smite them by day, nor the moon by night ; and “when the blast of the terrible ones comes as a storm against the wall,” they have in him a “refuge from the storm, and a shadow from the heat.” Does it seem too much to expect so great things from him ? Or does faith, struggling with the infirmities of the flesh, and the temptations of the world, find it hard at times to lay hold of the spiritual reality ? It will do well in such a case to revive its fainting spirit by recurring to the visible manifestations of God in the wilderness. Let it mark there the goings of the divine Shepherd with his people ; and assure itself, that as he can neither change nor deny himself, and is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, so what he then did amid the visible realities of sense and time, he

cannot but be ready to do again in the spiritual experience of a redeemed people to the end of time. He has recorded what he did in the one case, for the express purpose of encouraging hope and confidence in regard to the other.

The whole of what has been said regarding the sojourn in the wilderness, has reference more immediately to the comparatively brief period during which properly the Israelites *should* have been there. The frequent outbreaks of a rebellious spirit, and especially the dreadful revolt which arose on the return of the spies from searching the land of Canaan, so manifestly proved them to be unfit for the proper occupation of the promised land, that the Lord determined to retain them in the wilderness till the older portion—those who were above twenty years when they left Egypt—had all perished. It was some time in the second year after their departure, that this decree was passed concerning them ; and the period fixed in the decree being, in round numbers, forty years, a year for every day the spies had been employed in searching the land, including, however, what had been already spent, there remained the long term of upwards of thirty-eight years, during which the promise of God was suffered to fall into abeyance. Of what passed during this dismal period scarcely anything is recorded. The only circumstances noticed concerning it are those connected with the punishment of the Sabbath-breaker, and the rebellion of Korah and his company. How far the miraculous provision for the desert was affected by the change in question, we are not told, though we may naturally infer it to have been to some extent—to such an extent as might render it proper, if not necessary, to bring into play all the available resources naturally belonging to the region. It was a time of judgment, and the very silence of Scripture concerning it is ominous. That the Lord wished them to regard their condition as at once a sad and anomalous one, is evident from what is recorded at the close of the period in Jos. v. 2–9, where we are told, that from the period of their coming under the judgment of the Lord up till that time, they had not been circumcised ; the reason of which we are plainly given to understand was, that they “ had not obeyed the voice of the Lord.” And now when the circumcision was renewed, and the whole company became a circumcised people, “ The Lord said

unto Joshua, This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you."

What is meant here by the reproach of Egypt, is not the reproach or shame of the sin they had contracted in Egypt, intimating that that impure state was now at an end, and that they had now at length entered on a comparatively pure, properly a new condition. The thing meant is the reproach which the people of Egypt were all this time casting upon them for the unhappy circumstances in which they were placed. It was that reproach which Moses so much dreaded on a former occasion, when he prayed the Lord not to pour out his indignation on the people to consume them: "For wherefore (says he) should the Egyptians say, For mischief did he bring them out to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth!" (Ex. xxxii. 12.) And this reproach was again the first thought that presented itself to the mind of Moses, when, on the occasion of the return of the spies, the Lord threatened to consume the mass of the people, and raise a new seed from Moses himself: "Then the Egyptians shall hear it (for thou broughtest up this people in thy might from among them), and they will tell it to the inhabitants of this land," &c. (Numb. xiv. 13-16.) The ground and occasion of the reproach was, that the Lord had not fulfilled in their behalf the grand promise of the covenant, for the realization of which they had left Egypt with such high hopes and such great glory. So far from having obtained what was promised, they had been made to wander like forlorn outcasts through the wilds and wildernesses of Arabia, where their carcasses were continually falling into a dishonoured grave. The covenant, in short, was for a time suspended,—the people were lying under the ban of heaven; and it was fitting that the ordinance of circumcision, the sacrament of the covenant, should be suspended too. But now that they were again received through circumcision into the full standing and privileges of a covenant-condition, it was a proof that the judgment of God had expired—that their proper relation to him was again restored—that he was ready to carry into execution the promise on which he had caused them to hope; and that, consequently, the ground of Egypt's reproach, as would presently be seen, was entirely rolled away.¹

¹ See Hengstenberg's *Authentic*, ii. p. 17. The opinion thrown out by the author of

It would seem, as might also have naturally been expected, on the supposition of this view of the case being correct, that the celebration of what might now be called the other sacrament of the covenant, the Passover, was suspended during the same period. We read of its having been celebrated at the beginning of the second year after their departure from Egypt (Numb. ix.), but never again till the renewal of circumcision on the borders of Canaan (Josh. v. 10). The same cause which brought a suspension of the one ordinance, of necessity implied a virtual prohibition to celebrate the other. The more so, indeed, as it was the children who were more directly concerned in the ceasing of circumcision, while the non-celebration of the passover directly touched the parents themselves. Even in regard to the ordinance of circumcision, the parents could not but conclude, that as it had been suspended from being the peculiar sign of the covenant, their circumcision had become in a manner uncircumcision. On *their* account, the flow of the divine goodness toward the congregation had meanwhile received a check as to its outward manifestation; and even what was promised and in reserve for their children, must for the present lie over till the revival of a better spirit opened the way for the possession of a more privileged condition.

But the question will naturally occur, Did the whole of that generation, which came out of Egypt as full-grown men, actually perish without an interest in the mercy of God? Did they really live and die under the solemn ban of heaven, aliens from his true commonwealth, and strangers to his covenant of promise? Was not Aaron, was not Moses himself one of those, who bore in this respect the punishment of iniquity, and died while the church was without its sacraments? Yes; and we may hence, with the utmost certainty conclude, that there was mercy mingled with the judgment. The Lord did not cease to be the gracious God,

the art. Circumcision in the Bib. Cyclopædia: "Knowing that the Egyptians were circumcised, it no longer remains doubtful how *the reproach of Egypt*, in Josh. v. 9, should be interpreted," will require no special refutation after what has been stated. There were far more solid grounds in the case for taking up a reproach, than the simple want of circumcision; and, besides, it is not certain that the Egyptians were accustomed to reproach those who were uncircumcised. It is even somewhat doubtful, if any but the priests were regularly circumcised, at least counted it an honour or distinctive mark to be so.

long-suffering, and plenteous in goodness to those who truly sought him. Only they had then to seek him under peculiar disadvantages, and in the absence of signs and tokens of his favour granted in all ordinary circumstances. His grace was still there, as it is in every judgment he executes on his professing people in this world; but it was grace in a disguise—grace as dropping from an overhanging cloud, rather than as shining forth from a clear and serene sky. Hence, while the two greatest ordinances of the church were suspended, others were still left to encourage their hope in the Lord's mercy: there was the pillar of fire and cloud, the tabernacle of testimony, the altar of sacrifice, not to mention others of inferior note. So that, to use the words of Calvin, who had a far better discernment of the anomalous state of things which then existed than the great majority of commentators since: "In one part only were the people excommunicated; there still were means of support to bear them up, that (the truly penitent) might not sink into despair. As if a father should lift up his hand to drive from him a disobedient son, and yet with the other should hold him back—at once terrifying him with frowns and chastisements, yet still unwilling that he should go into exile."

The feelings to which this very peculiar state of Israel gave rise are beautifully expressed in the 90th Psalm—whether actually written by Moses or not—which breathes throughout the mournful language of a people suffering under the judgment of God, and yet exercising hope in his mercy. We need have no doubt, therefore, that subjects of grace died in the wilderness, just as afterwards, when the covenant with most of its ordinances was again suspended, subjects of grace, even pre-eminent grace, were carried to Babylon and died there. Yet there is much reason to fear, in regard to the Israelites in the wilderness, that the number of such was comparatively small, both on account of the nature of the judgment itself, and also from the testimonies of the prophets (especially Ez. xx. and Amos v. 25, 26), concerning the extent to which the leaven of Egypt still wrought in the midst of them.

This remarkable portion of God's dealings is well fitted to impress upon us the following truths, important for every age of the church. 1. The tendency of sin to root itself in the soul: when it once fairly obtains a footing there, it will resist all that is wonderful in mercy, and terrible in judgment. For what astonishing

sights had not those men witnessed ! what awful displays of God's justice ! what glorious exhibitions of his goodness ! Yet in the case of most of them, all proved to be in vain. 2. The honour God puts upon his ordinances, especially the sacraments of his covenant. These are for the true children of the covenant ; and it is in his sight a proper thing that they should be hindered from access to them, who do not appear to possess the character of children. 3. The inseparable connection between the promise of God's covenant and the holiness of his people. The inheritance cannot be entered into and possessed but by a believing, spiritual, and holy seed. God *must* have such a people, and till he could get them he would let his inheritance lie waste ; for such only could serve the ends and purposes which their settlement in the inheritance was intended to accomplish. And on that account, God is waiting so long now, before he brings in the everlasting inheritance of life and glory. It is for those only of clean hands and a pure heart ; and till the destined number of such is prepared and ready, it must be known only as an "inheritance reserved in heaven." 4. Finally, what a fearful guilt attaches to a backsliding and corrupt church ! It stays the fountain of God's mercy—it brings reproach on his name and cause, and compels him, in a manner, to visit evil upon those whom he would rather—how much rather !—enlarge and bless.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE DIRECT INSTRUCTION GIVEN TO THE ISRAELITES BEFORE THE ERECTION OF THE TABERNACLE, AND THE INSTITUTION OF ITS SYMBOLICAL SERVICES—THE LAW.

SECTION I.

WHAT PROPERLY, AND IN THE STRICTEST SENSE, TERMED THE LAW, VIZ. THE DECALOGUE—ITS PERFECTION AND COMPLETENESS BOTH AS TO THE ORDER AND SUBSTANCE OF ITS PRECEPTS.

THE historical transactions connected with the redemption of Israel from the land of Egypt, were not immediately succeeded by the introduction of that complicated form of symbolical worship, which peculiarly distinguishes the dispensation of Moses. There was an intermediate space occupied by revelations, which were in themselves of the greatest moment, and which also stood in a relation of closest intimacy with the symbolical religion that followed. The period we refer to is that to which belongs the giving of the law. And it is impossible to understand aright the nature of the tabernacle and its worship, or the purposes they were designed to accomplish, without first obtaining a clear insight into the prior revelation of law, and the place it was intended to hold in the dispensation brought in by Moses.

What precisely formed this revelation of law, and what was the nature of its requirements? This must be our first subject of inquiry; and by a careful investigation of the points connected with it, we hope to avoid some prolific sources of confusion and

error, and prepare the way for a correct understanding of the dispensation as a whole, and the proper adjustment of its several parts.

I. There can be no doubt that the word *law* is used both in the Old and the New Testament Scriptures with some latitude, and that what is meant by "the law" in one place, is sometimes considerably different from what is meant by it in another. It is used to designate indifferently precepts and appointed observances of any kind, as well as the books in which they are enjoined. This only implies, however, that the things commanded by Moses had so much in common that they might be all comprehended in one general term. It does not prevent that the law of the ten commandments may have been properly and distinctively *the law* to Israel, and on that account might have a peculiar and pre-eminent place assigned it in the dispensation. We are convinced that such in reality was the case, and present the following considerations in support of it.

1. The very manner in which these commandments were delivered is sufficient to vindicate for them a place peculiarly their own. For these alone, of all the precepts which form the Mosaic code, were spoken immediately by the voice of God; while the rest were privately communicated to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. Nor were they simply proclaimed by God himself in the hearing of all the people, but that amidst demonstrations of divine majesty, such as were never witnessed on any other occasion. So awfully grand and magnificent was the scene, and so overwhelming the impression produced by it, that the people, we are told, could not endure the sight, and Moses himself exceedingly feared and quaked. That this unparalleled display of the infinite majesty and greatness of Jehovah should have been made to accompany the deliverance of only these ten commandments, seems to have been intended to invest them with a very peculiar character and bearing.

2. The same also may be inferred from their number—ten, the symbol of completeness. It indicates that they formed by themselves an entire whole, made up of the necessary, and no more than the necessary, complement of parts. A good deal of what, if not altogether fanciful, is at least incapable of any solid proof,

has recently been propounded, especially by Bähr and Hengstenberg, regarding the symbolical import of numbers. But there are certain points which may be considered to have been thoroughly established respecting them; and none more so than the symbolical import of ten, as indicating completeness. The ascribing of such an import to this number appears to have been of very ancient origin; for traces are to be found of it in the earliest and most distant nations; and even Spencer, who never admits a symbolical where he can possibly avoid it, is constrained to allow a symbolical import here.¹ "The ten," to use the words of Bähr,² "by virtue of the general laws of thought shuts up the series of primary numbers, and comprehends all in itself. Now, since the whole numeral system consists of so many decades (tens), and the first decade is the type of this endlessly repeating series, the nature of number in general is in this last fully developed, and the entire course comprised in its idea. Hence the first decade, and of course also the number ten is the representative of the whole numeral system. And as number is employed to symbolize being in general, ten must denote the complete perfect being, that is, a number of particulars necessarily connected together, and combined into one whole. So that ten is the natural symbol of perfection and completeness itself—a definite whole, to which nothing is wanting." It is on account of this symbolical import of the number ten, that the plagues of Egypt were precisely of that number—forming as such a complete round of judgments; and it was for the same reason that the transgressions of the people in the wilderness were allowed to proceed till the same number had been reached—when they had "sinned ten times," they had filled up the measure of their iniquities (Numb. xiv. 22). Hence also the consecration of the tenths or tithes, which had grown into an established usage so early as the days of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 20). The whole increase was represented by ten, and

¹ De Leg. Heb. iii. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matth. xxv. 1: Numero denario gavisum plurimum est gens Judaica et in sacris et in civilibus. But see the proof fully given in Bähr, Symb. i. p. 175 ss. Among other ancient authorities he produces the following: Etymol. Mgn. s. v. δεκάς: ἡ ἔχουσα ἐν αὐτῇ πάντα ἀριθμὸν. Cyrill. in Hos. iii.: σύμβολον δὲ τελειότητος ὁ δέκα ἐστὶν ἀριθμὸς, παντέλειος ὢν. Herm. Trismeg. Poemand. 13: ἡ ἐνάς οὖν κατὰ λόγον τὴν δεκάδα ἔχει καὶ ἡ δέκας τὴν ἐνάδα.

² Symbolik, i. p. 175.

one of these was set apart to the Lord in token of all being derived from him and held of him. So this revelation of law from Sinai, which was to serve for all coming ages as the grand expression of God's holiness, and the summation of man's duty, was comprised in the number ten, to indicate its perfection as one complete and comprehensive whole—"the all that a divinely called people, as well as a single individual, should and should not do in reference to God and their neighbour."¹

3. It perfectly accords with this view of the ten commandments, and is a farther confirmation of it, that they were written by the finger of God on two tables of stone—written on *both sides*, so as to cover the entire surface, and not leave room for future additions, as if what was already given might admit of improvements; and written on *durable tables of stone*, while the rest of the law was written only on parchment or paper. It was for no lack of writing materials, as Hengstenberg has fully shewn,² that in this and other cases the engraving of letters upon stones was used in that remote period; for materials in great abundance existed in Egypt and its neighbourhood, and are known to have been used from the earliest times, in the papyrus, the byssus-manufacture, and the skins of beasts. "The stone," he justly remarks, "points to the perpetuity which belongs to the law, as an expression of the divine will, originating in the divine nature. It was an image of the truth uttered by our Lord, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.'"

4. Then, these ten words, as they are called, had the singular honour conferred on them of being properly the terms of the covenant formed at Sinai. Thus Moses, when rehearsing what had taken place, says, Deut. iv. 13, "And he declared to you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Again in ch. ix. 9, 11, he calls these tables of stone "the tables of the

¹ Sack's Apologetik, p. 180. As further examples of the Scriptural import of *ten*, we might have mentioned the ten men in Zechariah laying hold of the skirt of a Jew. ch. viii. 23, the parable of the ten virgins, and the ten horns or kingdoms in Revelation.

² Authentie, i. p. 481 ss. So Buddeus, Hist. Eccl. i. p. 606: Argumento vero id etiam erat, perennem istam legem esse atque perpetuam, &c., and Calvinistic divines generally.

covenant." So also in Ex. xxxiv. 28, "the words written upon the tables, the ten commandments," are expressly called "the words of the covenant." It is true, some other commands are recorded in the preceding context; and in the verse immediately preceding the Lord said to Moses, that "after the tenor of (at the mouth of, according to) these words he had made a covenant with Israel." It is true, also, that at the formal ratification of the covenant, Ex. xxiv., we read of *the book of the covenant*, which comprehended not only the ten commandments, but also the precepts contained in ch. xxi.-xxiii.; for it is clear that this book comprised all that the Lord had then said either directly or by the instrumentality of Moses, and to which the people answered, "we will do it." But it is carefully to be observed, that a marked distinction is still put between the ten commandments and the other precepts; for the former are called emphatically "the words of the Lord," while the additional words given through Moses are called "the judgments" (v. 3). They are, indeed, peculiarly rights or judgments, having respect for the most part to what should be done from one man to another, and what, in the event of violations of the law being committed, ought to be enforced judicially with the view of rectifying or checking the evil. Their chief object was to secure through the instrumentality of the magistrate, that if the proper *love* should fail to influence the hearts and lives of the people, still the *right* should be maintained. Yet while these form the great body of the additional words communicated to Moses and written in the book of the covenant, the symbolical institutions had also a certain place assigned them; for both in ch. xxiii., and again in ch. xxiv., the three yearly feasts and one or two other points of this description are noticed. But still these directions and judgments formed no proper addition to the matter of the ten commandments, considered as God's revelation of law to his people. The terms of the covenant still properly stood, as we are expressly and repeatedly told, in the ten commandments; and what, besides, was added before the ratification of the covenant, cannot justly be regarded as having had any other object in view, in so far as they partook of the nature of laws, than as subsidiary directions and restraints to aid in protecting the covenant, and securing its better observance. The feast-laws, in particular, so far from forming any proper addition

to the terms of the covenant, had respect primarily to the people's profession of adherence to it, and gave directions concerning the sacramental observances of the Jewish church.

5. What has been said in regard to the ten commandments, as alone properly constituting the terms of the covenant, is fully established, and the singular importance of these commandments further manifested, by the place afterwards assigned them in the tabernacle. The most sacred portion of this, that which formed the very heart and centre of all the services connected with it, was the ark of the covenant. It was the peculiar symbol of the Lord's covenant-presence and faithfulness, and immediately above it was the throne on which he sat as king in Jeshurun. But that ark was made on purpose to contain the two tables of the law, and was called "the ark of the covenant," simply because it contained "the tables of the covenant." The book of the law was afterwards placed by Moses at the side of the ark (Deut. xxxi. 26), that it might serve as a check upon the Levites, who were the proper guardians and keepers of the book; it was a wise precaution lest they should prove unfaithful to their charge. The tables on which the ten commandments were written, alone kept possession of the ark, and were thus plainly recognized as containing in themselves the sum and substance of what was strictly held to be required by the covenant in righteousness.

6. Finally, our Lord and his apostles always point to the revelation of law engraven upon these stones as holding a pre-eminent place, and, indeed, as comprising all that in the strict and proper sense was to be esteemed as law. The Scribes and Pharisees of that age had completely inverted the order of things. Their carnality and self-righteousness had led them to exalt the precepts respecting ceremonial observances to the highest place, and to throw the duties inculcated in the ten commandments comparatively into the back ground—thus treating the mere appendages of the covenant as of more account than its very ground and basis. Hence, when seeking to expose the insufficient and hollow nature of "the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees," our Lord made his appeal to the testimony engraved on the two tables, and most commonly, indeed, though not exclusively, to the precepts of the second table, because he had to do more especially with hypocrites, whose defects and shortcomings might most readily be ex-

posed by a reference to the duties of the second table, (Matt. xix. 16 ; Luke x. 25, xviii. 18, &c.) In such cases, as Calvin justly remarks, "Christ speaks of those works by which a man ought to approve himself as just. The obedience of the first table consisted almost entirely either in the internal affection of the heart, or in ceremonies. The affection of the heart was not visible, and hypocrites were diligent in the observance of ceremonies ; but the works of charity were of such a nature as to be a solid attestation of righteousness."¹ For the same reason, Christ's Sermon on the Mount, which was chiefly intended to be an exposition of the real nature and far-reaching import of the ten commandments, bears most respect to those commandments which belonged to the second table, and which had suffered most from the corruption of the times. But the prophets of the Old Testament had done precisely the same thing in reproving the ungodliness prevalent in their day. They were continually striving to recal men from the mere outward observances which the most worthless hypocrites could perform, to the sincere piety toward God, and deeds of substantial kindness toward man, required by the law of the two tables ; so that the prophets, as well as the law, were truly said to hang upon one and the same commandment of love.² In like manner, the Apostle Paul, after Christ, as the prophets before, when discoursing in regard to the law, what it was or was not, what it could or could not do, always has in view pre-eminently the law of the two tables. Without an exception his examples are taken from the very words of these, or what they clearly prohibited and required, (Rom. ii. 17-23, iii. 10-18, vii. 7, xiii. 9, 10 ; 1 Tim. i. 7-10.) This, of course, does not exactly apply to the argument maintained in the epistles to the Galatians and Colossians, where the error met and opposed consisted in an undue exaltation of the ceremonial institutions by themselves, as if the observance of these by the Christian Church were essential to salvation. In this case he could not possibly avoid referring chiefly

¹ Inst. B. ii. c. 8, § 52.

² See especially Ps. xv. xxiv., which describe the righteousness required under the covenant, by obedience to the ten commandments, and more particularly to those of the second table—specially indited, no doubt, to meet the tendency which the more attractive and orderly celebration then introduced into God's service was fitted to awaken ; see also Ps. xl. l. ii. ; Isa. i. lvii., &c., Micah, vi.

to precepts of a ceremonial nature, and discussing them with respect to the light in which they were improperly viewed by certain parties in the apostolic church. But when the question was, what the law in its strict and proper sense really required, and what were the ends it was fitted to serve, he never fails to manifest his concurrence with the other inspired writers in taking the ten words as the law and the testimony, by which everything was to be judged and determined.

We should despair of proving any thing respecting the Old Testament dispensation, if these considerations do not prove that the law of the ten commandments stood out from all the other precepts enjoined under the ministration of Moses, and were intended to form a full and comprehensive exhibition of the righteousness of the law, in its strict and proper sense. No doubt, many of the other precepts teach substantially what these commandments did, or contain statements and regulations bearing some way upon their violation or observance. But this was not done with the view of supplying any new or additional matter of obligation; it was merely intended to explain their real import, or to give instructions how to adapt to them what might be called the jurisprudence of the state. We cannot but regard it as an unhappy circumstance, tending to perpetuate much misunderstanding and confusion regarding the legislation of Moses, that the distinction has been practically overlooked, which it so manifestly assigns to the ten commandments, and that they have so generally been regarded by the more learned theologians, as the kind of quintessence of the whole Mosaic code, as the few general or representative heads under which all the rest are to be ranged. Thus Calvin, while he held the ten commandments to be a perfect rule of righteousness, and gave for the most part a correct, as well as admirable exposition of their tenor and design, yet failed to bring out distinctly their singular and prominent place in the Mosaic economy, and in his commentary reduces all the ceremonial institutions to one or other of these ten commandments. They were, therefore, regarded by him as standing to the entire legislation of Moses in the relation of primary elements or heads. And in that case, there must have been, as he partially admits there was, something shadowy in the one as well as in the other. But what was chiefly a defect of arrangement in Calvin

and many subsequent writers, has in Bähr been elevated into a formal principle, and is laid as the foundation of his view of the whole Mosaic system. "The decalogue is representative of the whole law; it contains religious and political, not less than moral precepts. The first command is a purely religious one; as is also the fourth, which belongs to the ceremonial law; and, indeed, generally by reason of the theocratical constitution, all civil commands were at the same time religious and moral ones, and inversely; so that the old division into moral, ceremonial, and political, or judicial, appears quite untenable."¹ On this point he even quotes Spencer with approbation, who considered all the different classes of precepts to be exhibited in the decalogue as on a small tablet, or in a brief compend. The majority of continental divines, evangelical as well as rationalistic, and as well in present as in former times, substantially espouse the same view. The mischievous consequences involved in it will appear in the course of our remarks upon some parts of the decalogue itself, and also afterwards when unfolding the relation of the decalogue to the ceremonial institutions. It is such an error as confounds the means of salvation with the great principles of religious and moral obligation, and leaves, if followed out, no solid basis for the doctrine of a vicarious atonement to rest on. With perfect consistency, Bähr constructs his system without the help of such an atonement.

II. We proceed now to consider the excellence of this law of the ten commandments, and to shew by an examination of its

¹ Symbolik, I. p. 384. He elsewhere, p. 181, seeks to justify this view from the number *ten*, in which the law was contained; and which number he considers to have been employed in the promulgation of this law, because "it was the fundamental law of Israel, in a religious and political respect, the representative of the whole Israelitish constitution." We hold this to be a most arbitrary interpretation, having nothing to justify it in the law itself, and disproved by the several considerations adduced above, for the peculiar position of the decalogue. We conceive it also to be a departure from his own view of the symbolical import of the *ten*—which he justly regards as indicating perfection and completeness; whereas, in attributing to the decalogue a representative value, and making it stand for the whole, he gives it the import of the *tenth*. If the whole law had been comprised in ten groups, and the decalogue had consisted of one from each group, we could then, but only then, have seen the force and justice of his interpretation.

method and substance, how justly it was regarded as a complete and perfect summary of religious and moral duty.

It is scarcely possible, even at this stage of the world's history, to consider with any care the words of this law, without in some measure apprehending its high character as a standard of rectitude. And could we throw ourselves back to the time when it was first promulgated—instead of looking at it, as we now do, from the eminence of a clearer and more perfect revelation—could we distinctly contemplate it, as given seventeen centuries before the Christian era, and received as the summary of all that is morally right and dutiful by a people who had just left the polluted atmosphere of Egypt, we could not fail to discern, in the very existence of such a law, one of the most striking proofs of the divine character of the Mosaic legislation. We should be much more disposed to exclaim here, than in regard to the outward prodigy, which first called forth the declaration, “This is the finger of God.”

A remarkable testimony was given to the general excellence of the decalogue, and its vast superiority as a code of morality, to any thing found among the native superstitions of the East, in the language of those Indians referred to by Dr Claudius Buchanan: “If you send us a missionary, send us one who has learned your ten commandments.”¹ If modern idolaters were thus taken with the divine beauty and singular preciousness of these commandments, we know those could have no less reason to be so, to whom they were first delivered. For the land of Egypt, out of which they had recently escaped, was as remarkable for the grossness of its superstition as for the superiority of its learning and civilization. As far back as our information respecting it carries us, at a period certainly more remote than that in which Israel sojourned within its borders, the Egyptians appear to have been immersed in the deepest mire of idolatry and its kindred abominations; and on them, in an especial sense, was chargeable the guilt and folly of “having changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.” Not satisfied even with this wide range of image-worship, they multiplied to them-

¹ Essay on the Estab. of an Episcopal Church in India, p. 61.

selves idols of monstrous forms, such as to their vain imaginations seemed fit symbols, through which to contemplate and adore the objects of their worship. And the kind of worship they paid their idol-gods, it is now ascertained, was connected with the foulest pollutions and most vicious excesses. There are not wanting indications of this in Herodotus, and several allusions are also made to it in the Books of Moses. But one of the most profound inquirers into the religion of the ancients, has recently shewn, on evidence the most complete, that the worship of ancient Egypt was essentially of a Bacchanalian character, full of lust and revelry; that its most frequented rites were accompanied with scenes of wantonness and impure indulgence; and that it sometimes gave rise to enormities not fit to be mentioned.¹

Such was the atmosphere in which the Israelites had lived during their abode in Egypt; and it was when fresh from such a region, that the law of the ten commandments was proclaimed in their hearing, and laid as the foundation of their entire polity,—a law which unfolds the clearest views of God's character and service—which denounces every form and species of idolatry as inconsistent with the spirituality of the divine nature—which enjoins the purest worship and the highest morality, and in its very form is a model of perfection and completeness. Wisdom of this kind Moses could least of all have learned from the Egyptians; nor could it have been his, unless it had descended to him from above.²

1. Let us look first to the perfection manifested in the beautiful order and arrangement of these commandments. They were written on two tables, and fall into two grand divisions corresponding to these—the first comprehending our duty to God, and the second our duty to man. This is admitted on all hands, though there is some diversity of opinion where the one terminates and

¹ Creuzer, *Symbolik*, i. p. 448, ss.; comp. also. Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, i. p. 118, ss.; *Egypt and Books of Moses*, p. 203, ss.

² It is one of the few correct things which Tacitus states concerning the religion of the Jews, that they counted it profanity to make images in the likeness of man, and that they worshipped only one supreme, eternal, unchangeable, and everlasting God (*Hist.* v. 5). It would be difficult, however, to throw together a larger amount of ignorance and error in the same space, than is expressed in this and the preceding chapter, by Tacitus, respecting the religious customs and rites of the Jews.

the other begins. Discarding the view adopted by the Roman Catholic, and generally also by Lutheran writers, which, by arbitrarily throwing the two first commandments into one, and splitting the last into two, places only three in the first table and seven in the last; the division most commonly adopted by Protestant divines, is that of four in the first and six in the second table. Yet this division does not appear to accord with the significance manifestly attached to the number *ten*, in which the whole are comprised, and which, in the case of a division into two great parts, we might naturally have expected to fall into two fives—two equal, incomplete halves. This also is what Josephus testifies to have been done, for he affirms that there were “five commandments upon each table, and two and a half upon each side of them.”¹ We are certainly not disposed to regard his testimony as by any means conclusive; but it is so far entitled to weight, as it no doubt expresses the current opinion or general tradition of his countrymen. And a more careful consideration of the nature of the fifth commandment will be found to vindicate its title to a place in the first rather than in the second table. For if the sum of the second table be, “Love thy neighbour as thyself,” as is clearly implied in both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures (Lev. xix. 18; Matt. xxii. 39), the command to honour parents can scarcely with propriety be included in it, as they do not stand on a footing of equality, in the relation of “a neighbour,” strictly so called. They are rather, according to the scriptural view, to be regarded as representatives of God, to whom he delegates a portion of his authority, and for whom he consequently exacts a portion of the honour due to himself. Hence the apostle Paul directs, that children should be taught “to shew *piety* at home, and to requite their parents,”—thus making filial reverence and dutiful regard to parents of the essence of religion. “The fifth commandment,” says Baumgarten, excellently, “enjoins the honouring of parents; but Jehovah alone is entitled to honour, and a man as such has no honour before others as such. If, however, the word here is of an obligation to give honour to men, this is what they could only have from God. Parents are therefore regarded as those whom God appoints to receive honour from their

¹ Ant. B. III. c. 6, § 5.

children. Nor is there any difficulty in understanding how it should be so ; for the creative power of God, on which all life depends, is communicated to the children through their parents ; so that God, as the creator of life, appears to the children primarily in the parents, as the earthly divinities (the *diis terrestribus*), to use the language of Grotius. We can thus readily explain why the command to honour parents has been assigned to the first half of the ten words, which expressly refers to Jehovah, as we also find in each one of those five first words the designation, ‘The Lord thy God.’ But since the relation between parents and children is the basis of all the divinely constituted relations of human society, which involve stations of superiority and inferiority, as the names also of father and mother have been made to stretch over the whole natural circle (Gen. xlv. 8 ; Judg. v. 7), it is certainly in the spirit of the law to explain this command, with Luther, in reference to the sphere of the civil life. Now, to this command, as Paul specially notices, Ep. vi. 2, is attached a promise, as being properly the first, and so the only one among the ten, that has a promise connected with it. For the promise at the second is only to be regarded as an appendage to the threatening which precedes, and stands in immediate connection with the prohibition. But that the command is here first coupled with a determinate promise, arises from the circumstance, that in this word the honouring of God is first brought out into the circle of the natural life, to which the Old Testament with its promises everywhere primarily refers.”¹

¹ Commentar, ii. pp. 12, 13. This last thought, which the learned author goes on to amplify, scarcely touches the exact bearing, we think, of the promise. It has respect rather to continuance in the land than to the possession of life—“that thy days may be long upon the land”—that thou mayest continue long in the enjoyment of what God promised to thy fathers. It is the great objective blessing of the covenant—the inheritance, which is appended by way of promise to this fifth commandment ; and appended to it, we conceive, on this account especially, because it is with the authority of God as delegated to these earthly heads, that we come first and most directly into contact ; and in them also it is associated with so much that is fitted to win and captivate the heart, that here peculiarly it may be said, “If we do not love (so as to obey) those whom we have seen, how can we love God, whom we have not seen ?” The Lord hung the people’s whole interest in the inheritance on the due fulfilment of the duties growing out of the parental relation, in the confidence that if these were neglected, nothing connected with his glory would be rightly attended to. According to this view, “a promise of long life and prosperity” hardly comes up to the full import of the encouragement either for

These considerations are amply sufficient to remove Calvin's objection to this view, as "confounding the distinction between piety and charity."¹ And it might be farther confirmed by pointing to the close connection established in other parts of the books of Moses, between God and the constituted authorities in the land, as if the one were in a sense identical with the other. Thus, in Deut. xix. 17, we find it ordained, that the men at strife with each other should "stand before the Lord, before the priests and the judges;" and in Ex. xxi. 6, the master of a servant is directed, in certain circumstances, to "bring him unto the judges," as it is in our version, but literally, unto God—the authority of the judges being regarded as that of God. So, again, in Ex. xxii. 8; and in v. 28, it is said, "Thou shalt not revile God (not gods as in our version), nor curse the ruler of thy people"—where the visible representative of God is coupled with God himself, and the offence committed against the one is held to be a dishonour done to the other. It is precisely in the same way, that the honouring of parents is placed among the things due to God himself. And by this arrangement we discover a beautiful order and gradation in the successive commands of the first table: Give God the honour and glory due to him, 1. In regard to his being, as the one living God; 2. to his worship; 3. to his name, or the outward manifestations he gives of himself; 4. to his day of rest; 5. to his representatives. Nor is it unworthy of notice to mark the gradual merging of the duties of the one table into those of the other—observable first, in the fourth commandment, which bears an especial respect to the condition of servants, and demands their release from ordinary labour every seventh day—but again, and more especially in the fifth, which has respect to men—to men, indeed, as God's representatives, and, as such, clothed with a portion of that authority which properly belongs only to him—but still in such a sense to men, that the transition appears most natural and easy, from such honour paid to God in them, to the kind and upright behaviour due from one man to another, in the ordinary intercourse of life.

Old or New Testament times.—The division of the two tables into two fives, has also been espoused by Hengstenberg, *Authentie*, II. p. 605, and others on the continent.

¹ Inst. B. II. c. viii. § 12.

The wisdom manifested, however, in the order and arrangement of the decalogue, not only appears in the contents of the two tables, but also in the relative position of these tables themselves—the first comprising the duties we owe to God, and the second those we owe to men. The forms and manifestations of love to God occupy the first rank of duties, and then, in a secondary place, but still in very close connection with the other, those expressive of love to man. Here, as well as in the Gospel, religion was made the foundation and root of morality. We must first stand, it was in a manner declared, in a becoming relation to God, and be rightly affectioned toward him, otherwise it will be vain to expect that we shall act our part aright toward our fellow-creatures. If our hearts have not come into fellowship and harmony with the great Head of the family, it is impossible, in the nature of things, that we should feel and act as brethren toward its members. And the principle of loving obedience to him must ever be, as Augustine has well expressed it, “in a sense the parent and guardian of all the virtues.”¹

There may, no doubt, be some measure of love and kindness between man and man, where there is no love, but only deep and rooted enmity toward God. Were it not so, society in irreligious countries would fall to pieces. But in such cases, there can be no love of the right kind—no love to men as the offspring of the Creator, made in his image; nor can it exist in the proper degree, but must, in many respects, be partial, defective, and erring in its manifestations. It was, therefore, in consistence with the highest wisdom, that the things which belong to God should in this grand summary of duty be exalted to the first place; and in farther demonstration of their pre-eminent rank and importance, it is to the commands of this table, and to these alone, that there are attached special reasons for God's exacting and man's giving the obedience required. The five commands of the second table are all of them simple and brief enunciations of the will of God as to the path of duty.

2. It is of more importance, however, to have a correct view of the perfection of the decalogue as to the summary of duty contained in it. Does it really prove itself, on examination, to be

¹ De Civ. Dei, L. xiv. c. 11. Mater quodammodo est omnium custosque virtutum.

a full and comprehensive statement of all obligation of duty toward God and man? and that with respect to the heart, as well as the outward walk and conduct?

An extremely low estimate, in this respect, is formed of the ten commandments by Spencer and his school, as well as of the other portions of the law of Moses. Spencer himself smiles at the idea of all religious and moral obligation being contained here in its fundamental principles, and affirms that such an extent of meaning can be brought out of it only by forcing on its words an import quite foreign to their proper sense. He can find nothing more in it than a few plain and disconnected precepts, aimed at the prohibition of idolatry and its natural effects.¹ "In the Mosaic covenant," says one, who here trod in the footsteps of Spencer, "God appeared chiefly as a temporal prince, and therefore gave laws intended rather to direct the outward conduct than to regulate the actings of the heart. A temporal monarch claims from his subjects only outward honour and obedience. God, therefore, acting in the Sinai covenant as king of the Jews, demanded from them no more."² What! the living and eternal God stoop to form such a mock-covenant as this, and resort to such a wretched expedient to uphold his honour and authority! Was it for him to descend from heaven and invest himself with the most imposing emblems of divine power and glory, that he might proclaim the terms of a covenant, the only aim of which was to draw around him a set of formal attendants and crouching hypocrites—men of show and parade—the mere ghosts and shadows of obedient children! It is the worst part of an earthly monarch's lot to be so often surrounded with creatures of this description; but to suppose that the living God, who from the spirituality of his nature must ever look mainly on the heart, and so far from seeking, must positively abhor any profession of obedience, which does not flow from the wellspring of a loving heart—to suppose that he should have actually entered into a covenant of blood to secure such a worthless display, betrays an astonishing misapprehension of the character of God, and the most shallow and unsatisfactory

¹ De Legibus Heb. L. I. c. 2. †

² Theol. Dissertations by Dr John Erskine, p. 5, 37.

view of the whole transactions connected with the revelation of Moses.¹

Indeed, if no more had been required by God in his law than what these divines imagine, the commendations bestowed on it, and the injunctions given to study and weigh its precepts, as a master-piece of divine wisdom, could only be regarded as extravagant and bombastical. What, on such a supposition, could we make of the command laid upon Joshua to meditate in it day and night (Josh. i. 8), or of the celebration of its matchless excellence and worth by the Psalmist, as better than thousands of gold and silver (Ps. cxix. 72), or of his prayer, that his eyes might be opened to behold the wondrous things contained in it? (Ps. cxix. 18). Such things clearly imply a great depth of meaning, and a vast breadth of requirement in the law of Moses, and pre-eminently in that part of it which formed the very heart and centre of the whole—the decalogue. Nor would the low and shallow

¹ It is strange that this notion so unworthy of God, and so obviously inconsistent with the nature of the law itself, and the recorded facts of Israelitish history, still holds its ground among us. The shades of Spencer and Warburton still rest even upon many minds of vigorous thought. The covenant of law is with the utmost confidence, and with the tone of one who had made a sort of discovery in the matter, represented by Mr Johnstone in his *Israel after the Flesh*, as a simply national covenant, having no other object than to maintain the national recognition of God, and no respect whatever to individuals (ch. i.) Even Mr Litton, in his able work on the *Church of Christ*, says, “If we look back to the provisions of the law when it was first promulgated, we find in them little or no reference to anything beyond the national worship of Jehovah, as the tutelary God of the nation” (p. 105). He allows, indeed, that “the law *implicitly* enjoined the spiritual service of the heart,” but the actual requiring of this “was an extension of its meaning reserved for future revelations” (p. 107). Not revelations, we should say, but spiritual thought and self-application—these certainly were necessary, but no more than these were necessary, to find in the law a great deal more than what related to the outward conduct, or the national acknowledgment of Jehovah. Why, only the first commandment of the ten properly referred to such an acknowledgment. And then, if that was all they required, how could the Israelites in the wilderness have been treated as guilty of a breach of the covenant for simply failing to exercise faith in a particular word of God? Or, how could our Lord charge the Scribes and Pharisees of his time with being condemned by their law, while they rigidly adhered to the acknowledgment of God? Besides, the law is not now, and never was intended, to be viewed as standing by itself. It was a mere appendage to the covenant of Abraham, and the revelations therewith connected. And if these were express on any point, it was, as we have shewn in vol. 1st., on the necessity of personal faith and heart-holiness, to fulfil the calling of a son of Abraham. If the law did not require spiritual service, it must have been a retrogression, not an advance in the revelation of God's character.

views respecting it, on which we have animadverted, ever have been propounded, if, as Calvin suggests,¹ men properly considered the Lawgiver, by whose character that of the law must also be determined. An earthly monarch who is capable of taking cognisance only of the outward actions, must prescribe laws which have respect simply to these. But, for a like reason, the King of heaven, who is himself a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable; can never prescribe a law but such as is spiritual, and has respect peculiarly to the thoughts and affections of the heart—to the outward behaviour no farther than this may be expressive of what is felt within. And it is justly inferred by Bähr from this view of God's character even in regard to the ceremonial part of the law of Moses, that the outward observances of worship it imposed could not possibly be in themselves an end; that they must have been intended to be only an image and representation of internal and spiritual relations; and that the command not to make any likeness or graven image is of itself an incontestable proof of the symbolical character of the Mosaic religion.²

Perhaps nothing has tended more to prevent the right perception of the spirituality and extent of the law of the ten commandments, than a mistaken view of the prevailing negative tone of the precepts, as if they were simply to be regarded as restraints against the doing of what is formally prohibited. If this, however, were the right view of the matter, there manifestly would have been no exception to the negative form of the precepts; they would all have possessed the character merely of prohibitions. But the fourth and fifth have been made to run in the positive form, and one of these, the fourth, in both the negative and positive form, to render it manifest, that along with the prohibition of the specified sins, each precept was to be understood as requiring the corresponding duties. In truth this predominantly negative character is rather a testimony to their deep spiritual import, as opposing at every point the depravity and sinfulness of the human heart. The Israelites then, as professing believers now, admitted by sovereign grace into a covenant-relation to God, and received to an interest in his inheritance, should have been disposed of themselves to love and serve God; they should

¹ Institutes, B. II. c. 8, § 6.

² Symbolik, I. p. 14.

not even have needed the strict constraint and binding obligations of law to do so. But as a solemn proof and testimony how much the reverse was the case, the law was thrown chiefly into the prohibitory form: "Thou shalt not do this or that;" as much as to say, thou art of thyself ready to do it—this is the native bent of thy inclination—but it must be restrained, and things of a contrary nature sought after and performed.

It was precisely on this account, as Hengstenberg has conclusively shewn in opposition to Bähr, that the law in general, and pre-eminently the law of the ten words, was called the *testimony*. This, in the language of the books of Moses, does not mean simply that they testified of God's mind and will, or constituted the revelation he was pleased to give of man's duty; but a testimony containing such a revelation of his holiness, as at the same time brought to light the sins of his people—his witness against the depravity and corruption of the human heart. Hence, when the law or any part of it is spoken of as a testimony, it is usually coupled with the accessory idea of a conviction of sin—a witnessing against them for transgressions committed (Deut. xxxi. 19, 26, 27; Josh. xxiv. 22.) And hence also, as the Lord's testimony against his people's sinfulness, it was placed under the covering of the mercy-seat, and is once and again mentioned in that connection—such a symbolical covering being necessary to render it possible for the righteous Jehovah to meet on terms of peace and friendship with those against whom his law was ever uttering, in a manner, such heavy tidings in his ears (Ex. xxv. 21, 22; xxvi. 34; Lev. xvi. 13.)¹ So that this law was of so pure and searching a nature, that its first effect upon the conscience was necessarily, like the work of the Spirit, "to convince of sin." And it bore the impress of this upon the very form of its precepts.

The more closely we examine these precepts themselves, the more clearly do we perceive their spiritual and comprehensive character. That they recognise love as the root of all obedience, and hatred as the root of all transgression, is plainly intimated in the description given of the doers and transgressors of the law in the second commandment; the latter being characterised as "those that hate me," and the former as "those that love me and

¹Authentic, II. p. 598, 640, comp. Bähr's Symbolik, I. p. 83, ss.

keep my commandments." And that the love required was no shallow and superficial thing, finding its development only in a few easy, external acts, that, on the contrary, it embraced the entire field of man's spiritual agency, and bore respect alike to his thoughts, words, and deeds, is manifest from the following analysis of the second table, which we present in the words of another:¹ "Thou shalt not injure thy neighbour, 1. in deed, and that (1) not in regard to his life, (2) not in regard to his dearest property, his wife, (3) not in regard to his property generally [in other words, in regard to his person, his family, or his property.] 2. In word, ('Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.') 3. In thought, ('Thou shalt not covet.') While it may be admitted, however, that the prohibition of lust or covetousness has an internal character, it may still with some plausibility be maintained, that on this very account the preceding commands are to be taken externally—that we are not in them to go beyond the word and deed—that the mere outward acts, for example, of murder and adultery, are prohibited, so that the four first precepts of the second table may be satisfied without any inward feeling of holiness, this being required only in the last. There is certainly some degree of truth in this remark. That a special prohibition of sinful lust should follow the rest, shews that what had been said in reference to word and deed, *primarily* has respect to these. Still it must not be overlooked, on the other hand, that precisely through the succession of deed, word, and thought, the deed and thought are stript of their merely outward character, and referred back to their root in the mind, are marked simply as the end of a process, the commencement of which is to be sought in the heart. If this is duly considered, it will appear, that what primarily refers only to word and deed, carried at the same time an indirect reference to the emotions of the heart. Thus, the only way to fulfil the command, 'Thou shalt not kill,' is to have the root extirpated from the heart, out of which murder springs. Where that is not done the command is not fully complied with, even though no outward murder is committed. For

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, ii. p. 600. Substantially the same analysis was made by Thomas Aquinas, in a short but very clear quotation given by Hengstenberg from the *Summa*, i. 2. q. 100, § 5.

this must then be dependent upon circumstances which lie beyond the circle of man's proper agency."

There is no less depth and comprehensiveness in the first table, as the same learned writer has remarked, and a similar regard is had in it to thought, word, and deed, only in the reverse order, and lying somewhat less upon the surface. The fourth and fifth precepts demand the due honouring of God in deed ; the third in word ; and the two first, pointing to his sole Godhead and absolute spirituality, require for himself personally, and for his worship, that place in the heart to which they are entitled. Very striking in this respect is the announcement in the second commandment, of a visitation of evil upon those that *hate* God, and an extension of mercy to thousands that *love* him. As much as to say, It is the heart of love I require ; and if even my worship is corrupted by the introduction of images, it is only to be accounted for by the working of hatred instead of love in the heart. So that the heart may truly be called the alpha and the omega of this wonderful revelation of law ; it stands prominently forth at both ends ; and, had no inspired commentary been given on the full import of the ten words, looking merely to these words themselves, we cannot but perceive that they stretch their demands over the whole range of man's active operations, and can only be fulfilled by the constant and uninterrupted exercise of love to God and man, in the various regions of the heart, the conversation, and the conduct.

We *have* commentaries, however, both in the Old and the New Testament Scriptures, upon the law of the Ten Commandments, and such as plainly confirm what has been said of its perfection and completeness as a rule of duty. With manifest reference to the second table, and with the view of expressing in one brief sentence the essence of its meaning, Moses had said : "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. xix. 18) ; and in like manner regarding the first table, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. vi. 5). It is against all reason to suppose, that these precepts should require more than what was required in those, which formed the very groundwork and heart of the whole Mosaic legislation. And we have the express authority of our Lord for holding, that the whole law, as well as the prophets, hung upon them (Matt.

xxii. 40). Nor only so, but, as already noticed, in the Sermon on the Mount he has himself given us an insight into the wide reach and deep spiritual meaning of the ten commandments, clearing them from the false and superficial glosses of the carnal Pharisees. That this is the true character and design of that portion of our Lord's discourse, that it was intended to bring distinctly out the full import of the old, and not to introduce any new and higher legislation, is now generally admitted by the sounder portion at least of exegetical writers.¹ And, to mention no more, the apostle Paul, referring to the law of the ten commandments, calls it "spiritual," "holy, just, and good,"—represents it as the grand instrument in the hands of the Spirit for convincing of sin,—and declares the only fulfilment of it to be perfect love (Rom. vii. 7-14; xiii. 10).

In conclusion, we trust we have established the claim of the law of the ten commandments, to be regarded in the light in which it has commonly been viewed by evangelical divines of this country, as a brief but comprehensive summary of all religious and moral duty. And as a necessary consequence, the two grand rules with which they have been wont to enter on the exposition of the decalogue, are fully justified. These rules are, 1. That the same precept which forbids the *external* acts of sin, forbids likewise the *inward* desires and motions of sin in the heart,—as also, that the precept which commands the external acts of duty, requires at the same time the inward feelings and principles of holiness, of which the external acts should only be the fitting expression. 2. That the negative commands include in them the injunction of the contrary duties, and the positive commands the prohibition of the contrary sins, so that in each there is something required as well as forbidden.—Nor is the language too strong, if rightly understood, which has often been applied to this law, that it is a kind of transcript of God's own pure and righteous character; *i. e.* a faithful and exact representation of that spiritual excellence which eternally belongs to himself, and which he must eternally require

¹ Tholuck, indeed, as usual on such points, holds a sort of middle opinion here in his Comm. on the Sermon on the Mount, although he is substantially of the opinion expressed above, and opposed to the view of Catholic, Socinian, and Arminian writers. See, however, Baumgarten, Doc. Christi de Lege Mosaica in Oratione Mon., with whom also Hengstenberg concurs, *loc. cit.*

of his accountable creatures. The idea which such language conveys is undoubtedly correct, if understood in reference to the great principles of truth and holiness embodied in the precepts, though but very imperfectly true in regard to the formal acts in which those principles were to find their prescribed manifestation. For the actual operation of the principles had of necessity to be ordered in suitable adaptation to men's condition upon earth, to which, as there belong relations, so also relative duties, not only different from anything with which God himself has properly to do, but different even from what his people shall have to discharge in a coming eternity. *There* such precepts as the fifth, the sixth, the seventh, or the eighth, as to the formal acts they prohibit or require, shall manifestly have lost their adaptation. And of the whole law we may affirm, that the precise form it has assumed, or the mould into which it has been cast, is such as fitly suits it only to the circumstances of the present life. But the love to God and man, which constitutes its all-pervading element, and for which the several precepts only indicate the particular ways and channels it is outwardly to take, this love man is perpetually bound in all times and circumstances to cherish in his heart, and manifest in his conduct. For the God, in whom he lives, and moves, and has his being, is love; and as the duty and perfection of the creature is to bear the image of the Creator, so to love as he loves—Himself first and supremely, and his offspring in him and for him, must ever be the bounden obligation and highest end of those whom he calls his children.

SECTION II.

THE LAW CONTINUED—APPARENT EXCEPTIONS TO ITS PERFECTION AND COMPLETENESS AS THE PERMANENT AND UNIVERSAL STANDARD OF RELIGIOUS AND MORAL OBLIGATION—ITS REFERENCES TO THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE ISRAELITES, AND REPRESENTATION OF GOD AS JEALOUS.

It is necessary to pause here for a little, and enter into some examination of the objections which have been raised out of the ten commandments themselves, against the character of perfection and completeness which we have sought to establish for them. For if any doubt should remain on this point, it will most materially interfere with and mar the line of argument we mean afterwards to pursue, and the views we have to propound in connection with this revelation of law to Israel.

By a certain class of writers, we are met at the very threshold with a species of objection, which they seem to regard as perfectly conclusive against its general completeness and universal obligation. For it contains special and distinct references to the Israelites as a people. The whole is prefaced with the declaration, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt," while the fifth commandment embodies in it the promise of the land of Canaan as their peculiar inheritance. And this, we are told, makes it clear as noon-day, that the decalogue was not given as a revelation of God's will to mankind at large, but was simply and exclusively intended for the Israelites—binding indeed, on them, so long as the peculiar polity lasted, under which they were placed, but also ceasing as an obligatory rule of conduct when that was abolished.¹ But, on this ground, the Gospel itself will

¹ Bialloblotzky, *de Legis Mos. abrogatione*, p. 131; Archb. Whately also repeats the same objection, in his *Essay on the abolition of the law*, p. 186 (Second Series of Essays). The view of both these authors, which is radically the same, regarding the abolition of

be found scarcely less imperfect, and we might almost at every step question the fitness or obligation of its precepts in respect to men in general. For it carries throughout a reference to existing circumstances, and by much the fullest developement of its principles and duties, that contained in the Epistles, was given directly and avowedly to particular persons and churches, with the primary design of instructing *them* in the will of God. So that if the specialties found in the law of the two tables were sufficient to exempt men *now* from its obligation, or to deprive it at any time of an oecumenical value, most of the revelations of the Gospel might, for the same reason, be shorn of their virtue, and in both alike, men would be entitled to pick and choose for themselves, what they were to regard as of universal moment and perpetual obligation.

But what egregious trifling is this? The objection overlooks one of the most distinctive features, and, indeed, one of the greatest excellencies of God's revelation, which at no period was given in the form of abstract delineations of truth and duty, but has ever developed itself in immediate connection with the circumstances of individuals and the leadings of Providence. From first to last it comes forth entwined with the characters and events of history. Not a little of it is written in the transactions themselves of past time, which are expressly declared to have been "written for *our* learning." And it is equally true of the law and the Gospel, that the historical lines, with which they are interwoven, while serving to increase their interest and enhance their instructive value, by no means detract from their general bearing, or interfere with their binding obligation. The ground of this lies in the unchangeableness of God's character, which may be said to generalize all that is particular in his revelation, and impart a lasting efficacy to what was but occasional in its origin. Without variableness

the law under the Christian economy, we shall have occasion to notice afterwards. The affirmation of the Archbishop, at p. 191, that "the Gospel requires a morality in many respects higher and more perfect in itself than the law, and places morality on higher grounds," has already been met in the preceding section. We admit, of course, that the Gospel contains far higher exhibitions of the morality enjoined in the law, than is to be found in the Old Testament, and presents far higher motives for exercising it; but that is a different thing from maintaining that this morality itself is higher or essentially more perfect.

or shadow of turning in himself, he cannot have a word for one, and a different word for another. And unless the things spoken and required were so manifestly peculiar as to be applicable only to the individuals to whom they were first addressed, or from their very nature possessed a merely temporary significance, we must hold them to be the revelation of God's mind and will for all persons and all times.

That the Lord uttered this law to Israel in the character of their Redeemer, and imposed it on them as the heirs of his inheritance, made no alteration in its own inherent nature; neither contracted nor enlarged the range of its obligation; only established its claim on *their* observance, by considerations peculiarly fitted to move and influence their minds. Christ's enforcing upon his disciples the lesson of humility, by his own condescension in stooping to wash their feet, or St Paul's entreating his Gentile converts to walk worthy of their vocation, by the thought of his being, for their sakes, the prisoner of the Lord, are not materially different. The special considerations, coupled in either case alike with the precept enjoined, leave perfectly untouched the ground of the obligation or the rule of duty. Their proper and legitimate effect was only to win obedience, or, failing that, to aggravate transgression. And when the things required are such as those enjoined in the ten commandments—things growing out of the settled relations in which men stand to God and to each other, the obligation to obey is universal and permanent, whether or not there be any considerations of the kind in question tending to render obedience more imperative, or transgression more heinous.

But what if some of the considerations employed to enforce the observance of the duties enjoined, involve views of the divine character and government partial and defective, at variance with the principles of the Gospel, and repulsive even to enlightened reason? Can that really have been meant to be of standing force and efficacy as a revelation of duty, which embodies in it such elements of imperfection? Such is the form the objection takes in the hands of another large class of objectors, who think they find matter of the kind referred to in the declarations attached to the second commandment. The view there given of God as a *jealous* being, and of the manner in which his jealousy was to

appear, has by some been represented as so peculiarly Jewish, by others as so flagrantly obnoxious to right principle, that they denounce the very thought of the decalogue being considered as a perfect revelation of the mind and will of God. The subject has long afforded a favourite ground of railing accusation to avowed infidels and rationalist divines; and Spinoza could not think of any thing in Scripture more clearly and manifestly repugnant to reason, than that the attribute of jealousy was ascribed to God in the decalogue itself.

The treatment which this article in the decalogue has met with, is a good specimen of the shallow and superficial character of infidelity. It proceeds on the supposition, that jealousy, when ascribed to God, must carry precisely the same meaning, and be understood to indicate the same affections, as when spoken of men. Considered as a disposition in man, it is commonly indicative of something sickly and distempered. But as every affection of the human mind must, when referred to God, be understood with such limitations as the infinite disparity between the divine and human natures renders necessary, it might be no difficult matter to modify the common notion of jealousy, so far as to render it perfectly compatible with the other representations given of God as perfect in holiness. But even this is scarcely necessary; for every scholar knows, that the word in the original is by no means restricted to what is distinctively meant by jealousy, and that the radical and proper idea, unless otherwise determined by the context, has respect merely to the *zeal* or ardour with which any one is disposed to vindicate his own rights. Applied to God, it simply presents him to our view as the one supreme Jehovah, who as such claims—cannot indeed but claim—he were not the One, Eternal God, but an idol, if he did not claim—the undivided love and homage of his creatures, and who, consequently, must resist with holy zeal and indignation every attempt to deprive him of what is so peculiarly his own. It is only to give vividness to this idea, by investing it with the properties of an earthly relation, that the divine affection is so often presented under the special form of jealousy. It arises, as Calvin has remarked, from God's condescending to assume toward his people the character of a husband, in which respect he cannot bear a partner. "As he performs to us all the offices of a true and faith-

ful husband, so he stipulates for love and conjugal chastity from us. Hence, when he rebukes the Jews for their apostacy, he complains that they have cast off chastity, and polluted themselves with adultery. Therefore, as the purer and chaster the husband is, the more grievously he is offended when he sees his wife inclining to a rival; so the Lord, who has betrothed us to himself in truth, declares that he burns with the hottest jealousy—whenever, neglecting the purity of his holy marriage, we defile ourselves with abominable lusts; and especially when the worship of his Deity, which ought to have been most carefully kept unimpaired, is transferred to another, or adulterated with some superstition; since, in this way, we not only violate our plighted troth, but defile the nuptial couch, by giving access to adulterers.”¹

Allowing, however, that the notion of jealousy, when thus explained, is a righteous and necessary attribute of Jehovah, does not the objection hold, at least in regard to the particular form of its manifestation mentioned in the second commandment? If it becomes God to be jealous, yet is it not to make his jealousy interfere with his justice, when he declares his purpose to visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation? So one might judge, if looking, not merely to the attacks of infidels, but to the feeble and unsatisfactory attempts which have too often been made to explain the declaration by Christian divines. Grotius, for example, resolves it simply into the absolute sovereignty of God, who has a right to do what he will with his own.² Warburton represents it as a temporary expedient to supply the lack of a future state of reward and punishment under the law; and in his usual way, contends that no otherwise could the principle be vindicated, and the several scriptures referring to it harmonised.³ Michaelis⁴, Paley⁵, and a host besides, while they also regard it as to a great extent a temporary arrangement, rest their defence of it mainly on the ground of its having to do only with temporal evils, and in no respect reaching to men’s spiritual and eternal interests. It is fatal to

¹ Inst. B. ii. c. 8, § 18.

² De Jure Belli et Pacis, ii. p. 593.

³ Divine Legation, B. v. sec. 5.

⁴ Laws of Moses.

⁵ Sermons.

all these attempts at explanation, that none of them fairly grapples with the visitation of evil threatened, as a punishment. For, viewed in this light, which is unquestionably the scriptural one, such attempts are manifestly nothing more than mere shifts and evasions of the point at issue. When resolved into the sovereignty of God, it still remains to be asked, whether such an exercise of his sovereignty is consistent with those ideas of immutable justice, which are implanted in the human breast. When viewed as a temporary expedient to supply a want, which, to say the least, might, if real, have admitted of a very simple remedy, the question still waits for solution, whether the expedient itself was in proper accordance with the righteous principles which should regulate every government, whether human or divine. And when it is affirmed, that the penalties denounced in the threatening were only temporal, the reply surely is competent, why might not God do in eternity what he does in time? Or, if the principle on which the punishment proceeds, be not in all respects justifiable, how could it be acted on by God temporarily, any more than eternally? Is it consistent with the notion of a God of infinite rectitude, that he should do on a small scale what he could not be conceived to do on a large one?

The fundamental error in the false explanations referred to, lies in the supposition of the children, who are to suffer, being in a different state morally from that of their parents—innocent children bearing the chastisement due to the transgressions of their wicked parents. But the words of the threatening purposely guard against such an idea, by describing the third and fourth generation, on whom the visitation of evil was to fall, as of *those that hate God*; just as, on the other hand, the mercy which was pledged to thousands, was promised as the dowry of those that *love* him. Such children alone are here concerned, who, in the language of Calvin, “imitate the impiety of their progenitors.” Indeed, Augustine has substantially expressed the right principle of interpretation on the subject, though he has sometimes failed in making the proper application of it, as when he says: “But the carnal generation also of the people of God belonging to the Old Testament, binds the sons to the sins of their parents; but the spiritual generation, as it has changed the inheritance, so also

the threatenings of punishment, and the promises of reward.”¹ And still more distinctly in his commentary on Ps. cix. 14, where he explains the visiting of the “iniquities of the fathers upon them that hate me,” by saying, “that is, as their parents hated me; so that, just as the imitation of the good secures that even one’s own sins are blotted out, so the imitation of the bad renders one obnoxious to the deserved punishment, not only of one’s own sins, but also of the sins of those whose ways have been followed.” In short, the Lord contemplates the existence among his professing worshippers of two entirely different *kinds* of generations—the one haters of God, and manifesting their hatred by depraving his worship, and pursuing courses of transgression—the other lovers of God, and manifesting their love by stedfastly adhering in all dutiful obedience to the way of his holy commandments. To these last, though they should extend to thousands of generations, he would shew his mercy, causing it to flow on from age to age in a perennial stream of blessing. But as he is the righteous God, to whom vengeance as well as mercy belongs, the free outpouring of his beneficence upon these, could not prevent or prejudice the execution of his justice upon that other class, who were entirely of a different spirit, and merited quite opposite treatment. It is an unwelcome subject, indeed; the merciful and gracious God has no delight in anticipating the day of evil, even for his most erring and wayward children. He shrinks, as it were, from contemplating the possibility of thousands being in this condition, and will not suffer himself to make mention of more than a third or a fourth generation rendering themselves the objects of his just displeasure. But still the wholesome truth must be declared, and the seasonable warning uttered. If men were determined to rebel against his authority, he could not leave himself without a witness, not even in regard to the first race of transgressors, that he hated their iniquities, and must take vengeance of their inventions. But if, notwithstanding, the children embraced the sinfulness of their parents, with the manifest seal of Heaven’s displeasure on it, as their iniquity would be more aggravated, so its punishment should become more severe; the descending and entailed curse would deepen as it flowed on, in-

¹ Contra Julianum Pelagianum, Lib. vi. § 82.

creasing with every increase of depravity and corruption, till the measure of iniquity being filled up, the wrath should fall on them to the uttermost.

That this is the aspect of the divine character and government which the declaration in the second commandment was meant to exhibit, is evident alone from the glowing delineations of mercy and goodness, with which the visitation of evil upon the children of disobedient parents is here and in other places coupled.¹ But it is confirmed beyond all doubt by two distinct lines of reflection, and, first, by the facts of Israelitish history. These fully confirm the principle of God's government as now expounded, but give no countenance to the idea of a punishment being inflicted on the innocent for the guilty. However sinful one individual, or one generation might be, yet if the next in descent heartily turned to the Lord, they were sure of being received to pardon and blessing. We are furnished with a striking instance of this in the 14th chapter of Numbers, where we find Moses pleading for the pardon of Israel's transgressions on the very ground of that revelation of the divine name or character in Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7, which precisely, as in the second commandment, combines the most touching representation of the divine mercy with the threat to visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children. It never occurred to Moses that this threat stood at all in the way of their obtaining a complete forgiveness. He found, indeed, that the Lord had determined to visit upon that generation their iniquities, so far as to exclude them from the land of Canaan, but without in the least marring the better prospects of their children, who had learned to hate the deeds of their fathers. And when, indeed, was it otherwise? Is it not one of the most striking features in the whole history of ancient Israel, that, so far from suffering for the sins of former generations, they did not suffer even for their own when they truly repented, but were immediately visited with favour and blessing? And, on the other hand, how constantly do we find the divine judgments increasing in severity when successive generations hardened themselves in their evil courses? Nor did it rarely happen that the series of retributions reached their last issues by the third or fourth generation. It was so in particular

¹ Compare besides Ex. xxxiv. 5, 6; Numb. xiv. 18; Ps. ciii. 8, 9.

with those who were put upon a course of special dealing—such as the house of Jeroboam, of Jehu, of Eli, &c.

Another source of confirmation to the view exhibited above, we find in the explanations given concerning it in the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. These prophets lived at the time when the descending curse had utterly failed, so far as it had gone, to turn the children from the sinful courses of their fathers, and was fast running to a fatal termination. But the infatuated people being not less distinguished for self-righteous pride than for their obstinate perseverance in wickedness, they were constantly complaining, as stroke after stroke fell upon them, that they were made unjustly to bear the sins of their fathers. Anticipating our modern infidels, they charged God with injustice and inequality in his ways of dealing, instead of turning their eye inward, as they should have done, upon their own unrighteousness, and forsaking it for the way of peace. The 18th chapter of Ezekiel contains a lengthened expostulation with these stout-hearted offenders, in the course of which he utterly disclaims the interpretation they put upon the word and providence of God; and assures them, that if they would only turn from their evil doings, they would not have to suffer either for their own or their fathers' guilt. And Jeremiah, in his 31st chapter, speaking of the new covenant, and of the blessed renovation it would accomplish on those who should be partakers of its grace, foretells, that there would be an end of such foolish and wicked charges upon God for the inequality of his ways of dealing—for such an increased measure of the Spirit would be given, such an inward conformity to his laws would be produced, that his dealing with transgressors would in a manner cease—his ways would be all acquiesced in as holy, just, and good.

SECTION III.

THE LAW CONTINUED—FURTHER EXCEPTIONS—THE WEEKLY SABBATH.

OBJECTIONS have been raised against the decalogue as a complete and permanent summary of duty, from the nature of its requirements, as well as from the incidental considerations, by which it is enforced. It is only, however, in reference to the fourth commandment, the law of the Sabbath, that any objection in this respect is made. The character of universal and permanent obligation, it is argued, which we would ascribe to the decalogue, cannot properly belong to it, since one of its precepts enjoins the observance of a merely ceremonial institution—an institution strictly and rigorously binding on the Jews, but, like other ceremonial and shadowy institutions, done away in Christ. It would be impossible to enumerate the authors, ancient and modern, who in one form or another have adopted this view. There can be no question that they embrace a very large proportion of the more learned and eminent divines of the Christian church, from the Fathers to the present time. Much diversity of opinion, however, prevails among those who agree in the same general view, as to the extent to which the law of the Sabbath was ceremonial, and in what sense the obligation to observe it lies upon the followers of Jesus. In the judgment of some, the distinction of days is entirely abolished as a divine arrangement, and no farther obligatory upon the conscience, than as it may be sanctioned by competent ecclesiastical authority for the purposes of social order and religious improvement. By others, the obligation is held to involve the duty of setting apart an adequate portion of time for the due celebration of divine worship—the greater part leaving that portion of time quite indefinite, while some

would insist upon its being at least equal to what was appointed under the law, or possibly even more. Finally, there are still others, who consider the ceremonial and shadowy part of the institution to have more peculiarly stood in the observance of precisely the seventh day of the week as a day of sacred rest, and who conceive the obligation still in force, as requiring another whole day to be consecrated to religious exercises.

It would require a separate treatise, rather than a single chapter, to take up separately such manifold subdivisions of opinion, and investigate the grounds of each. We must for the present view the subject in its general bearings, and endeavour to have some leading principles ascertained and fixed. In doing this, we might press at the outset the consideration of this law being one of those engraved upon tables of stone, as a proof that it, equally with the rest, possessed a peculiarly important and durable character. For the argument is by no means disposed of, as we formerly remarked, by the supposition of Bähr and others, that the ceremonial, as well as the other precepts of the law, were represented in the ten commandments; and still less by the assertion of Paley, that little regard was practically paid in the books of Moses to the distinction between matters of a ceremonial and moral, of a temporary and perpetual kind. It is easy to multiply assertions and suppositions of such a nature; but the fact is still to be accounted for, why the law of the Sabbath should have been deemed of such paramount importance, as to have found a place among those which were "written as with a pen in the rock for ever?" Or why, if in reality nothing more than a ceremonial and shadowy institute, this, in particular, should have been chosen to represent all of a like kind? Why not rather, as the whole genius of the economy might have led us in such a case to expect, should the precept have been one respecting the observance of the great annual feasts, or a faithful compliance with the sacrificial services?¹ It is impossible to answer these questions satisfactorily, or to shew any valid reason for the introduction of the Sabbath into the law of the two tables, on the supposition of its

¹ The Roman Catholics have felt the force of this in reference to their own church, which, like the Jewish, deals so much in ceremonies, and therefore have sometimes, in their catechism, presented the fourth commandment thus: Remember the festivals to keep them holy.

possessing only a ceremonial character. But we shall not press this argument more fully, or endeavour to explain the futility of the reasons by which it is met, as in itself it is rather a strong presumption, than a conclusive evidence of the permanent obligation of the fourth command.

It deserves more notice, however, than it usually receives in this point of view, and should alone be almost held conclusive, that the ground on which the obligation to keep the Sabbath is based in the command, is the most universal in its bearing that could possibly be conceived. "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy, for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day." There is manifestly nothing Jewish here; nothing connected with individual interests or even national history; the grand fact, out of which the precept is made to grow, is of equal significance to the whole world; and why should not the precept be the same, of which it forms the basis? God's method of procedure in creating the visible heavens and earth, produced as the formal reason for instituting a distinctive, temporary Jewish ordinance! Could it be possible to conceive a more "lame and impotent conclusion?" And this, too, in the most compact piece of legislation in existence! It seems, indeed, as if God in the appointment of this law had taken special precautions against the attempts which he foresaw would be made to get free of the institution, and that on this account he laid its foundations deep in the original framework and constitution of nature. The law as a whole, and certain also of its precepts, he was pleased to enforce by considerations drawn from his dealings toward Israel, and the peculiar relations which he now held to them. But when he comes to impose the obligation of the Sabbath, he rises far beyond any consideration of a special kind, or any passing event of history. He ascends to primeval time, and, standing as on the platform of the newly created world, dates from thence the commencement and the ordination of a perpetually recurring day of rest. Since the Lord has thus honoured the fourth commandment above the others, by laying for it a foundation so singularly broad and deep, is it yet to be held in its obligation and import the narrowest of them all? Shall this, strange to think, be the only one which did not utter a voice for all times and all

generations? How much more reasonable is the conclusion of Calvin, who in this expressed substantially the opinion of all the more eminent reformers: "Unquestionably God assumed to himself the seventh day, and consecrated it when he finished the creation of the world, that he might keep his worshippers entirely free from all other cares, while they were employed in meditating on the beauty, excellence, and splendour of his works. It is not proper, indeed, to allow any period to elapse, without our attentively considering the wisdom, power, justice, and goodness of God, as displayed in the admirable workmanship and government of the world. But because our minds are unstable, and are thence liable to wander and be distracted, God in his own mercy, consulting our infirmities, sets apart one day from the rest, and commands it to be kept free from all earthly cares and employments, lest anything should interrupt that holy exercise. . . . In this respect the necessity of a Sabbath is common to us with the people of old, that we may be free on one day (of the week), and so may be better prepared both for learning, and for giving testimony to our faith."¹

But then, it is argued, that whatever may have been the reason for admitting the law of the Sabbath into the ten commandments, and engraving it on the tables of stone, it still is in its own nature different from all the rest. They are moral, and because moral, of universal force and obligation, while this is ceremonial, owing its existence to positive enactment, and therefore binding only so far as the enactment itself might be extended.

¹ Comm. on Ex. xx. 11. The same view is taken in his notes on Gen. ii. 3: "God, therefore, first rested, then he blessed that rest, that it might be sacred among men through all coming ages; he consecrated each seventh day to rest, that his own example might continually serve as a rule," &c. To the same effect, Luther on that passage, who holds, that "if Adam had continued in innocence, he would yet have kept the seventh day sacred," and concludes, "Therefore the Sabbath was, from the beginning of the world, appointed to the worship of God." We have already treated of this branch of the subject in vol. i., and need not go farther into it at present. It is proper to state, however, that the leading divines of the Reformation, and the immediately subsequent period, were of one mind regarding the appointment of a primeval Sabbath. The idea, that the Sabbath was first given to the Israelites in the wilderness, and that the words in Gen. ii. only proleptically refer to that future circumstance, is an after-thought—originating in the fond conceit of some Jewish Rabbins, who sought thereby to magnify their nation, and was adopted only by such Christian divines as had already made up their minds on the temporary obligation of the Sabbath.

The duties enjoined in the former are founded in the nature of things, and the essential relations in which men stand to God, or to their fellow-men ; hence they do not depend on any positive enactment, but are co-extensive in their obligation with reason and conscience. But the law of the Sabbath prescribing one day in seven to be a day of sacred rest, has its foundation simply in the authoritative appointment of God, and hence, unlike the rest, is not fixed and universal, but special and mutable.

There is unquestionably an element of truth in this, but the application made of it, in the present instance, is unwarranted and fallacious. It is true that the Sabbath is a positive institution, though intimately connected with God's work in creation ; and apart from his high command, it could not have been ascertained by the light of reason, that one entire day should at regular intervals be consecrated for bodily and spiritual rest, and especially that one in seven was the proper period to be fixed upon. In this respect we can easily recognise a distinction between the law of the Sabbath, and the laws which prohibit such crimes as lying, theft, or murder. But it does not therefore follow, that the Sabbath is in such a sense a positive, as to be a merely partial, temporary, ceremonial institution, and like others of this description done away in Christ. For a law may be positive in its origin, and yet neither local nor transitory in its destination ; it may be positive in its origin, and yet equally needed and designed for all nations and ages of the world.

For of what nature, we ask, is the institution of marriage ? The seventh commandment bears respect to that institution, and is thrown as a sacred fence around its sanctity. But is not marriage in its origin a positive institution ? Has it any other foundation than the original act of God in making one man and one woman, and positively ordaining, that the man should cleave to the woman, and the two be one flesh ?¹ Wherever this is not recognised, as it is not, in part at least, in Mahomedan and heathen lands, and by certain infidels of the baser sort in Christen-

¹ Gen. ii. 23, 24. This has a great deal more the look of a proleptical statement, than what is written at the beginning of the chapter about the Sabbath, for it speaks of leaving father and mother, while still Adam and Eve alone existed. Yet our Lord regards it as a statement fairly and naturally drawn from the facts of creation, and as applicable to the earlier as to the later periods of the world's history (Matth. xix. 4, 5.)

dom, there also the moral and binding obligation of the ordinance is disowned. But can any sincere believer disown it? Would he not indignantly reject the thought of its being only a temporary ordinance, because standing as to its first foundation, in God's method of creation, and the natural inference thence arising? Or does he feel himself warranted to assume, that because, after Christ's appearing, the marriage-union was treated as an emblem of Christ's union to the Church, the literal ordinance is thereby changed or impaired? Assuredly not. And why should any deal otherwise with the Sabbath? This too, in its origin, is a positive institution, and was also, it may be, from the first designed to serve as an emblem of spiritual things—an emblem of the blessed rest which man was called to enjoy in God. But in both respects it stands most nearly on a footing with the ordinance of marriage; both alike owed their institution to the original act and appointment of God; both also took their commencement at the birth of time—in a world unfallen, when, as there was no need for the antitypes of redemption, so no ceremonial types or shadows of these could properly have a place; and both are destined to last till the songs of the redeemed shall have ushered in the glories of a world restored.

The distinction, we apprehend, is often too broadly drawn in discussions on this subject, between the positive and the moral: as if the two belonged to entirely different regions, and but incidentally touched upon each other. As if also the strictly moral part of the world's machinery were in itself so complete and independent, that its movements might proceed of themselves, in a course of lofty isolation from all positive enactments and institutions. This was not the case even in paradise, and much less could it be so afterwards. A certain amount of what is positive in appointment, is absolutely necessary to settle the relations, in connection with which the moral sentiments are to work and develop themselves. The banks which confine and regulate the current of a river, are not less essential to its existence than the waters that flow within them; for the one mark out and fix the channel, which keeps the other in their course. And in like manner, the moral feelings and affections of our nature, must have something outward and positive, determining the kind of landmarks which they are to observe, and the channels through

which they are to flow. There may, no doubt, be many things of this nature at different times appointed by God, that are variable and temporary, to suit the present condition of his church and the immediate ends he has in view. But there may also be some coeval with the existence of the world, founded in the very nature and constitution of things, so essential and necessary that the love, which is the fulfilment of all obligation, cannot operate steadfastly or beneficially without them.

The real question, then, in regard to the Sabbath, is, whether such love can exist in the heart, without disposing it to observe the rest there enjoined? Is not the present constitution of nature such, as to render this necessary for securing the purposes which God contemplated in creation? Could mankind, as one great family, properly thrive and prosper even in their lower interests, as we may suppose their beneficent Creator intended, without such a day of rest perpetually coming round to refresh their wearied natures? Could they otherwise command sufficient time, amid the busy cares and occupations of life, to mind the higher interests of themselves and their households? Without such a salutary monitor ever and anon returning, and bringing with it time and opportunity for all to attend to its admonitions, would not the spiritual and eternal be lost sight of amid the seen and temporal? Or, to mount higher still, how, without this ordinance, could any proper and adequate testimony be kept up throughout the world in honour of the God that made it? Must not reason herself own it to be a suitable and becoming homage rendered to His sole and supreme lordship of creation, for men on every returning seventh day to cease from their own works, and take a breathing-time to realize their dependance upon him, and give a more special application to the things which concern His glory? In short, abolish this wise and blessed institution, and must not love both to God and man be deprived of one of its best safeguards and most important channels of working—God himself become practically dishonoured and forgotten, and man be worn down with deadening and oppressive toil?

Experience has but one answer to give to these questions. Hence, where the true religion has been unknown, it has always been found necessary to appoint, by some constituted authority, a

certain number of holidays, which have often, even in heathen countries, exceeded, rarely anywhere have fallen short of, the number of God's instituted Sabbaths. The animal and mental, the bodily and spiritual nature of man alike demand them. Even Plato deemed the appointment of such days of so benign and gracious a tendency, that he ascribed them to that pity which "the gods have for mankind, born to painful labour, that they might have an ease and cessation from their toils."¹ And what is this but an experimental testimony to the truth of God's having ordered his work of creation with a view to the appointment of such an institution in providence? and to his wisdom and goodness in having done so? It is manifest, besides, that while men may of themselves provide substitutes to a certain extent for the Sabbath, yet these never can secure more than a portion of the ends for which it has been appointed, nor could anything short of the clear sanction and authority of the living God, command for it general respect and attention. The inferior benefits which it carries in its train, are not sufficient, as experience has also too amply testified, to maintain its observance, if it loses its hold upon men's minds in a religious point of view. So that there can scarcely be a plainer departure from the duty of love we owe alike to God and man, than to attempt to weaken the foundations of such an ordinance, or to encourage its violation.

If the broad and general view of the subject, which has now been given, were fairly considered, the other and minuter objections which are commonly urged in support of the strictly Jewish character of the Sabbatical institution, would be easily disposed of. Even taken apart there is none of them, which, if due account is made of special circumstances, may not be satisfactorily removed.

1. No notice is taken of the institution during the antediluvian and earlier patriarchal periods of sacred history; the profanation of it is not mentioned among the crimes for which the flood was sent, or fire and brimstone rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah; it never rises distinctly into view as a divine institution till the time of Moses; whence, it is inferred, it only had its commence-

¹ De Leg. II. p. 787, as quoted by Barrow, vol. V. p. 561.

ment then. But how many duties of undoubtedly perpetual and universal obligation might be cut off on similar grounds? And how few comparatively of the sins which we may infer with the utmost certainty to have been practised, are noticed in those brief records of the world's history? It is rather, as we might have expected, the general principles that were acted upon—or, in regard to heinous transgressors, the more flagrant misdeeds into which their extreme depravity ran out, that find a place in the earliest portions of sacred history. Besides, even in the later and fuller accounts, it is usual, through very long periods of time, to omit any reference to institutions which were known to have had a settled existence. There is no notice, for example, of circumcision from the time of Joshua to the Babylonish exile; but how fallacious would be the conclusion from such silence, that the rite itself was not observed? Even the Sabbath, notwithstanding the prominent place it holds in the decalogue and the institutions of Moses, is never mentioned again till the days of Elisha (nearly seven hundred years later), when we meet with an incidental and passing allusion to it (2 Kings iv. 23.) Need we wonder, then, that in such peculiarly brief compends of history as are given from the creation to Moses, there should be a similar silence?

And yet it can by no means be affirmed, that they are without manifest indications of the existence of a seventh day of sacred rest. The record of its appointment at the close of the creation-period, as we have already noticed, is of the most explicit kind, and is afterwards confirmed by the not less explicit reference in the fourth commandment, of its origin and commencement to the same period. Nor can any reason be assigned one-half so natural and probable as this, for the division of time into weeks of seven days, which meets us in the history of Noah and the later patriarchal times, and of which also very early traces occur in profane history.¹ Then, finally, the manner in which it first presents

¹ Gen. viii. 10, 12; xxix. 27. A large portion of the Jewish writers hold, that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, and was observed by the patriarchs, although some thought differently. References to various of their more eminent writers are given in Meyer, *De Temporibus Sacris et Festis Diebus Hebræorum*, P. ii. c. 9. Selden (*De Jure Nat. et Gent.* L. iii. 12) has endeavoured to prove that the older Jewish writers all held the first institution of the Sabbath to have been in the wilderness, though by special revelation made known previously to Abraham, and that the notice taken of the

itself on the field of Israelitish history, as an existing ordinance, which God himself respected, in the giving of the manna, before the law had been promulgated (Ex. xvi.), is a clear proof of its prior institution. True, indeed, the Israelites themselves seem then to have been in a great measure ignorant of such an institution—not perhaps altogether ignorant, as is too commonly taken for granted, but ignorant of its proper observance, so far as to wonder that God should have bestowed a double provision on the sixth day, to relieve them from any labour in gathering and preparing it on the seventh. Habituated as they had become to the manners, and bowed down by the oppression of Egypt, it had been strange, indeed, if any other result should have occurred. Hence, it is mentioned by Moses, and by Nehemiah, as a distinguished token of the Lord's goodness to them, that in consequence of bringing them out of Egypt, he made them to know or gave them his Sabbaths. (Ex. xvi. 29 ; Deut. v. 15 ; Neh. ix. 14.)

2. But the institution of the Sabbath was declared to be a sign between God and the Israelites, that they might know that he was the Lord who sanctified them (Ex. xxxi. 13.) And if a sign or token of God's covenant with Israel, then it must have been a new and positive institution, and one which they alone were bound to observe, since it must separate between them and others. So Warburton¹ and a host of others. We say nothing against its having been as to its formal institution of a positive nature, for there, we think, many defenders of the Sabbath have lost themselves.² But its being constituted a sign between God and Israel,

subject at the creation is by prolepsis. This, however, does not appear to have been the general opinion among them, certainly not that of some of their leading writers ; and as Meyer remarks, it by no means follows from their having sometimes held the proleptical reference in Genesis to the institution of the Sabbath in the wilderness, that they therefore denied its prior institution in Paradise. See also Owen's Preliminary Dissertations to his Com. on Heb. Ex. 36 ; where, further, the notices are gathered which are to be found in ancient heathen sources regarding the primitive division of time into sevens, and the sacredness of the seventh day. As to the ancient nations of the world not observing it, or not being specially charged with neglecting it, the same may be said in reference to the third commandment, the fifth, many of the sins of the seventh, eighth, and ninth. Besides, when they forsook God himself, of how little importance was it how they spent his Sabbaths !

¹ Divine Leg. B. iv., Note R. R. R. R.

² It has been called a moral-positive command—partly moral, and partly positive ; in itself a positive enactment, but with moral grounds to recommend or enforce it. See,

neither inferred its entire novelty, nor its special and exclusive obligation upon them. Warburton himself has contended, that the bow in the cloud was not rendered less fit for being a sign of the covenant with Noah, that it had existed in the antediluvian period. And still less might the Sabbath's being a primeval institution have rendered it unfit to stand as a sign of the Israelitish covenant, as this had respect not so much to its appointment on the part of God, as to its observance on the part of the people. He wished them simply to regard it as one of the chosen means by which he intended them to become, not only a comfortable and blessed, but also an holy nation. Nor could its being destined for such an use among them, in the least interfere with its obligation or its observance among others. Circumcision was thus also made the sign of the Abrahamic covenant, although it had been observed from time immemorial by various surrounding tribes and nations, from whom still the members of the covenant were to remain separate. And with perfect propriety, at least in the latter case. For, it was not the merely external rite or custom which God regarded, but its spiritual meaning and design. When connected with his covenant, or embodied in his law, it was stamped as a religious institution; it acquired a strictly religious use; and only in so far as it was observed with a reference to this, could it fitly serve as a sign of God's covenant.

Indeed, a conclusion precisely the reverse of the one just referred to, should rather be drawn from the circumstance of the Sabbath having been taken for a sign that God sanctified Israel. There can be no question that holiness in heart and conduct was the grand sign of their being his chosen people. In so far as they fulfilled the exhortation, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," they possessed the mark of his children. And the proper observance of the Sabbatical rest, being so specially designated a sign in this respect, was a proof of its singular importance to the interests of religion and morality. These, it was virtually said, would thrive and flourish if the Sabbath was duly observed, but would languish and die if it fell into desuetude. Hence, at the close of a long

for example, Ridgeley's *Body of Divinity*, ii. p. 267, who expresses the view of almost all evangelical divines of the same period in this country. The distinction, however, is not happy, as the same substantially may be said of all the ceremonial institutions. Moral reasons were connected with them all, and yet they are abolished.

expostulation with the people regarding their sins, and such especially as indicated only a hypocritical love to God, and a palpable hatred or indifference to their fellow-men, the prophet Isaiah presses the due observance of the Sabbath as in itself a sufficient remedy for the evil: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Isa. lviii. 13, 14.)

This passage may fitly be regarded as an explanation of the sense in which the Lord meant them to regard the Sabbath as a sign between them and him. And it is clear, on a moment's reflection, that the prophet could never have attached the importance he did to the Sabbath, nor so peculiarly connected it with the blessing of the covenant, if the mere outward rest had been all that the institution contemplated. This is what the objectors we now argue with, seem uniformly to take for granted; as if the people were really sanctified when they simply rested every Sabbath-day from their labours. The command had a far deeper import, and much more was involved in such a compliance with it, as should prove a sign between them and God. It was designed at once to carry the heart up in holy affection to its Creator, and outwards in acts of goodwill and kindness to men on earth. Hence its proper observance is so often put, both in the law and the prophets, for the sum of religion. This is frankly admitted by some who urge the objection (for example Barrow), while they still hold it to have been a ceremonial institution. But we would ask, if any other ceremonial institution can be pointed to as having been thus honoured? Are they not often rather comparatively dishonoured, by being placed in a relation of inferiority to the weightier matters of the law? And we might also ask, if precisely the same practical value is not attached to the strict religious observance of the Lord's day now, by all writers of piety, and even by those who, with strange perversion or inconsistency, labour to establish the freedom of Christians from the obligation of the Sabbath? It is one of the burdens, says Barrow, which

the law of liberty has taken off from us, and yet he has no sooner said it, than he tells us in regard to the very highest and most spiritual duties of this law, that we are much more obliged to discharge them than the Jews could be.¹ Paley, too, has no sooner tried to get rid of the binding obligation of the Sabbath, than he proceeds to shew the necessity of dedicating the Sunday to religious exercises, to the exclusion of all ordinary works and recreations ; and still more expressly in his first sermon, written at a more advanced stage of life, when he knew more personally of the power of religion, he speaks of "keeping holy the Lord's day regularly and most particularly," as an essential mark of a Christian.² The leading Reformers were unanimous on this point, holding it to be the duty of all sound Christians to use the Lord's day as one of holy rest to him, and that by withdrawing themselves not only from sin and vanity, but also from those worldly employments and recreations which belong only to a present life, and by yielding themselves wholly to the public exercises of God's worship, and to the private duties of devotion, excepting only in cases of necessity or mercy. The learned Rivet, also, who unhappily argued (in his work on the Decalogue) against the obligation of keeping the Sabbath as imposed in the fourth commandment, yet deplored the prevailing disregard of the Lord's day as one of the crying evils of the times ; and Vitranga raised the same lamentation in his day (on Isa. lviii. 13).

What, then, should induce such men to contend against the strict and literal obligation of the fourth command ? They must be influenced by one of two reasons : either they dislike the spirit of holiness that breathes in it, or, loving this, they somehow mistake the real nature of the obligation there imposed. There can be no doubt that the former is the cause which prompts those who are mere formalists in religion to decry this obligation ; and as little doubt, we think, in regard to the Reformers and pious divines of later times, that the latter cause was what influenced them. This we shall find occasion to explain under the next form of objection, to which we now proceed.

3. It is objected that the Sabbath, as imposed on the Jews, had

¹ Works, V. p. 565, 568.

² Moral and Polit. Philosophy, B. V. c. 7 and 8, comp. with 1st of the Sermons on several subjects.

a rigour and severity in it quite incompatible with the genius of the Gospel : the person who violated its sacredness, by doing ordinary work on that day, was to be punished with death ; and so far was the cessation from work carried, that even the kindling of a fire or going out of one's place was interdicted (Ex. xvi. 29 ; xxxv. 3). It looks as if men were determined to get rid of the Sabbath by any means, when the capital punishment inflicted on the violators of it, in the Jewish state, is held up as a proof of its transitory and merely national character. For there is nothing of this in the fourth commandment itself ; and it was afterwards added to this, in common with many other statutes, as a check on the presumptuous violation of what God wished them to regard as the fundamental laws of the kingdom. A similar violation of the first, the second, the third, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh commandments, had the same punishment annexed to it ; but who would thence argue, that the obligation to practise the duties they required, was binding only during the Old Testament dispensation ?

The other part of the objection demands a longer answer ; in which we must first distinctly mark what is the precise point to be determined. The real question is, Did the fourth commandment oblige the Jews to anything which the people of God are under no obligation now to perform ? Did it simply enjoin a rigid cessation from all ordinary labour, every seventh day, and did such cessation constitute the kind of sanctification it required ? Such unquestionably was the opinion entertained by Calvin and most of the Reformers ; who consequently held the Sabbath exacted of the Israelites under this precept, to be chiefly of a ceremonial nature, foreshadowing through its outward repose, the state of peaceful and blessed rest, which believers were to enjoy in Christ, and like other shadows, vanishing when he appeared. There is certainly a colour of truth in this idea, as we shall have occasion to notice under the next objection, but not in the sense understood by such persons. Their opinion of what the Jewish Sabbath *should* have been, almost entirely coincided with what it actually *was*, after a cold and dead formalism had taken the place of a living piety. But, so far from being justified by the law itself, it is the very notion which our Lord sought repeatedly to expose, by

shewing the practical impossibility of carrying it out under the former dispensation itself. Parents performed on the Sabbath the operation of circumcising their children ; priests did the work connected with the temple-service ; persons of all sorts went through the labours necessary to preserve or sustain life in themselves or their cattle ; and yet they were blameless—the command stood unimpaired, notwithstanding the performance of such works on the seventh day, for they were not inconsistent with its real design. In regard to all such cases, Christ announced the maxim: “The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,”—meaning of course the Sabbath in its original purport and existing obligation—not under any change or modification now to be introduced ; for had there been any intention of that sort, it would manifestly have been out of place then to speak of it—but the Sabbath as imposed in the fourth commandment upon the Israelites:—this Sabbath was made for man, as a means to promote his real interests and well-being, and not as a remorseless idol, to which these were to be sacrificed. “To work in the way of doing good to a fellow-creature (such was the import of Christ’s declaration), or entering into the employments of God’s worship, is not now, nor ever was any interference with the proper duties of the Sabbath, but rather a fulfilment of them. ‘Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath,’—He, who is Lord of man must needs also be Lord of that which was made for man’s good—but its Lord, not to turn it to any other purpose than that for which it was originally given—no, merely to use it myself, and teach you how to use it for the same. You do, therefore, grievously err in supposing it possible for me to do any thing inconsistent with the design of this institution ; for, though, as the Father worketh hitherto, I also must work on this day (John v. 17), so far as the ends of the divine government may require, yet nothing is or can be done by me, which is not in the strictest sense a divine work, and as such suitable to the day of God.”¹

¹ No texts have been more perverted from their obvious meaning, by the opponents of the Sabbath, than those referred to in Mark ii. 27, 28, about the Son of Man being Lord of the Sabbath, and the Sabbath being made for man, as if the Lord had been there bringing in something new, instead of explaining what was old. The latter is also held “as manifestly implying, that the observance of the Sabbath was not a duty of an

It is to wrest our Lord's words quite beside the purpose for which they were spoken, to represent him in those declarations he made respecting the Sabbath, as intending to relax the existing law, and bring in some new modification of it. His discourse was clearly aimed at convincing the Jews, that this law did not, as they erroneously conceived, absolutely prohibit all work, but work only in so far as the higher ends of God's glory and man's best interests might render needful. Precisely as in the second commandment, the prohibition regarding the making of any graven image or similitude, was not intended simply to denounce all pictures and statues—both, in fact, had a place in the temple itself—but to interdict their employment in the worship of God, so that his worshippers might be free to serve him in spirit and in truth. And as men might have abstained from using these, while still far from yielding the spiritual worship which the second command really required, so they might equally have ceased from ordinary labour on the seventh day, and yet been far from sanctifying it according to the fourth commandment.

This was distinctly enough perceived by some of the more thinking portion of the Jews themselves. Hence, not only does Philo speak of "the custom of philosophising," as he calls it, on the seventh day, but we find Abenezra expressly stating, that "the Sabbath was given to man, that he might consider the works of God, and meditate in his law." To the same effect Abarbanel: "The seventh day has been sequestered for learning the divine law, and for remembering well the explanations and inquiries regarding it. As is taught in Gemara Hierosol: 'Sabbaths and holidays were only appointed for meditating on the law of God; and therefore it is said, in Medrash Schamoth Rabba, that the Sabbath is to be prized as the whole law.'" Another of their leading authorities, R. Menasse Ben Isr. even characterizes it as a notable

essential and unchangeable nature, such as those for which man *is* especially constituted and ordained," (Bib. Cyclop. art. Sabbath.) But the same may be said of marriage—it was made for man, and not man for it—and seeing, if there be no marriage there can be no adultery, is therefore the seventh command only of temporary obligation? Or, since, where there is no property, there can be no theft, and man was not made for property, is the eighth command also out of date? The main point is, Were they not all alike coeval with man's introduction into his present state, and needful to abide with him till its close?

error, to imagine the Sabbath to have been instituted for idleness ; for as idleness is the mother of all vice, it would then have been the occasion of more evil than good."¹

These comments, wonderfully good to come from such a quarter, are in perfect accordance with the import of the fourth commandment ; that is, if this commandment is to be subjected to the same mode of interpretation, which is made to rule the meaning of the rest—if it is to be regarded simply as prohibiting one kind of works, that those of an opposite kind may be performed. Yet, in strange oversight of this, perhaps also unwittingly influenced by the mistaken views and absurd practices of the Jews, such men even as Calvin and Vitringa held that in the Jewish law of the Sabbath, there was only inculcated a cessation from bodily labour, and that the observance of this cessation formed the substance of Sabbatical duty.² Their holding this, however, did not, we must remember, lead them to deny the fact of God's having set apart, and men's being in all ages bound to observe, one day in every seven to be specially devoted to the worship and service of God. This, with one voice they held ; but they conceived the primeval and lasting institution of the Sabbath to have been so far accommodated to the symbolical character of the Jewish religion, as to demand almost nothing from the Jews but a day of bodily rest. And this rest they farther conceived to have been required, not as valuable in itself, but as the legal shadow of better things to come in Christ:—So that they might at once affirm the Jewish Sabbath to be abolished, and yet hold the obligation binding upon Christians to keep, by another mode of observance, one day in seven sacred to the Lord. This is just what they did. And, therefore, Gualter, in his summary of the views of the divines of the Reformation upon this subject, has brought distinctly out these two features in their opinions—what they parted with and what they retained : “The Sabbath properly signifies rest and leisure from servile work, and at the same time is used to denote the seventh day, which God at the beginning of the world consecrated to holy rest, and afterwards in the law con-

¹ See Meyer de Temp. Sacris et Festis diebus Heb., p. 197–199, where the authorities are given at length.

² Calvin. Inst. II. c. 8. Vitringa Synagog. vet. II. c. 2, and Com. in Isa. c. lvi.

firmed by a special precept. And although the primitive church abrogated the Sabbath, in so far as it was a legal shadow, lest it should savour of Judaism; yet it did not abolish that sacred rest and repose, but transferred the keeping of it to the following day, which was called the Lord's day, because on it Christ rose from the dead. The use of this day, therefore, is the same with what the Sabbath formerly was among the true worshippers of God." Only, the particular way, or kind of service, in which it is now to be turned to this sacred use, is different from what it was in Judaism, and he goes on to describe how the Reformers thought the day should be spent: viz. in a total withdrawing from worldly cares and pleasures, as far as practicable, and employing the time in the public and private exercises of worship.¹

¹ I have entered so fully into the views of the Reformers, because their sentiments on this subject are almost universally misunderstood, even by theologians, and their names have often been abused, and indeed still are so, to support views which they would themselves have most strongly reprobated. The ground of the whole error lay in their not rightly understanding—what, indeed, is only now coming to be properly understood—the symbolical character of the Jewish worship. They viewed it too exclusively in a typical aspect, in its reference to gospel things, and saw but very dimly and imperfectly its design and fitness to give a present expression to the faith and holiness of the worshipper. Hence, *positive* institutions were considered as altogether the same with *ceremonial*, and the services connected with them as all of necessity, bodily, typical, shadowy, therefore done away in Christ. In this way superficial readers, who glance only at occasional passages in their writings, and do not take these in connection with the whole state of theological opinion then prevalent regarding the old and new dispensations, find no difficulty in exhibiting the Reformers as against all Sabbatical observances; while, if it suited their purpose to look a little farther, another set of passages might be found, which seem to establish the very reverse. Archbishop Whately says (Second Series of Essays, p. 206,) that the English Reformers were almost unanimous in disconnecting the obligation regarding the keeping of the Lord's day among Christians, from the fourth commandment, and resting it simply on the practice of the apostles and the early church—thus making the Christian Lord's day an essentially different institution from the Jewish Sabbath. We don't need to investigate the subject separately as it affects them, for their opinions, as the Archbishop indeed asserts, agreed with those of the Continental Reformers. But we affirm, that the Reformers, as a body, *did* hold the divine authority and binding obligation of the fourth command, as requiring one day in seven to be employed in the worship and service of God, admitting only of works of necessity and of mercy, to the poor and afflicted. The release from legal bondage, of which they speak, included simply the obligation to keep precisely the seventh day of the week, and the external rest, which they conceived to be so rigorously binding on the Jews, that even the doing of charitable works was a breach of it—the very mistake of the Pharisees. In its results, however, the doctrinal error regarding the fourth commandment has been very disastrous even in England, but still more so on the Continent. However strict the Reformers were personally, as to the practical observance of the Lord's day—so strict,

It presents no real contrariety to the interpretation we have given of the fourth commandment, as affecting the Jews, that Moses on one occasion enjoined the people not to go out of their place or tents on the Sabbath-day. For that manifestly had respect to the gathering of manna, and was simply a prohibition against their going out, as on other days, to obtain food. Neither is the order against kindling a fire on the Sabbath any argument for an opposite view; for it was not less evidently a temporary appointment, suitable to their condition in a wilderness of burning sand, necessary there perhaps to ensure even a decent conformity to the rest of the Sabbath, but palpably unsuitable to the general condition of the people, when settled in a land which is subject to great vicissitudes, and much diversity as to heat and cold. It was in fact plainly impracticable as a national regulation; and was not considered by the people at large binding on them in their settled state, as may be inferred from Josephus noticing it as a peculiarity of the Essenes, that they would not kindle a fire on the Sabbath (*Wars*, II. c. 8, § 9). Indeed, it is no part of the fourth commandment, fairly interpreted, to prohibit ordinary labour, excepting in so far as it tends to interfere with the proper sanctification of the time to God, and this in most cases would rather be promoted than hindered by the kindling of a fire for purposes of comfort and refreshment. So we judge, for example, in regard to the sixth commandment, which, being intended to guard and protect the sacredness of man's life, does not absolutely prevent all manner of killing, nay, may sometimes rather be said to require this, that life may be preserved. In like manner, it was not work in the abstract that was forbidden in the fourth commandment, but work only in so far as it interfered with the sanctified use of the day. And the endless restrictions and limitations of the Jews, in our Lord's time and since, about the Sabbath-day's journey, and the particular acts that were, or were not lawful on that day, are only to be regarded as the wretched puerilities of men, in whose hands the spirit of the precept had

especially in Geneva, that they were charged by some with Judaizing—the separation they made here between the law and the gospel soon wrought most injuriously upon the life of religion; and the saying of Owen was lamentably verified: “Take this day off from the basis wherupon God hath fixed it, and all human substitutions of any thing in the like kind, will quickly discover their own vanity.”—See Appendix A.

already evaporated, and for whom nothing more remained than to dispute about the bounds and lineaments of its dead body.

4. But then, there is an express abolition of Sabbath-days in the Gospel, as the mere shadows of higher realities; and the apostle expressly discharges believers from judging one another regarding their observance, and even mourns over the Galatians, as bringing their Christian condition into doubt, by observing days and months and years. We shall not waste time by considering the unsatisfactory attempts which have frequently been made to account for such statements, by many who hold the still abiding obligation of the fourth commandment. But supposing this commandment simply to require, as we have endeavoured to shew it does, the withdrawal of men's minds from worldly cares and occupations, that they might be free to give themselves to the spiritual service of God, is it conceivable, from all we know of the apostle's feelings, that he would have warned the disciples against such a practice as a dangerous snare to their souls, or raised a note of lamentation over those who had adopted it, as if all were nearly gone with them? Is there a single unbiassed reader of his epistles, who would not rather have expected him to rejoice in the thought of such a practical ascendancy being won for the spiritual and eternal world, over the temporal and earthly? It is the less possible for any one to doubt this, when it is so manifest from his history, that he *did* make a distinction of days in this sense, by everywhere establishing the practice of religious meetings on the first day of the week, and exhorting the disciples to observe them aright. When he, therefore, writes against the observing of days, it must plainly be something of a different kind he has in view. And what could that be, but the lazy, corporeal, outward observance of them, which the Jews had now come to regard as composing much of the very substance of religion, and by which they largely fed their self-righteous pride? Sabbath-days in this sense, it is certainly no part of the Gospel to enforce; but neither was it any part of the law to do so; Moses, had he been alive, would have denounced them, as well as the ambassador of Christ.

But this, it may perhaps be thought, scarcely reaches the point at issue; for the apostle discharges Christians from the observance of Sabbath-days, not in a false and improper sense, but in that very sense in which they were shadows of good things to

come—placing them on a footing in this respect with distinctions of meat and drink. It is needless to say here, that all the feast days of the Jews, being withdrawn from a common to a sacred use, were called Sabbaths, and that the apostle alludes exclusively to these.¹ There can be no doubt, indeed, that they were so called, and are also included here; but not to the exclusion of the seventh-day Sabbath, which, from the very nature of the case, was the one most likely to be thought of by the Colossians. Unless it had been expressly excepted, we must in fairness suppose it to have been at least equally intended with the others. But the truth is simply this: what the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath was not necessarily, or in itself, it came to acquire in the general apprehension from the connection it had so long held with the symbolical services of Judaism. In its original institution there was nothing in it properly shadowy or typical of redemption; for it commenced before sin had entered, and while yet there was no need for a Redeemer. Nor was there anything properly typical in the observance of it imposed in the fourth commandment; for this was a substantial re-enforcement of the primary institution, only with a reference in the letter of the precept to the circumstances of Israel, as the destined possessors of Canaan. But becoming then associated with a symbolical religion, in which spiritual and divine things were constantly represented and taught by means of outward and bodily transactions, the bodily rest enjoined in it, came to partake of the common typical character of all their symbolical services. The same thing happened here, as with circumcision, which was the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant of grace, and had no immediate connection with the law of Moses: while yet it became so identified with this law, that it required to be supplanted by another ordinance of precisely similar import, when the seed of blessing arrived, which the Abrahamic covenant chiefly respected. So great was the necessity for the abolition of the one ordinance, and the introduction of the other, that the apostle virtually declares it to

¹ This is Haldane's explanation in his appendix to his Com. on Romans, as it had also been that of Ridgeley's and others in former times. But if that explanation were right—if the apostle really intended to except, what the world at large pre-eminently understood by Sabbath-days, it would be impossible to acquit him of using language almost sure to be misunderstood.

have been indispensable, when he affirms those, who would still be circumcised, to be debtors to do the whole law. At the same time, the original design and spiritual import of circumcision, he testifies to have been one and the same with baptism—calls baptism, indeed, the circumcision of Christ (Col. ii. 11,)—and, consequently, apart from the peculiar circumstances arising out of the general character of the Jewish religion, the one ordinance might have served the purpose contemplated as well as the other.

So with the Sabbath. Having been engrafted into a religion so peculiarly symbolical as the Mosaic, it was unavoidable, that the bodily rest enjoined in it should acquire, like all the other outward things belonging to the religion, a symbolical and typical value. For that rest, though by no means the whole duty required, was yet the substratum and groundwork of the whole: the heart, when properly imbued with the religious spirit, feeling in this very rest a call to go forth and employ itself on God. To aid it in doing so, suitable exercises of various kinds would, doubtless, be commonly resorted to ;¹ but not as a matter of distinct obligation, rather as a supplementary help to that quiet rest in God, and imitation of his doings, to which the day itself invited. This end is the same also which the Gospel has in view, but which it seeks to accomplish by means of more active services and direct instruction. The end under both dispensations was substantially the same, with a characteristic difference as to the manner of attaining it, corresponding to the genius of the respective dispensations—the one making more of the outward, the other addressing itself directly to the inward man—the one also having more of a natural, the other more of a spiritual, redemptive basis. Hence the mere outward, bodily rest of the Sabbath came, by a kind of unavoidable necessity, to acquire of itself a sacred character—although ultimately carried to an improper and unjustifiable excess, by the carnality of the Jewish mind. And hence, too, when another state of things was introduced, it became necessary to assign to such Sabbaths a place among the things that were done away, and so far to change the ordinance itself as to

¹ 2 Kings iv. 23, where the Shunamite woman's husband expressed his wonder that she should go to the prophet, when it was neither new moon nor Sabbath, implies that it was customary to meet for social exercises on these days.

transfer it to a different day, and even call it by a new name. But as baptism is Christ's circumcision, so the Lord's day is his Sabbath, and to be in the Spirit on that day, worshipping and serving him in the spirit of his Gospel, is to take up the yoke of the fourth commandment.

5. This touches on, and partly answers, another objection—the only one of any moment that still remains to be adverted to—that derived from the change of day, from the last to the first day of the week. This was necessary, not only, as Horsley says,¹ to distinguish Christian from Jew, but also to distinguish Sabbath from Sabbath—a Sabbath growing up amid symbolical institutions, which deeply imbued it with a spirit of quiet repose, and a Sabbath not less marked, indeed, by a withdrawal from the cares and occupations of worldly business, but much more distinguished by spiritual employment and active energy, both in doing and receiving good. Such a change in its character was clearly indicated by our Lord, in those miracles of healing which he purposely performed on the Sabbath, that his followers might now see their calling, to use the opportunities presented to them on the day of bodily rest, to minister to the temporal or the spiritual necessities of those around them. And in fitting correspondence with this, the day chosen for the Christian Sabbath was the first day of the week—the day on which Christ rose from the dead—that he might enter into the rest of God, after having finished the glorious work of redemption. But that rest, how to be employed? Not in vacant repose, but in an incessant, holy activity, in directing the affairs of his mediatorial kingdom, and diffusing the inestimable blessings he had purchased for men. A new era then dawned upon the world, which was to give an impulse hitherto unknown to all the springs of benevolent and holy working; and it was meet that this should communicate its impress to the day, through which the Gospel was specially to develop its peculiar genius and proper tendency. But pre-eminent as this Gospel stands above all earlier revelations of God, for the ascendancy it gives to the unseen and eternal over the seen and temporal, it would surely be a palpable contrariety to the whole

¹ Works, vol. i. p. 356. The greater part of his three Sermons is excellent, though he does not altogether avoid, we think, some of the misapprehensions referred to above.

spirit it breathes, and the ends it has in view, if now, on the Lord's day, the things of the world were to have more, and the things of God less, of men's regard than formerly on the Jewish Sabbath. Least of all could any change have been intended in this direction; and the only change in the manner of its observance, which the Gospel itself warrants us to think of, is the greater amount of spiritual activity to be put forth on it, flowing out in suitable exercises of love to God, and acts of kindness and blessing towards our fellow-men.

What though the Gospel does not expressly enact this change of day, and in so many words enjoin the disciples to hallow the ordinance after the manner now described? It affords ample materials to all for discovering the mind of God in this respect, who are really anxious to learn it; and what more is done in regard to the ordinances of worship generally, or to any thing in God's service connected with external arrangements? It is the characteristic of the Gospel to unfold great truths and principles, and only briefly to indicate the proper manner of their development and exercise in the world. But can any one in reality have imbibed these, without cordially embracing, and to the utmost of his power, improving the advantages of such a wise and beneficent institution? Or, does the Christian world now not need its help, as much as the Jewish did of old? Even Tholuck, though he still does not see how to give the Christian Sabbath the right hold upon the conscience, yet deploras the prevailing neglect of it as destructive to the life of piety, and proclaims the necessity of a stricter observance. "Spirit, spirit! we cry out: but should the prophets of God come again, as they came of old, and should they look upon our works—Flesh, flesh! they would cry out in response. Of a truth, the most spiritual among us cannot dispense with a rule, a prescribed form, in his morality and piety, without allowing the flesh to resume its predominance. The sway of the spirit of God in your minds is weak; carry, then, holy ordinances into your life."¹

¹ Sermons, Bib. Cab. vol. xxviii. p. 13. The absolute necessity of a strict observance of the Lord's day to the life of religion, is well noted in a comparison between Scotland and Germany, by a shrewd and intelligent observer—Mr Laing, in his *Notes on the Pilgrimage to Treves*, ch. x. He does not profess to state the theological view of the subject, and even admits there may be some truth in what is sometimes pleaded

It is not unimportant to state farther in regard to the change of day from the last to the first day of the week, that while strong reasons existed for it in the mighty change that had been introduced by the perfected redemption of Christ, no special stress appears, even in the Old Testament Scripture, to have been laid on the precise day. Manifestly the succession of six days of worldly occupation, and one of sacred rest, is the point chiefly contemplated there. So little depended upon the exact day, that on the occasion of renewing the Sabbatical institution in the wilderness, the Lord seems to have made the weekly series run from the first giving of the manna. His example, therefore, in the work of creation, was intended merely to fix the relative proportion between the days of ordinary labour and those of sacred rest—and with that view is appealed to in the law. Nay, even there the correspondence is closer than is generally considered between the Old and the New; for while the original Sabbath was the seventh day, in regard to God's work of creation, it was man's first. He *began* his course of weekly service upon earth by holding Sabbath with his Creator; much as the church was called to begin her service to Christ on his finishing the work of the new creation. Nor, since redemption is to man a still more important work than creation, can it seem otherwise than befitting, to a sanctified mind, that some slight alteration should have taken place in the relative position of the days, as might serve for a perpetual memorial, that this work also was now finished. By the resurrection of Christ, as the apostle shews, in 1 Cor. xv. 20, sq., a far higher dignity has been won for humanity, than was given to it by the creation of Adam; and one hence feels, as Sartorius has remarked (*Cultus*, p. 154), that it would be alike unnatural and untrue, if the church now should keep the creation-Sabbath of the Old, and not the resurrection-Sabbath of the New—if

for a looser observance of the day, especially in regard to those situated in large towns—but still holds the necessity of a well-spent Sabbath to produce and maintain a due sense of religion, and attributes the low state of religion in Germany very much to their neglect of the Sabbath. He justly says, the strict observance of Sunday “is the application of principle to practice by a whole people; it is the working of their religious sense and knowledge upon their habits; it is the sacrifice of pleasures, in themselves innocent—and these are the most difficult to be sacrificed—to a higher principle than self-indulgence; such a population stands on a much higher moral and intellectual step than the population of the Continent,” &c.

she should honour, as her holy-day, *that* day on which Christ was buried, and not rather the one on which he rose again from the dead. It was on the eve of the resurrection-day that he appeared to the company of the disciples, announced to them the completion of his work, gave them his peace, and authorized and commissioned them to preach salvation and dispense forgiveness to all nations in his name (Luke xxiv). So that if Adam's Sabbath was great by the divine blessing and sanctification, Christ's Sabbath was still greater through the divine blessing of peace, grace, and salvation, which he sheds forth upon a lost world, in order to re-establish the divine image in men's souls, in a higher even than its original form, and bring in a better paradise than that which has been lost.

In conclusion, we deem the law of the Sabbath, as interpreted in this section, to have been fully entitled to a place in the standing revelation of God's will concerning man's duty, and to have formed no exception to the perfection and completeness of the law :—

(1.) Because, first, there is in such an institution, when properly observed, a sublime act of holiness. The whole rational creation standing still, as it were, on every seventh day as it returns, and looking up to its God—what could more strikingly proclaim in all men's ears, that they have a common Lord and Master in heaven ! It reminds the rich, that what they have is not properly their own—that they hold all of a superior—a superior who demands that on this day the meanest slave shall be as his master—nay, that the very beast of the field shall be loosed from its yoke of service, and stand free to its Creator. No wonder that proud man, who loves to do what he will with his own, and that the busy world, which is bent on prosecuting with restless activity the concerns of time, would fain break asunder the bands of this holy institution. For it speaks aloud of the overruling dominion and rightful supremacy of God, which they would willingly cast behind their backs. But the heart that is really imbued with the principles of the Gospel, how can it fail to call such a day the holy of the Lord and honourable ? Loving God, it cannot but love what gives it the opportunity of holding undisturbed communion with him.

(2.) Secondly, because it is an institution of mercy. In per-

fect harmony with the Gospel, it breathes good-will and kindness to men. It brings, as Coleridge well expressed it, fifty-two spring days every year to this toilsome world ; and may justly be regarded as a sweet remnant of paradise, mitigating the now inevitable burdens of life, and connecting the region of bliss that has been lost with the still brighter glory that is to come. As in the former aspect there is love to God, so here there is love to man.

(3.) Lastly, we uphold its title to a place in the permanent revelation of God's will to man, because of its eminent use and absolute necessity to promote men's higher interests. Religion cannot properly exist without it, and is always found to thrive as the spiritual duties of the day of God are attended to and discharged. It is, when duly improved, the parent and the guardian of every virtue. In this practical aspect of it, all men of serious piety substantially concur ; and as a specimen of thousands, which might be produced, we conclude with simply giving the impressive testimony of Owen : " For my part, I must not only say, but plead, whilst I live in this world, and leave this testimony to the present and future ages, that if ever I have seen anything of the ways and worship of God, wherein the power of religion or godliness hath been expressed,—anything that hath represented the holiness of the Gospel and the Author of it,—anything that looked like a prelude to the everlasting Sabbath and rest with God, which we aim, through grace, to come unto, it hath been there, and with them, where, and among whom, the Lord's day hath been held in highest esteem, and a strict observation of it attended to, as an ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ. The remembrance of their ministry, their walk and conversation, their faith and love, who in this nation have most zealously pleaded for, and have been in their persons, families, parishes, or churches, the most strict observers of this day, will be precious to them that fear the Lord, whilst the sun and moon endure. Let these things be despised by those who are otherwise minded ; to me they are of great weight and importance." (On Heb. vol. i. 726, Tegg's ed.)

SECTION FOURTH.

WHAT THE LAW COULD NOT DO—THE COVENANT-STANDING AND
PRIVILEGES OF ISRAEL BEFORE IT WAS GIVEN.

HAVING now considered what the law, properly so called, was in itself, we proceed to inquire into the ends and purposes for which it was given, and the precise place which it was designed to hold in the divine economy. Any misapprehension entertained, or even any obscurity allowed to hang upon these points, would, it is plain, materially affect the result of our future investigations. And there is the more need to be careful and discriminating in our inquiries here, as from the general and deep-rooted carnality of the Jewish people, the effect which the law actually produced upon the character of their religion, was to a considerable extent different from what it ought to have been. This error on their part has also mainly contributed to the first rise and still continued existence of some mistaken views regarding the law among many Christian divines.

There can be no doubt, that the law held relatively a different place under the Old dispensation, from what it does under the New. The most superficial acquaintance with the statements of New Testament scripture on the subject, is enough to satisfy us of this. "The law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." But there is one point—the first that properly meets us in this department of our subject—in regard to which both dispensations are entirely on a footing. This point has respect to the *condition* of those to whom the law was given, and which, being already possessed, the law could not possibly have been intended to bring. So that an inquiry into the nature of that condition, of necessity carries along with it the consideration of what the law could not do.

Now, as the historical element is here of importance, when was

it, we ask, that this revelation of law was given to Israel? Somewhere, we are told, about the beginning of the third month after their departure from the land of Egypt.¹ Hence, from the very period of its introduction, the law could not come as a redeemer from evil, or a bestower of life and blessing. Its object could not possibly be to propose any thing which should have the effect of shielding from death, rescuing from bondage, or founding a title to the favour and blessing of heaven—for all that had been already obtained. By God's outstretched arm, working with sovereign freedom and almighty power in behalf of the Israelites, they had been brought into a state of freedom and enlargement, and under the banner of divine protection, were travelling to the land settled on them as an inheritance, before one word had been spoken to them of the law in the proper sense of the term. And whatever purposes the law might have been intended to serve, it could not have been for any of those already accomplished or provided for.

It is of great importance to keep distinctly in view this *negative* side of the law—what it neither could, nor was ever designed to do. For, if we raise it to a position which it was not meant to occupy, and expect from it benefits which it was not fitted to yield, we must be altogether at fault in our reckoning, and can have no clear knowledge of the dispensation to which it belonged. It is in reference to this, that the apostle speaks in Gal. iii. 17, 18: "And this I say, that the covenant, which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise." The Jews had come in the apostle's time, and most of them, indeed, long before, to look to their deeds of law as constituting their title to the inheritance; and the same leaven of self-righteousness was now beginning to work among the Galatian converts. To check this tendency in them, and convince them of the fundamental error on which it proceeded, he presses on their consideration the nature and design of God's covenant with Abraham, which he represents as having been "confirmed before of God in Christ," because in making promise of a seed of blessing, it had respect pre-eminently to Christ, and might justly be regarded in its lead-

¹ Ex. xix. 1.

ing objects and provisions, as only an earlier and imperfect exhibition of the Christian covenant of redemption. But that covenant expressly conferred on Abraham's posterity, as Heaven's free gift, the inheritance of the land of Canaan ; and it must also have secured their redemption from the house of bondage, and their safe conduct through the wilderness, since these were necessary to their entering on the possession of the inheritance. Hence, as the apostle argues, their title to these things could not possibly need to be acquired over again by deeds of law afterwards performed, for this would manifestly have been to give to the law the power of disannulling the covenant of promise, and would have made one revelation of God overthrow the foundation already laid by another.

But that God never meant the law to interfere with the gifts and promises of the covenant, is clear from what he said to the children of the covenant immediately before the law was given : " Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people ; for all the earth is mine ; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." (Ex. xix. 5.) Here God addresses them as already standing in such a relation of nearness to him, as secured for them an interest in his faithfulness and love. He appeals to the proofs, which he had given of this, as amply sufficient to dispel every doubt from their mind, and to warrant them in expecting whatever might still be needed to complete their felicity. " Now *therefore* if ye will obey my voice"—not because ye have obeyed it, have the great things which have just been accomplished in your experience taken place, but these have been done, that you might feel your calling to obey, and by obeying fulfil the high destiny to which you are appointed. In this call to obedience we already have the whole law, so far as concerns the ground of its obligation, and the germ of its requirements. And when the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai, to proclaim the words of the law, he is simply to be regarded as giving utterance to that voice which they were to obey. Hence also, in prefacing the words then spoken by the declaration, " I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the

house of bondage," he rests his claim to their obedience on precisely the same ground as here ; he resumes what he had previously said in regard to the peculiar relation in which he stood to them, as proved by the grand deliverance he had achieved in their behalf, and on that founds his special claim to the return of dutiful obedience, which he justly expected at their hands. And when it was proclaimed as the result of this obedience, that they would be to God " a peculiar people, a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation," they were given to understand, that thus alone could they continue to occupy the singular place they now held in the regard of Heaven, enjoy intimate fellowship with God, and be fitting instruments in his hand for carrying out the wise and holy purposes of his divine government. This, however, belongs to another part of the subject, and has respect to what the law *was* given to do.

We see, then, from the very time and manner in which the law was introduced, that it could not have been designed to interfere with the covenant of promise ; and as all that pertained to redemption, the inheritance, and the means of life and blessing, came by that covenant, the law was manifestly given to provide none of them. Nor could it make any alteration on the law in this respect, that it was made to assume the form of a covenant. Why this was done, we shall inquire in the sequel. But looking at the matter still in a merely negative point of view, it is obvious, that the law's coming to possess the character of a covenant, could give it no power to make void the provisions of that earlier covenant, which secured for the seed of Abraham, as heaven's free gift, the inheritance and everything properly belonging to it. And if the Israelites should at any time come to regard the covenant of law as having been made for the purpose of founding a title to what the covenant with Abraham had previously bestowed, they would evidently misinterpret the meaning of God, and confound the proper relations of things. This, however, is what they actually did on a large scale, the grievous error and pernicious consequences of which are pointed out in Gal. iv. 21-31 : " Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law ? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free-woman. But he, who was of the bondwoman, was born after the flesh ; but he of the free-woman was

by promise. Which things are an allegory ; for these are the two covenants, the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar. For this Hagar is (*i. e.* corresponds to) Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem, which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, (Isa. liv. 1), Rejoice thou barren, that bearest not, break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she that hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise," &c.

Here the proper wife of Abraham, Sarah, and his bondmaid Hagar, are viewed as the representatives of the two covenants respectively, and the children of the two mothers as, in like manner, representatives of the kind of worshippers, whom the covenants were fitted to produce. Sarah, the only proper spouse of Abraham, stands for the heavenly Jerusalem ; that is, the true church of God, in which he perpetually resides, and begets children to himself. Whoever belong to it are born from above, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." And that Sarah's son might be the fit representative of all such, his birth was delayed till she had attained an advanced age. Born as Isaac was, it was impossible to overlook the immediate and supernatural operation of God's hand in his birth ; and if ever mother had reason to say, "I have gotten a man from the Lord," it was Sarah when she brought forth Isaac. But what was true of Isaac's *natural* birth, is equally true of the *spiritual* birth of God's people in every age. The church, as a heavenly society, is their mother. But that church is so, simply because she is the habitation of God, and the channel through which his grace, flowing into the dead heart of nature, quickens it into newness of life. And the covenant in the hand of this church, by which she is empowered to bring forth such children to God, must be substantially the same in every age ; viz. the covenant of grace, which began to be disclosed in part on the very scene of the fall—which was again more distinctly revealed to Abraham, when he received the promises of a seed of blessing, and an inheritance everlasting, and which has been clearly brought to light, and finally confirmed in Christ for the whole elect family of God. This unquestionably is the covenant which answers to Sarah, and

belongs to the heavenly Jerusalem ; to this covenant all the real children of God owe their birth, their privileges, and their hopes ; those, who are born of it, in whatever age of the church, are born in freedom, and heirs of the inheritance.

It is this church, standing in and growing out of this covenant, that the prophet Isaiah addresses, in the passage quoted by the apostle, as a "barren woman, a widow, and desolate," and whom he comforts with the promise of a numerous offspring. He does not expressly name Sarah, but he evidently has her in his eye, and draws his delineation both of the present and the future in language suggested by her history. For, as in her case, so the seed of the true church was long in coming, and slow of increase, compared with those born after the flesh. It seemed often, especially in such times of backsliding and desolation as those contemplated by the prophet, as if the spouse were absolutely forsaken, or utterly incapable of being a mother, and she appeared all the more in need of consolation, as her carnal rival even then possessed a large and numerous offspring. But the prophet cheers her with the prospect of better days to come ; and gives her the assurance, that, in the long run, her spiritual seed would greatly outnumber the fleshly seed of the other. This prospect began (as the apostle intimates, v. 31) to be more especially realized, when the kingdom opened the door of salvation to the Gentiles.

The other covenant, which answers to Hagar, was the covenant of law ratified at Sinai ; but that by no means corresponding, as is often represented, to the Old Testament church or dispensation. For viewed in the light of mothers, the two covenants are spoken of as directly opposite in their nature, tendency, and effects, while the Old and New Testament dispensations present no such contrast to each other. They are rather to be regarded as in all essential respects the same. They differ, not as Ishmael differed from Isaac, but only as the heir, when a child, differs from the heir when arrived at maturity. Of all the true members of both churches, Abraham is the common parent and head ; and whether outwardly descended from his loins or not, they constitute properly but one people. They are all the children of faithful Abraham, possessing his covenant-relation to God, and his interest in the promises of good things to come, (Rom. iv. 11-13 ; Gal. iii. 29). But the seed that came by Hagar, which was born, not

properly of God, but of the will of the flesh, was entirely of another kind, and represented no part of the true church in any age ; it represented only the carnal portion of the professing church—the unregenerate, idolatrous, or self-righteous Israelites of former times, who deemed it quite enough that they were able to trace their descent from Abraham—and the merely nominal believers now, who satisfy themselves with an outward standing among the followers of Jesus, and a formal attendance on some of the ordinances of his appointment. These are they, “who say they are Jews, but are not ;” they no more belonged to the seed of God, under the Old Testament, than they do under the New ; they are Ishmaelites, not Israelites—a spurious, fleshly offspring, that should never have been born, and when born, without any title to the inheritance and the blessing.

It was the prevailing delusion of the Jews in our Lord’s time, as it had been also of many former times, not to perceive this—not to understand, what yet God had taken especial pains to teach them, that the subjects of his love and blessing were always an elect seed. From the time of Abraham, they had chiefly belonged to his stock, but never had they at any period embraced all his offspring :—not the sons of Hagar and Keturah, but only the son of Sarah ; not both the sons of Isaac, but only Jacob ; not all the sons of Jacob, but only such as possessed his faith, and were, like him, princes with God. The principle, “not all Israel, who are of Israel,” runs through the entire history ; and too often also do the facts of history afford ground for the conclusion, that those who were simply of Israel, had greatly the preponderance in numbers and influence over such as truly were Israel.

But how did such children come to exist at all ? How did they get a being within the bosom of the church of God ? They also had a mother, represented by Hagar, and that mother, as well as the other, a covenant of God, the covenant of Sinai. But why should it have produced such children ? In one way alone could it possibly have done so ; viz. by being put out of its proper place, and turned to an illegitimate use. God never designed it to *be* a mother ; no more than Hagar, respecting whom Abraham sinned, when he turned aside to her, and took her for a mother of children ; her proper place was that only of an handmaid to Sarah. And it was, in like manner, to pervert the covenant of law from

Sinai to an improper purpose, to look to it as a parent of life and blessing ; nor could any better result come from the error. "It gendereth unto bondage," says the apostle ; that is, in so far as it gave birth to any children, these were not true children of God, free, spiritual, with hearts of filial confidence and devoted love ; but miserable bondmen, selfish, carnal, full of mistrust and fear. Of these children of the Sinaitic covenant we are presented with a finished specimen in the Scribes and Pharisees of our Lord's time—men, who were chiefly remarkable for the full and ripened development of a spirit of bondage in religion—who were complete in all the garniture of a sanctified demeanour, while they were full within of ravening and wickedness—worshipping a God, whom they eyed only as the taskmaster of a laborious ritual, by the punctual observance of which they counted themselves secure of his favour and blessing—crouching, like slaves, beneath their yoke of bondage, and loving the very bonds that lay on them, because nothing higher than the abject and hiring spirit of slavery breathed in their hearts. Such were the children, whom the covenant of law produced, as its natural and proper offspring. But did God ever seek such children ? Could he own them as members of his kingdom ? Could he receive them to an interest in his promised blessings ? Assuredly not ; and therefore it was entirely against his mind, when his professing people looked in that direction for life and blessing. If really his people, they already had these by another and earlier covenant which *could* give them ; and those who still looked for them to the covenant of law, only got a serpent for bread, instead of a blessing a curse.¹

It seems very strange, that so many Christian divines, especially of such as hold evangelical principles, should here have fallen into substantially the Jewish error, representing the Israelites as being in such a sense under the covenant of law, that by obedience to it they had to establish their title to the inheritance. Not only does Warburton call the dispensation, under which they were placed, roundly "a dispensation of works,"² but we find Dr

¹ On this negative side of the law, may be consulted Bell on the Covenants, which, though full of repetition, is clear and satisfactory on this part of the subject ; it forms a sort of expanded, though certainly rather tedious illustration of Vitringa's Com. on Isa. liv. 1. On the positive side of the law, or what it was designed to do, the work is not quite so successful.

² Div. Leg. B. v. Note C.

John Erskine, an evangelical writer, among many similar things, writing thus: "He, who yielded an external obedience to the law of Moses, was termed *righteous*, and had a claim in virtue of his obedience to the land of Canaan, so that doing these things he lived by them. Hence Moses says, Deut. v. 25, 'It shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God;' *i. e.* it shall be the cause and matter of our justification, it shall found our title to covenant blessings. But to spiritual and heavenly blessings, we are entitled by the obedience of the Son of God, not by our own."¹ It was very necessary, when the learned author made obedience to the covenant of Sinai the ground of a title to the inheritance of Canaan, that he should bring down its terms as low as possible; for had these not been of a superficial and formal nature, it would manifestly have been a mockery to make the people's obedience the ground of their title. But what, then, becomes of the covenant of Abraham, if the inheritance, which it gave freely in promise to his seed, had to be acquired over again by deeds of law? And what, indeed, becomes of the spiritual and unchangeable character of God, if in one age of the church, he should appear to have exacted duties of an external kind, as the ground of a title to his blessing, while in another all is given of grace, and the duties required are pre-eminently inward and spiritual! In such a case, there not only could have been no proper correspondence between the earlier and the later dispensations, but the revealed character of God must have undergone an essential change; he could not be "the Jehovah, that changeth not." The confusion arises from assigning to the covenant of law a wrong place, and ascribing to it what it was never intended to do or give. "God did never make a new promulgation of the law by revelation to sinful men, in order to keep them under mere law, without setting before them, at the same time, the promise and grace of the new covenant, by which they might escape from the curse, which the law denounced. The legal and evangelical dispensations have been but different dispensations of the same covenant of grace, and of the blessings thereof. Though there is now a greater degree of light, consola-

¹ Theological Dissertations, p. 44.

tion, and liberty, yet if Christians are now under a kingdom of grace, where there is pardon upon repentance, the Lord's people under the Old Testament, were (as to the reality and substance of things) also under a kingdom of grace."¹ So that it is quite wrong, as the judicious author states, to represent those "who were under the pedagogy of the law, as if they had been under a proper and strict covenant of works."

Bähr, who rises immeasurably above all who have imbibed their notions of the legal dispensation in the school of Spencer and Warburton, and who everywhere exhibits a due appreciation of the moral and religious element in Judaism, still so far coincides with them, that he elevates the law to a place not properly its own. After investigating the descriptions given of the Decalogue, he draws the conclusion, that "for Israel this formed the foundation of its whole existence as a people, the root of its religious and political life, the highest, best, most precious thing the people had, their one and all."² So also again, when speaking of the covenant and the law being entirely the same, he says to the like effect: "This covenant first properly gave Israel as a people its being; it was the root and basis of the life of Israel as a people"³ No doubt understanding, as he does, by the law or covenant all the precepts and institutions of Moses, which he holds to have been represented in the Decalogue, the idea here expressed is not quite so wide of the truth as it might otherwise appear. But still the statement is by no means correct; it is utterly at variance with the facts of Israel's history, and calculated to give a false impression of the whole nature and design of the Mosaic legislation. It presents this to our view simply as a dispensation of works, having law for the root of life, and consequently the deeds of law for the only ground of blessing. In plain contrariety to the assertion of the apostle,⁴ it virtually says that a law *was* given which brought life, and that righteousness was by the law. Finally, it gives such a place to the mere requirements and operations of law, that nothing remained for grace to do, but merely to pardon the shortcomings and transgressions of which men might

¹ Fraser on Sanctification; Explic. of Rom. vii. 8.

² Symbolik, i. 386, 387.

³ Symbolik, ii. p. 389.

⁴ Gal. iii. 21.

be guilty, as subject to law ; all else was earned by the obedience performed ; even forgiveness itself in a manner was thus earned, because obtained as the result of services rendered in compliance with the terms and prescriptions of law.

This glorification of law, however, has not been confined to the Old Testament Church. There are not a few Christian divines who are so enamoured of law, that the gospel of the grace of God has become in their hands only a kind of modified covenant of works ; and they can only account for faith holding the peculiar place assigned to it in the work of salvation, because in their view it comprehends all graces and virtues in its bosom. Salvation appears not directly and properly as the free gift of divine grace in Christ, but rather as the acquired result of man's evangelical righteousness, or, as it is generally termed, his sincere though imperfect obedience. The title to heaven must still be earned, only the satisfaction of Christ has secured its being done on much easier conditions. There is no need for our entering into any exposure of this New Testament legalism, as we have seen that its prototype under the Old Testament, though it had more seemingly to countenance it, was still without any proper foundation. But we may briefly advert to the statements of another class of theologians, who, while they admit that the Old, as well as the New Testament Church, was under a dispensation of grace, to which it owed all its privileges, blessings, and hopes, at the same time regard the covenant of Sinai as in itself properly the covenant of works, by obedience to which, if faithfully and fully rendered, men would have founded a title to life and blessing. They justly regard it as in substance a republication of the law of holiness originally impressed upon the soul of Adam ; but fall into perplexity and confusion by adopting a somewhat erroneous view of the primary design and object of that law. The righteousness there required they are accustomed to represent as that "by the doing of which man was to found his right to promised blessings ;"¹ or, to use the language of another, "in virtue of which he might thereon plead and demand the reward of eternal life."² Then, viewing such a law or covenant of works in reference to men as

¹ Bell on Covenants, p. 198.

² Boston's Notes on Marrow of Modern Divinity, p. 1, Introd.

sinful, the works required in it are necessarily considered as "the condition of a sinner's justification and acceptance with God," "a law to be done that he might be saved."¹

But was a law ever given, or a covenant ever made with man with any such professed design? Was it even propounded thus to Adam in paradise? Had he not received as a free gift from the hand of God, before anything was exacted of him in the way of obedience, both the principle of a divine life and an inheritance of blessing? So far from needing to found by deeds of righteousness a title to these, he came forth at the very first fully fraught with them; and the question with him was, not how to obtain what he had not, but how to continue in the enjoyment of what he already possessed. This he could no otherwise do than by fulfilling the righteous ends for which he had been created. To direct him towards these, therefore, must have been, if not the sole, at least the direct and ostensible object of whatever law was outwardly proposed to him, or inwardly impressed upon his conscience. If the word to him might be said to be, "Do this and live," it could only be in the sense of his thereby continuing in the life, in the possession and blessedness of which he was created. And it was the fond conceit of the Pharisaical Jews, that their law was given for purposes, higher even than those for which any law was given to man in innocence; that they might, by obedience to law, work out a righteousness, and acquire a title to life and glory, which did not naturally belong to them. It is simply against this groundless and perverse notion, which had come latterly to diffuse its leaven through the whole Jewish mind, that our Lord and his apostles are to be understood as speaking, when in a manifold variety of ways they endeavour to withdraw men's regards from the law, as a source of life, and point them to the riches of divine grace.²

It is, then, carefully to be remembered, in regard to the Old

¹ *Ib.* P. 1, c. 1, and the Marrow itself there; also Fraser on Rom. vii. 4, and Chalmers's Works, vol. x. p. 207.

² Rom. iii. vii.; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7; Gal. iii. 11, 21; Phil. iii. 8, 9; Eph. i. 3-7; Tit. iii. 4-7; 1 John i. v. 11; also of our Lord's Discourses, Luke xv.; xix. 1-10; John iii. 16-18; vi. 51. When he directed the lawyer, who tempted him with the question, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" to the commandments of the law, and in reference to the perfect love there required to God and man, said, "This do and thou shalt live;" it is clear he merely met the inquirer on his own ground, and aimed at send-

Testament church, that she had two covenants connected with her constitution—a covenant of grace, as well as of law ; and that the covenant of law, as it came last, so it took for granted the provisions of the existing covenant of grace. It was grafted upon this, and grew out of it. Hence, in revealing the terms of the legal covenant, the Lord spake to the Israelites as already *their* God, from whom they had received life and freedom (Ex. xx. 2),—proclaimed himself as the God of mercy, as well as of holiness (v. 5, 6),—recognised their title to the inheritance as his own sovereign gift to them (v. 12),—thus making it clear to all, that the covenant of law raised itself on the ground of the previous covenant of grace, and sought to carry out this to its legitimate and fruitful results.¹

That this also is the order of God's procedure with men under the Gospel, nothing but the most prejudiced mind can fail to perceive. Everywhere does God there present himself to his people as in the first instance a giver of life and blessing, and only afterwards as an exacter of obedience to his commands. Their obedience, so far from entitling to salvation, can never be acceptably rendered, till they have become partakers of the blessings of salvation. These blessings are altogether of grace, and are, therefore, received through faith. For what is faith, but the acceptance of heaven's grant of salvation, or a trusting in the record in which the grant is conveyed ? So that, in the order of each man's experience, there must, as is fully brought out in the epistle to the

ing him away with an impression of the impossibility of obtaining life by perfecting himself in the law's requirements. So also, such expressions as that in Rom. vii. 10, of "the commandment being ordained to life," (lit. which was for, or unto life), cannot mean that it was given to confer life, or to shew the way of obtaining it, for this is denied of any law that ever could have been given to sinful men, Gal. iii. 21. It simply means, that the law was given to subserve or promote the purposes of God in respect to life.

¹ The relation between the two covenants is briefly, but correctly stated by Sack in his *Apologetik*, p. 179 : "The matter of the law is altogether grounded upon the covenant of promise made with Abraham. . . . The law neither could nor would withdraw the exercise of faith from the covenant of promise, or render that superfluous, but merely formed an intermediate provision, until the fulfilment came." The relation is seldom correctly made out by writers of the class last referred to. For example, Boston would have the two covenants to have been revealed simultaneously from Sinai, making the Sinaitic covenant as much a covenant of grace as of law, (on the *Marrow*, p. 1, c. 2.) Burgess (on *Moral Law and Covenants*, p. 224,) represents it as properly a covenant of grace.

Romans, first be a participation in the mercies of God, and then growing out of this a felt and constraining obligation to run the way of God's commandments. How can it, indeed, be otherwise? How were it possible for men, laden with sin, and underlying the condemnation of heaven, to earn anything at God's hands, or do what might seem good in his sight, till they become partakers of grace? Can they work up so far, at least, against the stream of his displeasure, and begin of themselves the process of recovery, which they only require him to perfect? To imagine the possibility of this, were to betray an utter ignorance of the character of God in reference to his dealings with the guilty. He *can*, for his Son's sake, bestow eternal life and blessing on the most unworthy, but he *cannot* stoop to treat and bargain with men about their acquiring a title to it through their own imperfect services. They must first receive the gift through the channel of his own providing; and only when they have done this, are they in a condition to please and honour him. Not more certainly is faith without works dead, than all works are dead which do not spring from the living root of faith already implanted in the heart.

SECTION FIFTH.

THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE LAW WAS GIVEN, AND THE CONNECTION
BETWEEN IT AND THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS.

WE proceed now to advance a step farther, and to consider what the law *was* designed to do for Israel. That it did not come with a hostile intent, we have already seen. Its object was not to disannul the covenant of promise, or to found a new title to gifts and blessings already conferred. It was given rather as an hand-maid to the covenant, to minister in an inferior, but still necessary place, to the higher ends and purposes which the covenant itself had in view. And hence, when considered as standing in that its proper place, it is fitly regarded as an additional proof of the goodness of God towards his people: "He made known his ways unto Moses, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any people."

1. The first and immediate purpose for which the law was given to Israel, was that it might serve as a revelation of the righteousness which God expected from them as his covenant-people in the land of their inheritance. It was for this inheritance they had been redeemed. They were God's own peculiar people, his children and heirs, proceeding, under the banner of his covenant, to occupy *his* land. And that they might know the high ends for which they were to be planted there, and how these ends were to be secured, the Lord took them aside by the way, and gave them this revelation of his righteousness. As the land of their inheritance was emphatically God's land, so the law, which was to reign paramount there, must of necessity be his law, and that law itself the manifestation of his righteousness. With no other view, could God have stretched out his hand to redeem a people to himself, and with no other testimony set them as his witnesses before the

eye of the world, on a territory peculiarly his own. He must have acted here in the highest sense for his own glory ; and as his glory, viewed in respect to his moral government, is essentially bound up with the interests of righteousness, so those whom he destined to be the chosen instruments for shewing forth his glory in the region prepared for them, must go thither with the revelation of his righteousness in their hand, as the law which they were to carry out into all the relations of public and private life.

The same thing might be said in this respect of the land as a whole, which the Psalmist declares in reference to its spiritual centre—the place on which the tabernacle was pitched : “ Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle ? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill ? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart.” (Ps. xv.) And again in Psalm xxiv. : “ Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, and who shall stand in his holy place ? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart ; who hath not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.” There can be no doubt, that the character here meant to be delineated is, that of the true servants of God, as contradistinguished from hypocrites—the real denizens of his kingdom, whose high distinction it was to be dwellers and sojourners with him. The going up to the hill of God, standing in his holy place, or abiding in his tabernacle, is merely an image to express this spiritual idea. The land as a whole being God’s land, the people as a whole should also have been found dwelling as guests, or sojourning with him. (Lev. xxv. 23.) But this they could only be in reality, the Psalmist means to say, if they possessed the righteous character he delineates. In both of the delineations he gives, it is impossible to overlook a reference to the precepts of the Decalogue. And that such delineations should have been given at a time when the tabernacle service was in the course of being set up anew with increased splendour, was plainly designed to sound a warning in the ears of the people, that whatever regard should be paid to the solemnities of worship, it was still the righteousness in thought, word, and deed, as required in the precepts of the Decalogue, which God pre-eminently sought. This was what peculiarly fitted them for the place they occupied, and the destiny they had to fill. Hence, not only the righteousness of the Decalogue in general, but that especially of the second

table, is made prominent in the description, because hypocrites have so many ways of counterfeiting the works of the first table.¹

It makes no essential alteration on the law in this point of view, that it was made to assume the form of a covenant. For what sort of covenant was it? And with what object ratified? Not as an independent and separate revelation; but only, as already stated, an handmaid to the previously existing covenant of promise. On this last, as the divine root of all life and blessing, it was grafted; and rising from the ground which that former covenant provided, it proceeded to develop the requirements of righteousness, which the members of the covenant ought to have fulfilled. It was merely to impart greater solemnity to this revelation of righteousness—to give to its calls of duty a deeper impression and firmer hold upon the conscience—to render it clear and palpable, that the things required in it were not of loose and uncertain, but of most sure and indispensable obligation,—it was for such reasons alone that the law, after being proclaimed from Sinai, was solemnly ratified as a covenant. By this most sacred of religious transactions the Israelites were taken bound as a people to aim continually at the fulfilment of its precepts. But its having been turned into a covenant did not confer on it a different character from that which belonged to it as a rule of life and conduct, or materially affect the results that sprung either from obedience or disobedience to its demands; nor was any effect contemplated beyond that of adding to its moral weight and deepening its hold upon the conscience. And the very circumstance of its being ratified as a covenant, having God in the relation of a Redeemer for one of the contracting parties, was fraught with comfort and encouragement; since an assurance was thus virtually given, that what God in the one covenant of law required his people to do, he stood pledged in the other covenant of promise with his divine help to aid them in performing. The blood of the covenant as much bound God to confer the grace to obey, as it bound them to render the obedience. So that, while there was in this transaction something fitted to lighten, rather than to aggravate, the burden of the law's yoke, there was, at the same time, what involved the necessity of compliance with the tenor of its requirements, and took away all excuse from the wilfully disobedient.

¹ See Hengstenberg and Calvin on Ps. xv. 2.

The sum of the matter, then, was this: The seed of Abraham, as God's acknowledged children and heirs, were going to receive for their possession the land which he claimed as more peculiarly his own. But they must go and abide there partakers also of his character of holiness, for thus alone could they either glorify his name, or enjoy his blessing. And so, bringing them as he did from the region of pollution, he would not suffer them to plant their foot within its sacred precincts, until he had disclosed to them the great lines of religious and moral duty, in which the resemblance most essentially stands to his character of holiness, and taken them bound by the most solemn engagement to have the pattern of excellence set before them, as far as possible, realized in practice, through all the dwellings of Canaan. Had they been but faithful to their engagement—had they as a people striven in earnest through the grace offered them in the one covenant to exemplify the character of the righteous man exhibited in the other, "delighting in the law of the Lord, and meditating therein day and night," then in their condition they would assuredly have been "like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season, whose leaf doth not wither, and whatsoever he doth prospereth." Canaan would then, indeed, have verified the description of a land flowing with milk and honey.

We thus see in the *immediate* purposes of God respecting Israel, a sufficient reason for the introduction of the law, and for the prominent place assigned to it in the divine dispensation. But if we connect the immediate with the *ultimate* design of God in this portion of his dealings, we see the absolute necessity of what was done, in order to make the past a faithful representation of the future. Canaan stood to the eye of faith the type of heaven; and the character and condition of its inhabitants should have presented the image of what theirs shall be, who have entered on the kingdom prepared for them before the foundation of the world. The condition of such, we are well assured, shall be all blessedness and glory. The region of their inheritance shall be Immanuel's land—where the vicissitudes of evil, and the pangs of suffering, shall be alike unknown—where every thing shall reflect the effulgent glory of its divine author, and streams of purest delight shall be ever flowing to satisfy the souls of the redeemed. But it is never to be forgotten, that their condition shall be thus replenished

with all that is attractive and good, because their character shall first have become perfect in holiness. No otherwise than as conformed to Christ's image can they share with him in his inheritance ; for the kingdom of which they are the destined heirs, is one which the unrighteous cannot inherit, nor shall corruption in any form or degree be permitted to dwell in it. "Its people shall be all righteous"—that is their first characteristic, and the second depending upon this, and growing out of it as its proper result, is, that they shall be all filled with the goodness and glory of the Lord.

Hence, in addition to the moral ends of a direct and immediate kind which required to be accomplished, it was necessary also, in this point of view, to make the experience of God's ancient people, in connection with the land of promise, turn upon their relation to the law. As he could not permit them to enter the inheritance without first placing them under the discipline of the law, so neither could he permit them afterwards to enjoy the good of the land, when they lived in neglect of the righteousness the law required. In both respects, the type became sadly marred in the event, and the image it presented of the coming realities of heaven, was to be seen only in occasional lines and broken fragments. The people were so far from being all righteous, that the greater part were ever hardening their hearts in sin. On *their* part, a false representation was given of the moral perfection of the future world ; and it was in the highest degree impossible that God on *his* part should countenance their backsliding so as notwithstanding to render their state a full representation of its perfection in outward bliss. He must of necessity trouble the condition and change the lot of his people, in proportion as sin obtained a footing among them. The less there was of heaven's righteousness in their character, the less always must there be of its blessedness and glory in their condition ;—until, at last, the Lord was constrained to say : " Because they have forsaken my law, which I set before them, and have not obeyed my voice, neither walked therein, but have walked after the imagination of their own heart ; therefore, thus sayeth the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel : Behold I will feed them with wormwood, and give them water of gall to drink ; I will scatter them also among the heathen, and will send a sword after them, till I have consumed them."¹ Such were the

¹ Jer. ix. 13-16.

imperfections of the type ; let us rejoice, that in the antitype such imperfections can have no place. All there stands firm and secure in the unchanging faithfulness of Jehovah, and it will be as impossible for sin, as for adversity and trouble, to enter into the heavenly Canaan.

The view now given in respect to the primary reason for the giving of the law, is in perfect accordance with what is stated by the apostle in Gal. iii. 19 : “ Wherefore, then, serveth the law ? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.” The meaning is, it was added to the provisions and blessings secured in the earlier covenant of promise, because of the disposition in the hearts of the people to transgress the obligations under which they stood, and fall in with the corruptions of the world. To check this disposition—to keep their minds under the discipline of a severe and holy restraint—and circumscribe and limit their way, so that no excuse or liberty would be left them to turn aside from the right path—for this reason the law was added to the covenant. *But* for that inherent proneness to sin, now sufficiently made manifest, there should have been no need for such an addition. Had the members of the covenant thoroughly imbibed its spirit, and responded as they should have done to the love God had manifested toward them in making good its provisions, they would of themselves have been inclined to do the things which were contained in the law. This, however, they were not ; and hence the law came, pre-supposing and building upon the moral aim of the covenant, and more stringently binding upon their consciences the demands of righteousness, in order to stem the current of their sinful inclinations. It was to these inclinations alone that the law carried a hostile and frowning aspect ; in respect to the people themselves, it came as a minister of good, and not of evil ; and so far from being opposed to the promises of the covenant, it was rather to be viewed as a friendly monitor and guide, directing the people how to continue in the blessing of the covenant, and fulfil the ends for which it was established.

2. There was, however, another great reason for the law being given, which is also, perhaps, alluded to by the apostle in the passage just noticed, when he limits the use of the law in reference to transgressions, to the period before Christ’s appearance. Christ

was to be pre-eminently the seed of promise, through whom the blessings of the covenant were to be secured ; and when he should come, as a more perfect state of things would then be introduced, the law would no longer be required as it was before. While, therefore, it had an immediate and direct purpose to serve in restraining the innate tendency to transgression, it might be said to have had the further end in view of preparing the minds of men for that coming seed. And this it was fitted to do precisely through the same property, which rendered it suitable for accomplishing the primary design, viz. the perfect revelation it gave of the righteousness of God. It brought the people into contact with the righteous character of God, and bound them by covenant-sanctions and engagements to make that the standard after which they should endeavour to regulate their conduct. But conscience, enlightened and aroused by the light which was thus made to shine upon them, was ever testifying of transgressions committed against the righteousness required. Instead of being a witness to which they could appeal in proof of their having fulfilled the high ends for which they had been chosen and redeemed by God, the law rather did the part of an accuser, testifying against them of broken vows and violated obligations. And thus keeping perpetually alive upon the conscience a sense of guilt, it served to awaken in the hearts of those who really understood its spiritual meaning, a feeling of the need, and a longing expectation of the coming, of Him who was to bring in the more perfect state of things, and take away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

The certainty of this effect both having been from the first designed, and also to some extent produced by the law, will always appear the more obvious, the more clearly we perceive the connection between the law and the ritual of worship, and see how inadequately the violations of the one seemed to have been met by the provisions of the other. We shall have occasion to refer to this more fully under the next division. But in some of the confessions of the Old Testament saints, we have undoubted indications of the feeling that the law, which they stood bound to obey, contained a reach of spiritual requirement which they were far from having complied with, and brought against them charges of guilt, from which they could obtain no satisfactory deliverance by any means of expiation then provided. The dread which God's

manifested presence inspired, even in such seraphic bosoms as Isaiah's, "Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of Hosts," is itself a proof of this ; for it betokened a conscience much more alive to impressions of guilt, than to the blessings of forgiveness and peace. It shewed that the law of righteousness had written its convictions of sin too deeply on the tablet of the heart, for the ceremonial institutions thoroughly to supplant them by the full sense of reconciliation. But a still more decided testimony to the same effect was given by the Psalmist, when in compositions designed for the public service of God, and of course expressing the sentiments of all sincere worshippers, he at once celebrated the law of God as every way excellent and precious, and at the same time spake of it as "exceeding broad,"—felt that it accused him of iniquities "more in number than the hairs of his head," so that if "the Lord were strict to mark them, none should be able to stand before him,"—nay, sometimes found himself in such a sense a sinner, that no sacrifice or offering could be accepted, and his soul was left without any ostensible means of atonement and cleansing, with nothing indeed to rest upon, but an unconditional forgiveness on God's part, and renewed surrender on its own.

It was this tendency of the law to beget deep convictions of sin, and to leave upon the mind such a felt want of satisfaction, which disposed truly enlightened consciences to give a favourable hearing to the doctrines of the Gospel, and to rejoice in the consolation brought in by Christ. It was this which gave in their minds such emphasis to the contrast : "The law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," and which led St Paul to hold it out as an especial ground of comfort to believers in Christ, that "by him they might be justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses." It was this feature also of the law, which the same apostle had more particularly in his eye, when he described it as a "schoolmaster to lead men to Christ," shutting them up, by its stern requirements and wholesome discipline, to the faith which was afterwards to be revealed. And the contrast which he draws in the 3d chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, between the law and the gospel, proceeds entirely upon the same ground in reference to the law ; that is, it is viewed simply as by itself, in the matter of its pre-

cepts, a revelation of the perfect righteousness of God, and, apart from the covenant of promise, with which it was connected, fitted only to inspire fear and trembling, or to bring condemnation and death. He, therefore, calls it the ministration of condemnation, a letter that killeth, as in Rom. vii. 10, he testifies of having found it in his own experience to be unto death. The apostle does not mean to say, that this was properly the object for which the law was given—for then it had come directly to oppose and subvert the covenant of promise—but that it was an inseparable effect attending it,—arising from the perfection of its character as a rule of righteousness, compared with the manifold imperfections and sins ever discovering themselves among men. And hence it only required spiritual minds, such as would enter thoroughly into the perception of the law's character, first to make them deeply sensible of their own guilt, and then to awaken in them the desire of something higher and better than was then provided for the true consolation of Israel.

An important connection thus arises between the law and the gospel, and both are seen to hold respectively their proper places in the order of the divine dispensations. "It is true," as Tholuck has remarked with sound discrimination, "that the New Testament speaks more of grace than of sin; but did it not on this very account pre-suppose the existence of the Old Covenant with the law, and a God who is an holy and jealous God, that will not pass by transgression and sin? The Old Covenant was framed for the conviction of sin, the New for the forgiveness of sin. The moral law, which God has written in indelible lines upon the heart of every man, was once also proclaimed with much solemnity from Sinai, that it might be clear that God, who appeared in fire and flame as the revealer of his holy law, is the same who has imprinted the image of holiness deep in the secret chambers of the bosom. Is not Israel, incessantly resisting with his stiff neck the God of love, until he has always again been reduced to subjection by the God of fiery indignation, an image of proud humanity in its constant warfare against God, who seeks to conquer them by anger and love?"¹ Hence, the order of God's dis-

¹ From a work, *Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner*, as quoted by Biallotzky, *De Abrogatione Legis*, p. 82, 83.

pensations is substantially also the order of each man's experience. The sinner must be humbled and bruised by the law, or, by some manifestation of God's righteousness, he must have his conscience aroused to a sense of sin, before he can be brought heartily to acquiesce in the gospel method of salvation. Therefore, not only had the way of Christ to be prepared by one, who with a voice of terror preached anew the law's righteousness and threatenings, but Christ himself also needed to enter on the blessed work of the world's evangelisation, by unfolding the wide extent and deep spirituality of the law's requirements. For, how large a portion of the Sermon on the Mount is taken up in giving a clear and searching exposition of the law's righteousness, and rescuing it from the false and extenuating glosses under which it had been buried? Nay Christ, during his personal ministry, could proceed but a small way in openly revealing the grace of the gospel, because after all the work of the law was so imperfectly done in the hearts even of his own disciples. And so still in the experience of men at large; it is because the sense and condemnation of sin are so seldom felt, that the benefits of salvation are so little known.¹

3. The necessary connection that subsisted between the law and the ceremonial institutions of the Old Testament, may be given as a still further reason of its revelation and enactment—although, when properly understood, this was not so much a distinct and separate end, as a combination of the two already specified. This law, perfect in its character, and perpetual in its obligation, formed the groundwork of all the symbolical services afterwards imposed; as was distinctly implied in the place chosen

¹ The use of the law now described, though properly but its secondary design, is very commonly given by popular writers of this country, as its chief, or almost only use, to the Israelites. Thus Bell on *Cov.* p. 142, speaking of God's design in giving the law from Sinai, says, "God gave it in subserviency to the promise, to shew unto sinners their transgression and their guilt, and of consequence to drive them unto it." So another still more strongly; "God made it (*viz.* the covenant of law, which is regarded by the author as the same with the covenant of works) with the Israelites for no other end, than that man being thereby convinced of his weakness, might flee unto Christ." (*Marrow of Modern Div.* P. i. c. 2). Their putting this design first, and making it in a manner all, arose from their viewing the religion of the Old Covenant too exclusively in a typical aspect, as if the things belonging to it had not also had an immediate and direct bearing.

for its permanent position. For, as the centre of all Judaism was the tabernacle, so the centre of this again was the law—the ark, which stood enshrined in the Most Holy Place, being made for the sole purpose of keeping the two tables of the covenant. So that the reflection could hardly fail to force itself on all considerate and intelligent worshippers, that the observance of this law was the great end of the religion then established. Nor could any other use be imagined, of the strictly religious rites and institutions, which so manifestly pointed to this law, as their common ground and centre, than—either to assist as means in preserving alive the knowledge of its principles, and promoting their observance—or as remedies to provide against the evils naturally arising from its neglect and violation.

These two objects plainly harmonize with the reasons already assigned for the giving of the law, and present the ceremonial services and institutions to our view, as partly subservient to the righteousness it enjoined, and partly conducive to its ulterior end of leading souls to Christ. It will be our endeavour in the next Book to bring fully out, and illustrate this relation between the law of the two tables, and the symbols of Judaism. But at present we must content ourselves with briefly indicating its general nature.

(1). In so far as those symbols had in view the first of the objects just mentioned, they are to be regarded in the same general light as the means and ordinances of grace, under the New Testament. It is through these that the knowledge of the Gospel is diffused, its divine principles implanted in the hearts of men, and a suitable channel also provided for expressing the thoughts and feelings which the reception of the Gospel tends to awaken. Such also was one great design of the law's symbolical institutions, though with a characteristic difference suited to the time of their appointment. They were formal, precise, imperative, as for persons in comparative childhood, who required to be kept under the bonds of a rigid discipline, and a discipline that should chiefly work from without inwards, so as to form the soul to right thoughts and feelings, while, at the same time, it provided appropriate services for the exercise of such when formed. Appointed for these ends, the institutions could not be of an arbitrary nature, as if the authoritative command of God were the only reason, that

could be assigned for their appointment, or as if the external service were required simply on its own account. They stood to the law, in the stricter sense—the law of the ten commandments—in the relation of expressive signs and faithful monitors, perpetually urging upon men's consciences, and impressing, as it were, upon their senses, the essential distinctions between right and wrong, which the law plainly revealed and established. The symbolical ordinances did not create these distinctions ; they did not of themselves even indicate wherein the distinctions stood ; and in this partly appeared their secondary and subservient position, as compared with the law of the two tables. The ordinance, for example, respecting clean and unclean in food, pointed to a distinction in the moral sphere—to one class of things to be avoided as evil, and another to be sought after as good ; but it gave no intimation as to what might actually be the one or the other. So, again, the ordinance respecting leprosy had respect to sin as a deadly evil, which was sure to bring down upon him who indulged in it, the judgment of God ; but it was silent as to what really constituted sin, referring for the knowledge of this to the fundamental revelation of law—the testimony laid up in the ark of the covenant. To that everything belonging to the legal economy pointed as its ground and centre ; and it was not to add anything to its obligations of duty, or to certify aught that it left doubtful, that such a multitude of external services was imposed, but to bring its solemn enactments constantly to remembrance, and bend the will into compliance with what they enjoined.

Such being the connection between the moral law in the legislation of Moses, and the symbolical rites and services annexed to it, it was plainly necessary that the latter required to be wisely arranged, both in kind and number, so as fitly to promote the ends of their appointment. They were not outward rites and services of any sort. The outward came into existence merely for the sake of the religious and moral elements embodied in it, for the spiritual lessons it conveyed, or the sentiments of godly fear and brotherly love it was fitted to awaken. And that such ordinances should not only exist, but also be spread out into a vast multiplicity of forms, was a matter of necessity ; as the dispensation then set up admitted so very sparingly of direct instruction, and was comparatively straitened in its supplies of inward grace. Imper-

fect as those outward ordinances were, so imperfect that they were at last done away as unprofitable, the members of the Old Covenant were still chiefly dependent upon them for having the character of the divine law exhibited to their minds, and its demands kept fresh upon the conscience. It was therefore fit, that they should not only pervade, but should even be carried beyond the strictly religious territory, and should embrace all the more important relations of life, that the Israelite might thus find something in what he ordinarily saw and did, in the very food he ate and the garments he wore, to remind him of the law of his God, and stimulate him to the cultivation of that righteousness which it was his paramount duty to cherish and exemplify.

Were these things duly considered, another and worthier reason would easily be discovered for the occasional intermingling of the moral and the ceremonial parts of the Mosaic legislation, than what is very commonly assigned. This did not arise from a confounding of the positive and moral, the shadowy and the abiding, as if they stood upon the same level, and no distinction were recognised betwixt them. The position of the law of the ten commandments in the ark of the covenant, as we have already stated, to say nothing of the other marks of distinction belonging to it, stood as a perpetual sign before the eyes of the people, that the things there enjoined held immeasurably the highest rank. And the coupling together of the symbolical and the moral, and passing without a break from the one to the other—as is done, for example, in chap. xix. of Leviticus—did not arise from any failure to discern the essential difference between them, but to shew that, in the people's experience, the one could not exist apart from the other; that the symbolical was appointed for the sake of the moral, and could not fall into abeyance without leading to a neglect of the weightier matters of the law. We find in fact, the very same intermixture, and for the same reasons, in the hortatory parts of New Testament Scripture, as when, in the tenth chapter of Hebrews, the injunction to provoke one another to love and to good works, is immediately followed by the warning, not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together; or when, in the third chapter of the epistle to the Colossians, the exhortation to have the word of Christ dwelling in us, and to make frequent use of psalms and hymns, appears in the midst of the most strictly moral precepts. Not that the things are in them-

selves equal ; the one is but the means, while the other is the end ; but let the means be neglected, and what soon shall become of the end ?

And there is another conclusion that grows out of what has been said. For, since the symbolical institutions of Judaism re-echoed the lessons of the moral law, and confirmed its testimony, it is plain that God never could be satisfied with a mere outward conformity to the letter of the Mosaic ritual. Support has often been sought in Scripture itself for such an idea, especially in regard to the sacrifices, but no proper foundation exists for it there. Hengstenberg justly remarks, that "there cannot be produced out of the whole Old Testament one single passage, in which the notion, that sacrifices of themselves, and apart from the state of mind in the offerers, are well-pleasing to God, is noticed, except for the purpose of vigorously opposing it. When, for example, in Lev. xxvi. 31, it is said in reference to the ungodly, 'I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours,' and when in Gen. iv. 4, 5, we find that along with an outward similarity, the offerings of Cain and Abel met with such a different reception from God, and that this difference is represented as being based on something *personal* to the individuals, it is all but expressly asserted, that sacrifices were regarded only as expressive of the inner sentiment."¹ And again : "That the law, with all its appearance of outwardness, still possessed throughout a religious-moral, an internal, spiritual character, is manifest from the fact, that the two internal commands of love to God, and one's neighbour, are in the law itself represented as those in which all the rest lie enclosed, the fulfilment of which carried along with it the fulfilment of all individual precepts, and without which no obedience was practicable : 'And now, Israel, what does the Lord thy God require of thee,' &c., (Deut. x. 12, vi. 5, xi. 1. 13, xiii. 3, xxx. 15. 20 ; Lev. xix. 18). If everything in the law is made to turn upon love, it is self-evident, that a dead bodily service could not be what was properly required. Besides, in Lev. xxvi. 41, the violation of the law is represented as the necessary product of 'an uncircumcised heart,' and in Deut. x. 16, we find the remarkable words : 'And ye shall circumcise the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked,'—which condemn all Pharisaism, that is ever ex-

¹ Introdnc. to Ps. xxxii

pecting good fruit from bad trees, and would gather grapes from thorns, and figs from thistles."—What is called the ceremonial law, therefore, was in its more immediate and primary aspect, an exhibition by means of symbolical rites and institutions of the righteousness enjoined in the Decalogue, and a discipline through which the heart might be subdued into some conformity to the righteousness itself.

(2). But the more fully the ceremonial parts of the Mosaic legislation were fitted to accomplish this end, they must so much the more have tended to help forward the other end of the law ; viz. to produce conviction of sin and prepare the heart for Christ. "By the law is the knowledge of sin"—the sense of shortcomings and transgressions is in exact proportion to the insight that has been obtained into its true spiritual meaning. And the manifold restrictions and services of a bodily kind, which were imposed upon the Israelites, as they all spoke of holiness and sin, so where their voice was honestly listened to, it must have been with the effect of begetting impressions of guilt. They were perpetually uttering without the sanctuary the cry of transgression, which was rising within, under the throne of God, from the two tables of testimony. They might be said to do more. For of them especially does it hold, "They entered that the offence might abound," since, while calling upon men to abstain from sin, they at the same time multiplied the occasions of offence. The strict limitations and numerous requirements of service, through which they did the one, rendered it unavoidable that they should also do the other ; as they thus necessarily made many things to be sin, which were not so before, or in their own nature, and consequently increased both the number of transgressions, and their burden upon the conscience. How comparatively difficult must it have been to apprehend through so many occasions and witnesses of guilt the light of God's reconciliation and love ! How often must the truly spiritual heart have felt as heavy laden with its yoke, and scarcely able to bear it ! And how glad should have been to all the members of the covenant the tidings of that "liberty with which Christ makes his people free !"

This, however, was not the whole. Had the ceremonial institutions and services simply co-operated with the Decalogue, in

¹ Authentic, ii. p. 611, 612.

producing upon men's minds a conviction of guilt, and shutting them up to the necessity of salvation, the yoke of bondage would indeed have been intolerable, and despair rather than the hope of salvation must have been the consequence. They so far differed, however, from the precepts of the law, that they provided a present atonement for the sin, which the law condemned—met the conscious defect of righteousness, which the law produced, with vicarious sacrifices and bodily lustrations. But these, as formerly noticed, were so manifestly inadequate to the end in view, that though they might, from being God's own appointed remedies, restore the troubled conscience to a state of peace, they could not thoroughly satisfy it. First of all, they betrayed their own insufficiency, by allowing certain fearful gaps in the list of transgressions to stand unprovided for. Besides, the comparatively small distinction that was made, as regards purification, between mere bodily defilements and moral pollution, and the absolute necessity of resorting anew to the blood of atonement, as often as the sense of guilt again returned, were plain indications that such services "could not make the comers thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience." To the thoughtful mind it must have seemed, as if a struggle was continually proceeding between God's holiness and the sin of his creatures, in which the former found only a most imperfect vindication. For what just comparison could be made between the forfeited life of an accountable being and the blood of an irrational victim? Or between the defilements of a polluted conscience and the external washings of the outward man? Surely the enlightened conscience must have felt the need of something greatly more valuable to compensate for the evil done by sin, and must have seen, in the existing means of purification, only the temporary substitutes of better things to come. Such, at least, was the ultimate design of God; and whatever may have been the extent, or clearness of view in those who lived among the shadows of the law, regarding the coming realities of the gospel, it is impossible that they should have entered into the spirit of the former dispensation, without being prepared to hail a suffering Messiah as the only true consolation of Israel; and prepared also to join in the song of the redeemed, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."

At the same time, there can be no doubt, that here peculiarly lay the danger of the members of the Old Covenant—a danger, which the issue too clearly proved, that but a small proportion of them were able properly to surmount. Not seeing to the end of the things amid which they were placed, and wanting the incalculable advantage of the awful revelation of God's righteousness in Christ, the law failed to teach them effectually of the nature of that righteousness, or to convince them of sin, or to prepare them for the reception of the Saviour. But failing in these grand points, the law became a stumbling-block and a hindrance in their path. For now men's consciences adjusted themselves to the imperfect appearances of things, and acted much in the spirit of those in present times, who, as a sensible and pious writer expresses it, "try to bring up the power of free-will to holiness, by bringing holiness down to the power of free-will."¹ The dead letter, consequently, became everything with them; they saw nothing beneath the outward shell, nor felt any need for other and higher realities than those with which they had immediately to do. Self-righteousness was the inevitable result; and *that* rooting itself the more deeply, and towering the more proudly aloft with its pretensions, that it had to travel the round of such a vast multiplicity of laws and ordinances. For great as the demand was, which the observance of these made upon the obedience, still, as viewed by the carnal eye, it was something that could be measured and done—not so broad but that the mind could grasp it—and hence, instead of undermining the pride of nature, only supplying it with a greater mass of materials for erecting its claims on the favour of heaven. This spirit of self-righteousness was the prevailing tendency of the carnal mind under the Old Dispensation, as an unconcern about personal righteousness is under the New. How many were snared by it! And how fatally! Of all "the spirits in prison," to whom the word of the Gospel came with its offers of deliverance, those proved to be the most hopelessly incarcerated in their strongholds of error, who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and stumbled at the rock of a free salvation.

¹ Fraser on Sanctification, p. 298.

SECTION SIXTH.

THE RELATION OF BELIEVERS UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT TO THE LAW—
 IN WHAT SENSE THEY ARE FREE FROM IT—AND WHY IT IS NO LONGER
 PROPER TO KEEP THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS CONNECTED WITH IT.

THE relation of believers under the New Testament to the law has been a fruitful subject of controversy among divines. This has arisen chiefly from the apparently contradictory statements made respecting it in New Testament Scripture ; and this again, partly from the change introduced by the setting up of the more spiritual machinery of the Gospel dispensation, and partly also in consequence of the mistaken views entertained regarding the law, by those to whom the Gospel first came, which required to be corrected by strong representations of an opposite description. Thus, on the one hand, we find our Lord saying, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets ; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven : but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."¹ Stronger language could not possibly be employed to assert the abiding force and obligation of the law's requirements under the New Testament dispensation ; for that this is specially meant by "the kingdom of heaven," is too obvious to require any proof. In perfect conformity with this statement of our Lord, we find the apostles everywhere enforcing the duties enjoined in the law ; as when the apostle James describes the genuine Christian by "his looking into the perfect law of liberty, and continuing therein," and exhorts the disciples "not to speak evil of the law, or to judge it, but to fulfil it ;"² or

¹ Matth. v. 17-19.

² Jas. i. 25 ; ii. 8-12.

when the apostle Paul not only speaks of himself as "being under the law to Christ,"¹ but presses on the disciples at Rome and Galatia the constant exercise of love, on the ground of its being "the fulfilling of the law;"² and in answer to the question, "Do we, then, make void the law through faith," he replies, "God forbid; yea, we establish the law."³

But, on the other hand, when we turn to a different class of passages, we meet with statements that seem to run in the precisely opposite direction, especially in the writings of St Paul. There alone, indeed, do we meet with them in the form of dogmatical assertions, although in a practical form, the same element of thought occurs in the other epistles. In the first epistle to Timothy, he lays this down as a certain position, that "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient."⁴ And in the epistle to the Romans, he indicates a certain contrast between the present state of believers in this respect, with what it was under the former dispensation, and asserts that the law no longer occupies the place it once did. "Now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held, that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter."⁵ And again, "Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace."⁶

That in all these passages the law, in the strict and proper sense, is meant—the law of the ten commandments, the sum of whose precepts is perfect love to God and man—we may here take for granted, after what has been said regarding it in the first section of this chapter. It seems perfectly unaccountable, on any grounds of criticism at least, that so many English writers should have thought of solving the difficulty arising from the use of such language, by alleging the Apostle to have had in view simply the ceremonial law, as contradistinguished from the moral. This view, we should imagine, is now nearly exploded among the better-informed students of Scripture; for not only does the Apostle, as Archbishop Whately states, speak of the freedom of Christians from the law, "without limiting or qualifying the as-

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 21.

² Rom. xiii. 10; Gal. v. 14.

³ Rom. iii. 21.

⁴ Ch. i. 9.

⁵ Rom. vii. 6

⁶ Rom. vi. 14.

sersion—without even hinting at any distinction between moral and ceremonial or civil precepts,” but there can be no doubt, that it is what is commonly understood by the moral part of the Mosaic legislation—the Decalogue, that he has specially and properly in view.¹

In what respect, then, can it be said of Christians, that they are freed from this law, or are not under it? We must first answer the question in a general way; after which only can we be prepared for pointing out distinctly wherein the relation of the members of the New Covenant to the law differs from that of those who lived under the Old.

1. Believers in Christ are not under the law as to the ground of their condemnation or justification before God. It is not the law, but Christ, that they are indebted to for pardon and life, and receiving these from him as his gift of grace, they cannot be brought by the law into condemnation and death. The reason is, that Christ has, by his own pure and spotless obedience, done what the law, in the hands of fallen humanity, could not do—he has brought in the everlasting righteousness, which, by its infinite worth, has merited eternal life for as many as believe upon him. “There is *therefore* now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus;” “Whosoever believeth upon him is justified from all things;” or, in the still stronger and more comprehensive language of Christ himself, “He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but hath passed from death to life.”²

This, it will be perceived, is what is commonly understood by deliverance from the law as a covenant. But it is proper to remark, that though the idea expressed in such language is scriptural, the language itself is not so, and is rather fitted to mislead. For it appears to imply that, as the law certainly formed the basis of a covenant with the Old Testament Church, its being

¹ The work of Fraser on Sanctification, which is less known in England than it should be, is perfectly conclusive against Locke, Hammond, Whitby, and others, that the Apostle in Romans had in view the moral, rather than the ceremonial law. It is impossible, indeed, that such a notion could ever have been entertained by such men, except through strong doctrinal prejudices.

² Rom. viii. 1; Acts xiii. 39; John v. 14.

so formed made it something else than a rule of life, and warranted the Israelites to look to it, in the first instance at least, for life and blessing. This, we have already shewn, was not the purpose for which the law was either given or established as a covenant among them; and deliverance from it in the sense mentioned above, marks no essential distinction between the case of believers under the Old and that of those under the New Testament dispensation. The standing of the one, as well as the other, was in grace; and when the law came, it came not for the purpose of subverting or changing that constitution, but only to direct and oblige men to carry out the important ends for which they had been made partakers of grace and blessing. Strictly speaking, therefore, the church never was under the law as a covenant, in the sense commonly understood by the term; it was only the mistake of the carnal portion of her members to suppose themselves to have been so. But as God himself is unchangeable in holiness, the demands of his law, as revealed to men in grace, must be substantially the same with those which they are bound in nature to comply with under pain of his everlasting displeasure. In this respect all may be said, by the very constitution of their being, to be naturally under law to God, and, as transgressors of law, liable to punishment. But through the grace of God in Christ, we are not so under it, if we have become true believers in him. We have pardon and acceptance through faith in his blood; and even though "in many things offending, and in all coming short," yet while faith abides in us, we cannot come into condemnation. To this belong all such passages as treat of justification, and declare it to be granted without the law, or the deeds of the law, to the ungodly, and as a gift of free grace in Christ.

2. But this is not the *only* respect in which the Apostle affirms believers now to be free from the law, nor the respect at all which he has in view in the sixth and seventh chapters of his epistle to the Romans. For the subject he is there handling is not justification, but sanctification. The question he is discussing, is not how, as condemned and sinful creatures, we may be accepted as righteous before God; but how, being already pardoned and accepted in the Beloved, we ought to live. In this respect, also, he affirms that we are dead to the law, and are not

under it, but under grace—the grace, that is, of God’s indwelling Spirit, whose quickening energy and pulse of life takes the place of the law’s outward prescriptions and magisterial authority. And if it were not already clear, from the order of the Apostle’s thoughts, and the stage at which he has arrived in the discussion, that it is in this point of view he is now considering the law, the purpose for which he asserts our freedom to have been obtained, would put it beyond all reasonable doubt, viz. “that sin might not have dominion over us” (ch. vi. 14), or, “that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.” (ch. viii. 4.)¹

According to the doctrine of the Apostle, then, believers are not under the law as to their walk and conduct; or, as he says elsewhere, “the law is not for the righteous;” believers “have the Spirit of the Lord, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” But is not this dangerous doctrine? For where now is the safeguard against sin? May not each one do as he lists, oblivious of any distinction between holiness and sin, or even denying its existence, as regards the children of God, on the ground that where no law is, there is no transgression? To such questions the Apostle’s reply is, “God forbid,”—so far from it, that the freedom he asserts from the law has for its sole aim a deliverance from sin’s dominion, and a fruitfulness in all well-doing to God.

The truth more fully stated is simply this: When the believer receives Christ as the Lord his righteousness, he is not only justified by grace, but he comes into a state of grace, or gets grace into his heart as a living, reigning, governing principle of life. What, however, is this grace but the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus? And this Spirit is emphatically the Holy Spirit: holi-

¹ It seems very strange, considering how plain and explicit the Apostle’s meaning is, that the late Professor Lee of Cambridge should still say: “The main question, I think, here discussed (viz. in ch. vii.) by the Apostle is, how is a man to be justified with God?” (Dissertations, I. sec. 10.) Haldane, also, in his commentary, maintains the same obviously untenable view, as we cannot but term it. Fraser (Sanctification, on Rom. vii. 4) justly remarks, that though the similitude of marriage used by the Apostle in ch. vii., “*might* be explained to shew that the sinner cannot attain justification or any of its comfortable consequences by the law,” yet that it is “another consequence of the marriage covenant and relation that he hath in his eye,” viz. “the bringing forth of fruit unto God;” in other words, the maintaining of such holy lives as constitute our sanctification.

ness is the very element of his being, and the essential law of his working ; every desire he breathes, every feeling he awakens, every action he disposes and enables us to perform, is according to godliness. And if only we are sufficiently possessed of this Spirit, and yield ourselves to his direction and control, we no longer need the restraint and discipline of the law ; we are free from it, because we are superior to it. Quickened and led by the Spirit, we of ourselves love and do the things which the law requires.

Does not nature itself teach substantially the same lesson in *its* line of things ? The child, so long as he *is* a child, must be subject to the law of his parents ; his safety and well-being depend on his being so ; he must on every side be hemmed in, checked, and stimulated by that law of his parents, otherwise mischief and destruction will infallibly overtake him. But as he ripens toward manhood, he becomes freed from this law, because he no longer needs such external discipline and restraint. He is a law to himself, putting away childish things, and of his own accord acting as the parental authority, had he still been subject to it, would have required and enforced him to do. In a word, the *mind* has become his, from which the parental law proceeded, and he has consequently become independent of *its* outward prescriptions. And what is it to be under the grace of God's Spirit, but to have *the mind of God* ?—the mind of Him who gave the law simply as a revelation of what was in his heart respecting the holiness of his people. So that the more they have of the one, the less obviously they need of the other ; and only require to be complete in the grace of the Spirit, to be rendered wholly independent of the bonds and restrictions of the law.

Or, think again of the relation in which a good man stands with respect to the laws of his country. In one sense, indeed, he is under them ; but in another and higher sense, he is not—he is above them, and moves along his course freely and without constraint, as if they existed not. For, what is their proper object but to prevent, under severe penalties, the commission of crime ? Crime, however, is already the object of his abhorrence ; he needs no penalties to keep him from it. He would never harm the person or property of a neighbour, though there were

not a single enactment in the statute-book on the subject. His own love of good and hatred of evil keep him in the path of rectitude, not the fines, imprisonments, or tortures, which the law hangs around the path of the criminal. The law was not made for *him*.

So is it precisely with the man who is under grace. The law, considered as an outward discipline, placing him under a yoke of manifold commands and prohibitions, has for him ceased to exist. But it has ceased in that respect only by taking possession of him in another. It is now within his heart. It is the law of the Spirit of life in his inner man; emphatically, therefore, "the law of liberty;" his delight is to do it, and it were better for him not to live, than to live otherwise than the tenor of the law requires. We see in Jesus, the holy child of God, the perfect exemplar of this free-will service to heaven. For while he was made under the law, he was so replenished with the Spirit, that he fulfilled it as if he fulfilled it not; it was his very meat to do the will of Him that sent him; and not more certainly did the law enjoin, than he in his inmost soul loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Such also in a measure will ever be the case with the devout believer upon Jesus—in the same measure in which he has received of his Master's spirit. Does the law command him to bear no false witness against his neighbour? He is already so renewed in the spirit of his mind, as to speak the truth in his heart, and be ready to swear to his own hurt. Does the law demand, through all its precepts, supreme love to God, and brotherly love to men? Why should this need to be demanded as matter of law from him who has the Eternal Spirit of love bearing sway within, and therefore may be said to live and breathe in an atmosphere of love? Like Paul, he can say with king-like freedom, "I can do all things through Christ strengthening me;" even in chains I am free; I choose what God chooses for me; his will in doing or suffering I embrace as my own; for I have him working in me both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

Now, it is here that the difference properly comes in between the Old and the New Testament dispensations—a difference, however, it must be carefully marked, of degree only, and not of kind.

The saying is here especially applicable,—“On the outside of things look for differences, on the inside for likenesses.”¹ In correspondence with the change that has taken place in the character of the divine administration, the relative position of believers has changed to the law and the Spirit; but under both covenants alike, an indispensable place belongs to each of them. In the former dispensation the law stood more prominently out, and was the more peculiar means for leading men to holiness—supplying, as by a sort of artificial stimulant and support, the still necessary defect in the inward gift of the Spirit’s grace. We say the *necessary* defect; for the proper materials of the Spirit’s working, the great objects of faith and hope, not yet being provided or openly revealed, the Spirit could not be fully given, nor could his work be carried on otherwise than in a mystery. It was so carried on, however; every true member of the covenant was a partaker of the Spirit, because he stood in grace, at the same time that he stood under the law. But his relation to the Spirit was of a more hidden and secret, to the law of a more ostensible and manifest character. In the New Testament dispensation this relation is precisely reversed, although in each respect it still exists. The work of Christ, which furnishes the proper materials of the Spirit’s operations, having been accomplished, and himself glorified, the Spirit is now fully and unreservedly given. Through the power of his grace, in connection with the word of the Gospel, the divine kingdom avowedly purposes to effect its spiritual designs, and bring forth its fruits of righteousness to God. This, therefore, it is to which the believer now stands immediately and ostensibly related, as the agency through which he is to fulfil the high ends of his calling—while the law retires into the back-ground, or should be known only as existing within, impressed in all its essential lines of truth and duty upon the tablet of the heart, and manifesting itself in the deeds of a righteous life. But whether the law or the spirit stand more prominently forward, the end is the same—namely, righteousness. The only difference that exists, is as to the means of securing this end—more outward in the one case, more inward in the other; yet in each a measure of both required, and one and the same point aimed at. Hence the words

¹ Hare’s Guesses after Truth, ii. p. 3.

of the apostle : " Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," *i. e.* both alike are for righteousness—that is the one great end which Christ and the law have equally in view. But in Christ it is secured in a far higher way than it could possibly be through the law, since he has not only perfected himself as the divine head and surety of his people in the righteousness which the law requires, but also endows them with the plentiful grace of his Spirit, " that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in them, walking not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

With these distinctions clearly perceived, we shall easily understand what is said in the New Testament scriptures of the difference, in a practical point of view, as to the condition of believers under the past and the present dispensations respectively. This is spoken of as a state of comparative freedom, that of a certain species of restraint or bondage—not the bondage, indeed, of slaves and mercenaries, which belonged only to the carnal, as opposed to the believing portion of the church—but the bondage of those, who, though free-born children, are still in nonage, and must be kept under the restraint and discipline of an external law. This, however, could in no case be the whole of the agency with which the believer was pried, for then his yoke must have been literally the galling bondage of the slave. He *must* have had more or less the Spirit of life within, begetting and prompting him to do the things which the law outwardly enjoined—making the pulse of life in the heart beat in harmony with the rule of life prescribed in the law ; so that, while he still felt as under tutors and governors, it was not as one needing to be " held in with bit and bridle," but rather as one disposed readily and cheerfully to keep to the appointed course. This would be the case with him always the more, the more diligently he employed the measure of grace within his reach ; and if in a spirit of faith he could indeed " lift the latch and force his way" onwards to the end of those things which were then established, he might even have become insensible to the bonds and trammels of his childhood-condition, and attained to the free and joyful spirit of the perfect man. So it unquestionably was with the Psalmist, and doubtless might have been with all, if they had but used, as he did, the privileges of grace. For such, the law was not a mere outward yoke, nor

properly a yoke at all ; it was " within their heart ;" they delighted in its precepts, and meditated therein day and night ; to listen to its instructions was sweeter to them than honey, and to obey its dictates was better than thousands of gold and silver.¹

It is only, therefore, in a comparative sense, that we are to understand the passages in the New Testament Scripture formerly referred to ; and in the same sense, also, that similar passages are to be interpreted in Old Testament Scripture. Such, for example, as Jer. xxxi. 31-34 : " Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah ; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt,...but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel ; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people ; and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour," &c. (comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 25-27, which differs only in particularizing the agency by which the better state of things was to be introduced—the larger gift of the Spirit). " The discourse here cannot be of a new and more complete revelation of the law of God, for this is common to both economies ; no jot or tittle of it can be lost under the New Testament, nor can a jot or tittle be added to it ; God's law rests on his nature, and this is eternally immutable (Mal. iii. 6). Just as little can the discourse be of the introduction of an entirely new relation, which by no means has the former for its groundwork. In this respect Kimchi rightly remarks : " Non erit foederis novitas, sed stabilimentum ejus" (not a change, but an establishing of the covenant). The covenant with Israel is eternal ; Jehovah would not be Jehovah, if an absolutely new beginning could take place. (Rom. xv. 8.) When, therefore, the subject of discourse is here the antithesis of an old and a new covenant, the former must designate, not the relation of God to Israel in itself, and in all its extent, but rather only the former manifestation of this relation—that, through which the Lord, until the time of the prophet, had made himself known as the God of Israel."² And in regard to the difference indicated

¹ See especially Ps. i., xv., xxiv., xl., cxix.

² Hengstenberg's Christology on Jer. xxxi. 31.

by the prophet, as to the believer's connection with the law under the two covenants, the learned author, expressing his concurrence in particular with Calvin and Buddeus, goes on to shew, that this also is not absolute, but only relative. He justly states, that the idea of a purely outward giving of the law is inconceivable, as God would then have done for Israel nothing farther than he did for the traitor Judas, in whose conscience he proclaimed his holy law, without giving him any power to repent—that the terms in which the law is spoken of by the Psalmist, in the name of the Old Testament saints, shews it to have been in their experience no longer a law that worketh wrath, but a law in connection with the Spirit, whose commands are not grievous—and that the antithesis between the Old and the New state of things, though in itself but relative, was expressed in the absolute form, merely because the gift of the Old Testament appeared, when compared with the infinitely more important and richer blessing of the New, as so small, that it vanished out of sight.

But something else than that should also vanish from *our* sight. For, if we enter as we should into these views, the idea of the law's abrogation or abolition under the New Testament, in whatever form proposed, will be repudiated as equally dangerous and ungrounded. The law is in no proper sense abolished by the revelations of the Gospel; nor does the Apostle in any fair construction of his language say that it is. He merely says, that through grace we are not under it, and in a conjugal respect are dead to it. In a certain qualified sense, believers in Old Testament times might be said to be married to it, or to be under it—only, however, in a qualified sense, for God himself—the God of grace, as well as of law—was properly their husband (Jer. xxxi. 32), and they stood under the covenant of grace before they came under the covenant of law. But though, even in that qualified sense, believers are not now under the law, or married to it, the righteousness required is as much binding upon their consciences, and expected at their hands, as it ever was at any former period of the church's history. More so, indeed; for the very reason, as the Apostle tells us, why they are placed less directly under the law, and more under the Spirit, is, that the end of the law might be more certainly attained, and a richer harvest yielded of its fruits of righteousness. Therefore it is, that in the same epistle

in which those expressions are used, conformity to the law's requirements is still held out, and inculcated as the very perfection of Christian excellence (Rom. xiii. 8-10). For it is not, as if these two, the law and the Spirit, were contending authorities, or forces drawing in two distinct and separate lines. On the contrary, they are essentially and thoroughly agreed—emanations both of them of the unchanging holiness of Godhead—the one its outward form and character, in which it was to appear, the other its inward spring and living pulse. What the one teaches, the other wills—what the one requires, the other prompts and qualifies to perform ;—and as the law at first came as an handmaid to the previously existing covenant of grace, so does it still remain in the hand of the Spirit to aid him, amid the workings of the flesh, and the imperfections of grace, in carrying out the objects for which he condescends to dwell and act in the bosoms of men.

Hence appears the monstrous absurdity and error of Antinomianism, which proceeds on the supposition of the law and the Spirit being two distinct, possibly contending, authorities—a doctrine not so much opposed to any particular portion of Scripture, as the common antifithesis of all its revelations, and the subversion of all its principles. But let it once be understood that the law and the Spirit have but one end in view, and one path, in a sense, to reach it—that the motions of the Spirit within, invariably, and by the highest of all necessities, take the direction prescribed by the law without—let this be understood, and Antinomianism wants even the shadow of a ground to stand upon.—It is not merely the Antinomians, however, who contend for the abrogation of the law ; the same thing is substantially done by many divines, who belong to an entirely different class. For example, Archbishop Whately, in his *Essay on the Abolition of the Law*, maintains this position : “ The simplest and clearest way then of stating the case, is to lay down, on the one hand, that the Mosaic law was limited both to the nation of the Israelites, and to the period before the Gospel ; but, on the other hand, that the natural principles of morality, which, among other things, it inculcates, are, from their own character, of universal obligation, and that Christians are bound to obey the moral commandments it contained, not *because* they are commandments of the Mosaic law, but because they

are moral." This view, which puts the Decalogue on a footing with the laws of Solon or Mahomet, in so far as any obligation on the conscience is concerned, is that also maintained, and with a considerable show of learning, supported by Bialloblotzky, in his work *De Abrog. Legis*. The form into which the learned author throws his statement is, that the nomothetical authority of the Mosaic law is abolished, but its didactical authority remains; in other words, it has no binding force as a law upon the conscience, but may still be profitably used for direction in the way of duty, due allowance, of course, being made for all that belonged to it of temporary appointment and ceremonial observance, which is no longer even a matter of duty. His chief arguments in supporting this view, are, that in some things, especially in regard to the Sabbath, marriage, the symbolical rites (for all are thrown, as we observed before, into one mass), Christ and his apostles have corrected the law—and that they oppose the authority of the Spirit to the external tyranny of the law (as if these were two contending masters, and we actually have the passage, "No man can serve two masters," produced in proof of the argument, p. 63.) Such views have been substantially met already. And we simply remark farther, that they necessarily open the widest door for Antinomianism and Rationalism; for if, as possessors of the Spirit, we must first judge what part of the law is moral or didactic, and even when we have ascertained this, still are permitted to hold, that we are not connected with it as a matter of binding and authoritative obligation, it is easy to see what slight convictions of sin will be felt, what loose notions of duty entertained, how feeble a barrier left against either the carnal or the fanatical spirit ridding itself of the plainest obligations. It is quite possible, no doubt, to produce unguarded statements, easily susceptible of an improper meaning, and partly, indeed, expressing such, from Luther's works on the law. But his real views, when carefully and doctrinally, not controversially expressed, were substantially correct, as will appear from a quotation to be given presently—or from Melancthon's works, which Luther is well known to have held to be better expositions than his own of their doctrinal views. For example, after speaking (vol. i. p. 309) of the Mosaic law as not availing to justification, and in its civil and ceremonial parts done away, Melancthon adds: "But the moral law, since it is the wis-

dom of God and his eternal rule of righteousness, and has been revealed, that man should be like God, cannot be abolished, but remains perpetually, Rom. iii. 31, viii. 4.”

The question naturally arises here, Of what use is the law to those who really are under the Spirit? We answer, it would be of none, if the work of spiritual renovation, which his grace is given to effect, were perfected in us. But since this is far from being the case, since imperfection still cleaves to the child of God, and the flesh, in a greater or less degree, still wars against the Spirit, the outward discipline of the law can never be safely dispensed with. Even St Paul was obliged to confess that he found the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and that though he was ever following after, he was conscious of not having yet attained to the full measure of grace and excellence in Christ. Therefore, for his own quickening and direction, as well as for that of others, he felt it needful to press the demands of law, and to look to the exceeding breadth of its requirements. Luther also, and his fellow-labourers, although their views were not always correct as to the relation in which Israel stood to the law, nor by any means clear regarding the precise nature of the change introduced by the Gospel, yet were sound enough on this point. Thus they say in one of their symbolical books: “Although the law was not made for the righteous (as the Apostle testifies, 1 Tim. i. 9), yet this is not to be understood as if the righteous might live without law. For the divine law is written upon their hearts. The true and genuine meaning, therefore, of Paul’s words, is, that the law cannot bring those who have been reconciled to God through Christ under its curse, and that its restraint cannot be irksome to the renewed, since they delight in the law of God after the inner man. ...But believers are not completely and perfectly renewed in this life. And though their sins are covered by the absolutely perfect obedience of Christ, so as not to be imputed to believers to their condemnation—and though the mortification of the old Adam, and the renovation in the spirit of their mind has been begun by the Holy Spirit, yet the old Adam still remains in nature’s powers and affections,” &c.¹

There are three different respects in which we still need the law of God, and which it will be enough briefly to indicate: 1. To

¹ De Abrog. Legis, p. 72, 73.

keep us under grace, as the source of all our security and blessing. This we are ever apt, through the pride and self-confidence of the flesh, to forget, even though we have already in some measure known it. Therefore the law must be our schoolmaster, not only to bring us to Christ at the beginning of a Christian life, but also afterwards to keep us there, and force continually back upon us the conviction, that we must be in all respects the debtors of grace. For when we see what a spirituality and breadth is in the law of God, how it extends to the thoughts and affections of the heart, as well as to our words and actions, and demands, in regard to all, the exercise of an unswerving devoted love, then we are made to feel that the law, if trusted in as a ground of confidence, must still work wrath, and that, convinced by it as transgressors, we must betake for all peace and consolation to the grace of Christ. Here alone, in his atonement, can we find satisfaction to our consciences, and here alone also in the strengthening aid of his Spirit, the ability to do the things which the law requires. 2. The law, again, is needed to restrain and hold us back from those sins which we might otherwise be inclined to commit. It is true, that in one who is really a subject of grace, there can be no habitual inclination to live in sin; for he is God's workmanship in Christ Jesus, created in him unto good works. But the temptations of the world, and the devices of the spiritual adversary, may often be too much for any measure of grace he has already received, successfully to resist; he may want in certain circumstances the willing and faithful mind either to withstand evil or to prosecute, as he should, the path of righteousness; and, therefore, the law is still placed before him by the Spirit, with its stern prohibitions and awful threatenings to move with fear, whenever love fails to prompt and influence the heart. Thus the Apostle: "I am determined to know nothing among you but Christ and him crucified"—it is my delight, my very life to preach the doctrines of his salvation—but if the flesh should recoil from the work and render the spirit unwilling, "a dispensation is committed to me, yea woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel." Thus the discipline of the law comes in to supply the imperfections of the Spirit, and curb the still remaining tendencies of sin. 3. And it is yet farther needed to present continually before the eye of the mind a clear representation of the righteousness which, through the grace of the

Spirit, believers should be ever striving to attain. While that grace is still imperfect, they are necessarily in danger of entertaining low and defective views of duty ; nay, in times of peculiar temptation or undue excitement, they might even mistake the motions of the flesh for the promptings of the Spirit, and turn aside into the path of error. But the law stands before them with its revelation of righteousness, as a faithful and resplendent mirror, in which they may behold, without any danger of delusion or mistake, the perfect image of that excellence which they should be ever yielding to God. " We are free—we have the Spirit, and are not subject to bondage." True, but free only to act as servants of Christ, and not to throw around you a cloak of maliciousness. You are free, not to introduce what you please into the service of God, for he is a jealous God, and will not allow his glory to be associated with the vain imaginations of men ; you are free to worship him only in spirit and in truth. You are free—what ! to give or withhold, as seems good to you, what may be needed to advance the cause of God in the world—to employ or not for sacred purposes the weekly return of his day of rest ! How impossible ! seeing, that if you are really filled with the Spirit, the love of God must have been breathed into your soul, so as of necessity to make it your delight to do what you can for his glory, and to engage in the services which bring you into nearest fellowship with heaven.—Thus, the freedom of the Spirit is a freedom only within the bounds and limits of the law ; and the law itself must stand, lest the flesh, taking advantage of the weakness of the Spirit's grace, should in its wantonness break out into courses which are displeasing to the mind of God.

So much for the law in the strict and proper sense—the law of the ten commandments, the freedom from which enjoyed by the Christian is not absolute, but relative only ; just as the Israelites' want of the Spirit was also relative, and not absolute. But in regard to what is called the ceremonial law, the freedom *is* absolute, and to keep up the observance of its symbolical institutions and services after the new dispensation entered, was not only to retain a yoke that might be dispensed with, but also an incongruity to be avoided, and even a danger to be shunned. For viewed simply as teaching ordinances, intended to represent and inculcate the great principles of truth and duty, they were superseded at the

introduction of the Gospel by the appointment of other means, more suitable as instruments in the hand of the Spirit for ministering instruction to the minds of men. The change then brought into the divine administration was characterized throughout by a more immediate and direct handling of the things of God. They were now things no longer hid under a veil, but openly disclosed to the eye of the mind. And ordinances, which were adapted to a state of the church, when neither the Spirit was fully given, nor the things of God were clearly revealed, could not possibly be such as were adapted to the church of the New Testament. The grand ordinance here must be the free and open manifestation of the truth—written first in the word of inspiration, and thenceforth continually proclaimed anew by the preaching of the Gospel; and such symbolical institutions as might yet be needed, must be founded upon the clear revelations of this word, not like those of the former dispensation, spreading a veil over the truth, or affording only a dim shadow of better things to come. Hence, the old ritual of service should have fallen into desuetude, whenever the new state of things came in; and the tenacity with which the Judaizing Christians clung to it, was the indication of a very imperfect enlightenment and corrupt taste. Had they known aright the new wine, they would straightway have forsaken the old. So long as they could get the kernel only through the shell, it was their duty to take the one for the sake of the other. But now, when the kernel itself was presented to them in naked simplicity, still to insist upon having the shell along with it, was the clear sign of an unhealthy condition—an undoubted proof that they had not yet come to the full knowledge and appreciation of Gospel truth, and were disposed to rest unduly in mere outward observances. The Apostle, therefore, on this ground alone, justly denounces such Judaizers as carnal, and as in spiritual things acting the part of persons who, though of full age, have not put away childish things, but continue in a willing “bondage to the elements of the world.”

This, however, was by no means the whole of the misapprehension which such conduct betrayed. For while those ordinances of the former dispensation were in one point of view means of instruction and grace, in another they were signs and acknowledgments of debt. Calling, as they did, continually for acts of atone-

ment and cleansing, and yet presenting nothing that could satisfactorily purge the conscience, they were, even when rigorously performed, testimonies, that the heavy reckoning for guilt was not yet properly met—bonds of obligation for the time relieved, but standing over to some future period for their full and adequate discharge. This discharge in full was given by Christ when he suffered on the cross, and brought in complete satisfaction for all the demands of the violated law. He is, therefore, said to have “blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.” The charges of guilt and condemnation which that handwriting had been perpetually making against men as transgressors, were now laid in one mass upon the body of the crucified Redeemer, and with its death were for ever abolished. So that those ceremonies being, as Calvin justly terms them, “attestations of men’s guilt, and instruments witnessing their liability,” “Paul with good reason warned the Colossians how seriously they would relapse, if they allowed a yoke in that way to be imposed upon them. By so doing, they at the same time, deprived themselves of all benefit from Christ, who, by his eternal sacrifice once offered, had abolished those daily sacrifices, which were indeed powerful to attest sin, but could do nothing to destroy it.”¹ It was in effect to say, that they did not regard the death of Christ as in itself a perfect satisfaction for the guilt of their sins, but required the purifications of the law to make it complete—at once dishonouring Christ, and shewing that they took the Old Testament ceremonies for something else than they really were.

It has sometimes been alleged, that in the case of the Jewish believers there was still a sort of propriety, or even of obligation, in continuing to observe the ceremonies of Moses—until, at least, the epistle to the Hebrews was written, formally discharging them from all further attendance upon such services.² But there is no real foundation for such an opinion. It is true that no express and authoritative injunction was given at first for the discontinuance of those services; but this arose simply out of accommodation to their religious prejudices, which might have received too great a shock, and among their unbelieving neighbours excited

¹ Inst. B. ii. c. 7. § 17.

² For example, Fraser on Sanct. in the introduction to explication of Rom. vii.

too outrageous an opposition, if the change had at once been introduced. But so far as obligation and duty were concerned, they should have required no explicit announcement on the subject different from what had already been given in the facts of gospel history. When the veil was rent in twain, abolishing the distinction at the centre, all others of an outward kind of necessity gave way. When the great High Priest had fulfilled his work, no work remained to be done by any other priest. The gospel of shadows was evidently gone, the gospel of realities come. And the compliances which the apostles generally, and Paul himself latterly made (Acts xxi.), to humour the prejudices, and silence the senseless clamours of the Jews, though necessary at first, were yet carried to an undue and dangerous length. They palpably failed in Paul's case to accomplish the end in view, and, in the case of the Jewish Christians themselves, were attended with jealousies, self-righteous bigotry, growing feebleness, and ultimate decay. "Before Messiah's coming, the ceremonies were as the swaddling bands in which he was wrapt; but after it, they resembled the linen clothes which he left in the grave. Christ was in the one, not in the other. And using them as the Galatians did, or as the Jews do at this day, they and their language are a lie; for they say he is still to come who is come already. They are now beggarly elements, having nothing of Christ, the true riches, in them."¹

¹ Bell on Cov. p. 140.

CHAPTER THIRD.

THE RELIGIOUS TRUTHS AND PRINCIPLES EMBODIED IN THE SYMBOLICAL INSTITUTIONS AND SERVICES OF THE MOSAIC DISPENSATION, AND VIEWED IN THEIR TYPICAL REFERENCE TO THE BETTER THINGS TO COME.

SECTION FIRST.

INTRODUCTORY—ON THE QUESTION WHY MOSES WAS INSTRUCTED IN THE WISDOM OF THE EGYPTIANS, AND WHAT INFLUENCE THIS MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO EXERCISE ON HIS FUTURE LEGISLATION.

THE learning of Moses was briefly adverted to in an earlier part of our investigations.¹ But this is the proper place for a more formal discussion of it, when we are entering on the explanation of the Mosaic symbols of worship and service. That an acquaintance with Egyptian learning was advantageous to Moses, to the extent formerly stated, no one will be disposed to question. Whatever might be its peculiar character, it would at least serve the purpose of expanding and ripening the faculties of his mind—would render him acquainted with the general principles and methods of political government—would furnish him with an insight into the religious and moral system of the most intelligent and civilized nation of heathen antiquity—and so, would not only increase his fitness, in an intellectual point of view, for holding the high commission that was to be entrusted to him, but would also lend to the commission itself, when bestowed, the recommendation, which superior rank or learning ever yields, when devoted to a sacred use.

¹ Vol. ii. chap. i. s. 2.

Such advantages, it is obvious, Moses might derive from his Egyptian education, irrespective altogether of the precise quality of the wisdom with which he thus became acquainted. It is another question, how far he might be indebted to that wisdom itself, as an essential element in his preparation—or to what extent the things belonging to it might be allowed to mould and regulate the institutions which he was commissioned to impose on Israel. Scripture throws no direct light upon this question ; it affords materials only for general inferences and probable conclusions. And yet the view we actually entertain on the subject cannot fail to exert a considerable influence on the spirit in which we investigate the whole Mosaic system, and give a distinctive colouring to our interpretations of many of its parts.

I. The opinion was undoubtedly very prevalent among the Christian fathers, that no small portion of the institutions of Moses were borrowed from those of Egypt, and were adopted as divine ordinances only in accommodation to the low and carnal state of the Israelites, who had become inveterately attached to the manners of Egypt. With the view, it was supposed, of weaning them more easily from the errors and corruptions which had grown upon them there, the Lord indulged them with the retention of many of the customs of Egypt, though in themselves indifferent or even somewhat objectionable, and gave a place in his own worship to what they had hitherto seen associated with the service of idols. They rarely enter into particulars, and never, so far as we know, formally discuss the grounds of their opinion ; but very commonly think it enough to refer in support of it to Ez. xx. 25, where the Lord is said to have given Israel “statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live.” This passage is also much pressed by Spencer, and, indeed, is the main authority of a scriptural nature to which both he, and after him Warburton (*Div. Legation*, B. iv. c. 6), appeal in confirmation of their general view of the Mosaic ritual. By a palpable misunderstanding of the meaning of the prophet, they regard the Decalogue as the statutes in themselves really and properly good, for breaking which in the wilderness, others, namely, the ceremonial observances, were imposed on them : “Because they had violated my *first* system of laws, the Decalogue—I added to them my *second* system, the ritual law, very aptly characterised (when

set in opposition to the moral law) by statutes that were not good, and by judgments whereby they should not live.”—(Warburton.) In our judgment, most *inaptly* so characterised; for certainly they could least of all have lived by the moral law, which, as the Apostle testifies, brings the knowledge of sin, and the judgment of death; and whatever life they had, must rather have come by the ritual, than the moral law. Besides, Moses had got all the instruction regarding the tabernacle and its ordinances before the revolt took place about the golden calf; so that the tabernacle-worship went before this, and was no after-thought, resorted to in consequence of the revolt. But it is quite beside the purpose of the prophet to compare one part of the law with another; “it is impossible that he could, especially after his own declarations regarding the law, designate it by such terms; the laws not good, bringing death and destruction, are opposed to those of God; they are the heathen observances which were arbitrarily put in the room of the other.”—(Hävernick.) So also Calvin, Vitringa, Obs. Sacræ, L. ii. c. 1. sec. 17. Indeed, Jerome, though he hesitates as to the proper meaning, has correctly enough expressed it in these words: “Hoc est, dimisit eos cogitationibus, et desideris suis, ut facerent quæ non conveniunt.”—Parallel is Ps. lxxxi. 12: “So I gave them up to their own hearts’ lusts, and they walked in their own counsels;” Acts vii. 42, “He gave them up to worship the host of heaven;” Rom. i. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 11.¹

Spencer, supporting himself on the authority of the fathers, and by a distorted interpretation of one or two passages of Scripture, has, with great learning and industry (in his work *De Legibus Hebræorum*), endeavoured to make good the proposition, that the immediate and proper design of the Mosaic law was to abo-

¹ The references to the fathers may be found in Spencer *De Leg. Hebr.* I. c. 1. Deyling has an acute dissertation on this passage (*Obs. Sac. P.* ii. ch. 23), in which he very successfully refutes the interpretation of the Fathers, Spencer, and those of later times, who substantially adopt his view, but also objects to the view given of it here, and contends, that the statutes not good, and the laws by which they could not live, were God’s chastisements punishing them for their violations of his good and life-giving ordinances. We have no doubt that these chastisements were in the eye of the prophet, but not to the exclusion of the other: God gave them up to foolish counsels and a reprobate mind, that they might manifestly appear to be undeserving of his care, and be left to inherit the recompense that was meet for their perversity.

lish idolatry and preserve the Israelites in the worship of the one true God ; and that, for the better effecting of this purpose, the Lord introduced many heathenish, chiefly Egyptian, customs into his service, and so changed or rectified others, as to convert them into a bulwark against idolatry. He coupled with this, no doubt, a secondary design, "the mystic and typical reason," as he calls it—that, namely, of adumbrating the better things of the Gospel. But this occupies such an inferior and subordinate place, and is occasionally spoken of in such disparaging terms, that one cannot avoid the conviction of his having held it in very small estimation. He even represents this mystical reference to higher things than those immediately concerned, as done partly in accommodation to the early bent given to the mind of Moses.¹ And of course, when he comes to particulars, it is only in regard to a few things of greater prominence, such as the tabernacle, the ark, and the more important institutions, that he can deem it advisable to search for any mystical meaning whatever. To go more minutely to work, he characterises as a kind of "sporting with sacred things ;" and declares his concurrence in a sentiment of St Chrysostom, that "all such things were but venerable and illustrious memorials of Jewish ignorance and stupidity."²

It is not so much, however, in this depreciation of the symbolical and typical import of the Mosaic ritual, that the work of Spencer was fitted to give a false impression of its real character and object, as in the connection he necessarily sought to establish, while endeavouring to prove his main proposition, between the institutions of Moses and the rites of heathenism. Though charged with a divine commission, Moses appears, in point of fact, only as an improved Egyptian, and his whole religious system is nothing more than a refinement on the customs and polity of Egypt. Not a few of the rites introduced were useless (*legibus et ritibus inutilibus*, p. 26), some were viewed as only tolerable fooleries (*quos ineptias norat esse tolerabiles*, p. 640), and would never have found a place in the institutions of Moses, but for the currency they had already obtained in Egypt, and the liking the Israelites had there acquired for them. But on such a view, it is impossible to conceive how to worship God according to the ritual of Moses, could have been an acceptable

¹ De Leg. Heb. p. 210.

² Ibid. p. 215.

service, and the very imposition of such a ritual in the name of God, must have been a kind of pious fraud. "God," to use the language of Bähr, "appears as a Jesuit, who makes use of bad means to accomplish a good end. Spencer, for example, considers sacrifice as an invention of religious barbarity, an evidence of superstitious views of the divine nature; now, when God by Moses, not only confirmed for ever the offerings already in common use, but also extended and enlarged the sacrificial code, instead of thereby extirpating the mistaken views, he would really have sanctioned and most strongly enforced them ... Besides, the relation of Israel to the Egyptians, and that in particular of Moses, as represented in the Pentateuch at the time of the Exodus, would lead us to expect an intentional shunning of every thing Egyptian, especially in religious matters, rather than an imitation and borrowing. The deliverance of Israel from Egypt is set forth as the special token of divine love and power, as the greatest salvation wrought for Israel, as the peculiar pledge of the covenant with Jehovah; and a separate feast was devoted to the commemoration of this divine goodness. It is unquestionable that there was here every inducement for Moses making the separation of Israel from Egypt as broad as possible. For this, however, it was indispensably necessary to brand everything properly Egyptian, and extirpate by all means the very remembrance of it. But by adopting the Egyptian ritual, Moses would have directly sanctioned what was Egyptian, and would have perpetuated the remembrance of the land of darkness and servitude."¹

Indeed, the objectionable character of Spencer's views could scarcely be better exposed than in the words of Lord Bolingbroke, when railing in his usual style against the current theology of his day: "In order to preserve the purity of his worship, God prescribes to them a multitude of rites and ceremonies, founded on the superstitions of Egypt, from which they were to be weaned, or in some analogy to them. They were never weaned entirely from all the superstitions: and the great merit of the law

¹ Symbolik, B. i. s. 41, 42. The latter part is stated rather too comprehensively, as we shall shew by and by. The circumstances were such as to have led Moses rather to avoid than to seek an imitation of what was Egyptian, but it was impossible altogether to exclude it, or precisely to brand every thing properly Egyptian.

of Moses was teaching the people to adore one God, much as the idolatrous nations adored several. This may be called *sanctifying* Pagan rites and ceremonies in theological language, but it is profaning the pure worship of God in the language of common sense."¹

But while Spencer's views lay open to such formidable objections, and were opposed to the more serious theology of the age, they gradually made way both in this country and on the Continent; and the influence of his work may be traced through a very large portion of the theological literature connected with the Old Testament down even to a recent period. The work owed this extraordinary success to the immense pains that had been bestowed upon it—its exact method, comprehensive plan, and lucid expression—and also to the great skill which the author displayed in availing himself of all the learning then accessible upon the subject, and bringing it to bear upon the general argument. His views were eagerly embraced on the Continent by Le Clerc, and (in his work on the Pentateuch), pushed to consequences from which Spencer himself would have shrunk. Then Michaelis came with his masculine intellect, his stores of oriental learning, but low and worldly sense, discovering so many sanatory, medicinal, political, and, in short, all kinds of reasons but moral and religious ones, for the laws and institutions of Moses, that if the Jewish lawgiver was in some measure vindicated from the charge of accommodating his policy to heathenish notions and customs, it was only to establish for him the equally questionable reputation of a well-skilled Egyptian sage, or an accomplished worldly legislator. In this case, as well as in the other, it was impossible

¹ Philosophical Works, vol. v. p. 377. It is remarked by Archbishop Magee, that Spencer's work "has always been resorted to by infidel writers, in order to wing their shafts more effectively against the Mosaic revelation." See note 60 to his work on the Atonement, where also are to be found some good remarks on such views generally, although, in resting upon the ground of Witsius, he does not place the opposition to them on its proper basis. He speaks of Tillotson as having been before-hand with Spencer in propounding the general view regarding the nature of the Mosaic ritual, and certainly Barrow (in his Sermon on the Imperfection of the Jewish Religion), exhibits to the full as low a view of the legislation of Moses as Spencer himself did shortly afterwards. We have no doubt that the view itself was an offshoot of the semi-deistical philosophy which sprung up at that period in England as a kind of re-action from Puritanism, and almost simultaneously insinuated itself into various productions of the more learned theologians.

to avoid the conviction, that it was somewhat out of character to claim for Moses a properly divine commission, and quite incredible that signs and wonders should have been wrought by heaven to confirm and establish it. After such pioneers, the way was open for the subtle explanations of rationalism, and the rude assaults of avowed infidelity.¹

In Britain the influence of Spencer's work has also been very marked, though, from the character of the national mind, and other counteracting influences, the results were not so directly and extensively pernicious. The more learned works that have since issued from the press, connected with the interpretation of the Books of Moses, have for the most part borne no unequivocal indications of the weight of Spencer's name; while the better convictions, and the more practical aim of the authors, generally kept them from embracing his views in all their grossness, and carrying them out to their legitimate conclusions. Even Warburton, who espouses in its full extent Spencer's view regarding the primary and immediate design of the Mosaic institutions, as being intended to "preserve the doctrine of the unity by means of institutions partly in compliance to their Egyptian prejudices, and partly in opposition to those and the like superstitions"²—yet gives a decidedly higher place to the typical bearing of the Mosaic ritual, and comes much nearer the truth in representing both its religious use under the Old Testament dispensation, and its prospective reference to the New.³ Such writers as Lowman⁴ and Shaw,⁵ gave only a partial and reluctant assent to some of Spencer's positions; and chiefly, it would seem, because they did not see how to dispose of his proofs and authorities. The latter, in particular, though he afterwards substantially grants what Spencer contended for, yet expresses his dissatisfaction with the general aim of Spencer's work, by saying, that "upon the whole he was still apt to imagine, that however it might have been one part of the Divine purpose to guard Israel against a corruption from the Egyptian idolatry, by the institution of the Mosaic economy, this

¹ Michaelis did not himself positively avow his disbelief of the miraculous in the history of Moses, but he plainly betrayed his anxiety to get rid of it as far as possible, by his questions to Niebuhr in regard to the passage through the Red Sea.

² Divine Leg., B. iv. s. 6, and v. s. 1. ⁴ Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship.

³ Ibid. B. vi. s. 5 and 6.

⁵ Philosophy of Judaism.

was not the principal design of it." It would have been strange, indeed, if such had been its principal design. And strange it certainly was, that men, not to say of penetration and learning, but with their eyes open, could ever have imagined that it was so. For what do we not see, when we direct our view to the latter days of the Jewish commonwealth? We see this end most completely attained. A people never existed that were more firmly established in the doctrine of the unity, and more thoroughly alienated from the superstitions of heathenism; and yet never were a people more thoroughly and generally estranged from the true knowledge of God, and more hostile to the claims of heaven. So that, in adopting the hypothesis in question, one must be prepared to maintain the monstrous proposition, that the principal and primary design of that religious economy might have been accomplished, while still the persons subject to it were neither true worshippers of the living God, nor fitted to enter into the kingdom of his Son.

The same considerations hold in regard to the other reason commonly assigned by this class of writers for the rites of Judaism—the separation of the people from the other nations of the earth. And indeed, from the very nature of things, that could not have been more than an incidental and temporary end. The covenant, out of which all Judaism grew, containing the promise, that in the seed of Abraham all the families of the earth should be blessed, it could never be the direct intention and design of the ordinances connected with it, to place them in formal antagonism to the other nations. This effect was no farther to have been produced than by the Israelites becoming too holy for intercourse with the nations. In so far as this distinction did not exist, both were virtually alike; the Israelites also were uncircumcised and heathen; and the circumstance of their being placed under such sanctifying ordinances, was chiefly designed to have a salutary influence on the surrounding heathen, and induce them to seek for light and blessing from Israel. Hence, Deut. xxxii. 43: "Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people;" and Isa. lvi. 7, "Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people."

2. A widely different, and in many respects entirely opposite view of the institutions of Moses, has also been maintained. Its chief expounder and advocate, as opposed to Spencer, was Witsius,

whose *Ægyptiaca* was published with the express design of meeting the arguments and counteracting the influence of the work of Spencer.¹ In this production, Witsius admits at the outset, that there is a striking similarity between the rites of the Mosaic law and those of other ancient nations, in particular of the Egyptians; and he even quotes with approbation a passage from Kircher, in which this similarity is asserted to have been so manifest, that "either the Egyptians must have hebraized, or the Hebrews must have egyptized." Nor does he think it improbable that this may have been the reason why the Egyptian and Jewish rites were so often classed together at Rome, and enactments made for restraining them as alike pernicious.² But he contends, at the same time, that some of the things in which this resemblance stood, were not peculiar to the Egyptians, but common to them with other nations of heathen antiquity; and especially, that in so far as there might be any borrowing in the case, it was more likely the Egyptians borrowed from the Hebrews, than the Hebrews from the Egyptians. His positions were generally acquiesced in by the more orthodox and evangelical divines of this country; and it is a somewhat singular fact, that the commencement of a false theology in regard to the Old Testament, had its rise in this country, and this country itself derived the chief corrective against the evil from abroad. In two important respects, however, the argument of Witsius was not satisfactory, and failed to provide a sufficient antidote to the work of Spencer. 1. He failed in proving, or even in rendering it probable, that the Egyptians borrowed from the Israelites the rites and ceremonies, in which the customs of the two nations resembled each other. Warburton is quite successful

¹ Spencer's work called forth many other opponents, but Witsius continued to hold the highest place. The *Ægyptiaca* was followed by a respectable work of Meyer, *De Temporibus et Festis diebus Hebræorum*—the first part against Sir John Marsham, the second against Spencer, taking up substantially the same ground as Witsius. Vitringa also opposes the leading views of Spencer, in various parts of his *Obs. Sacræ*, as does Deyling also, in his *Obs. Sac.* In this country, Shuckford in the first vol. of his *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, and Graves in his *Lectures on the Pentateuch* (he has only one lecture on the subject, P. ii. Lec. v.), with various other writers of inferior note, have opposed Spencer, on the ground of Witsius, and without adding to its strength. Daubeny's *Connection between the Old and the New Testament*, though praised by Magee in his notes on this subject, does not touch on the controversy, and, in a critical point of view, is an inferior work.

² Lib. i. c. 2.

here in meeting the positions of Witsius and his followers, both on account of the unquestionable antiquity of the Egyptian institutions, and the want of any such connection between the two nations as to render a borrowing on the part of the Egyptians from the Israelites in the least degree likely. And the more recent investigations which have been made into the history and condition of ancient Egypt, by such inquirers as Heeren, Rossellini, and Wilkinson, have given such confirmation to the views of Warburton, in this respect, that they may now be regarded as conclusively established. It is not only against probability, but we may even say against the well authenticated facts of history, to allege that the Egyptians had to any extent borrowed from the Israelites. 2. If in this respect the argument of Witsius was erroneous, in another it was defective; it made no attempt to supply what had partly occasioned the work of Spencer, and certainly contributed much to its success—a more solid and better-grounded system of typology. This still remained as arbitrary and capricious in its expositions of Old Testament events and institutions as it had been before—like a nose of wax, as Spencer somewhere sneeringly, though not without reason, terms it, which might be bent any way one pleased. Orthodox divines should, as Hengstenberg remarks, “have directed all their powers to a fundamental and profitable investigation into the symbolical and typical meaning of the ceremonial institutions.”¹ But not having done this, though they succeeded in weakening some of Spencer’s statements, and proving the connection between the Jewish and Egyptian customs to be less in certain cases than he imagined, yet his system, as a whole, had the advantage of an apparently settled and consistent foundation, while theirs seemed to swim only in doubt and uncertainty.

3. In recent times, considerable advances have been made toward the supplying of this deficiency on the part of Witsius and his followers. Much praise is due, especially to Bähr, for having laid the foundation of a more profound and systematic explanation of the symbols of the Mosaic dispensation, although, from some radical defects in his doctrinal views, the meaning he brings out is often far from being satisfactory. On the particular point now

¹ *Authentic*, I p. 8.

under consideration, he substantially agrees with Witsius, holding the institutions of Moses to have been in no respect derived from Egypt; but differing so far, that he conceives the Egyptians to have been as little indebted to the Israelites, as the Israelites to the Egyptians. He maintains, that whatever similarity existed between their respective institutions, arose from the necessity of employing like symbols to express like ideas, which rendered a certain degree of similarity in all symbolical religions unavoidable. "Even if we should grant," he says, "a direct borrowing in particular cases, why should not the lawgiver have adopted that which appeared formally suitable to him? The natural and the sensible is by no means in itself heathenish, and the sensible things of which the heathens availed themselves, to represent religious ideas, did not become in the least heathenish from having been applied to such a use. The main inquiry still is, what was indicated by these signs, and that not merely in the particulars, but pre-eminently in their combination into one entire system. Besides, no case is known to us, in which any such borrowing can with certainty be proved."¹ "The investigations," he again says, "recently prosecuted in such a variety of ways into the religions of the eastern nations shew, that what was formerly regarded as peculiarly Egyptian in the religion of Moses, is also to be found among other nations of the East, especially amongst the Indians, and yet nobody would maintain that Moses borrowed his ceremonial institutions from India."² Unquestionably not; but there may still be sufficient ground for holding, that, without travelling to India to see what was there, he took what suited his purpose near at hand. Besides, Hengstenberg in his *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, has endeavoured to prove—and in some cases we think has successfully proved, that there are distinct traces to be found in the laws of Moses of Egyptian usages, and that Bähr is not borne out by his authorities, in alleging the same usages to have existed elsewhere. We are disposed, therefore, to regard Bähr's position as somewhat extreme; and on the whole subject of the Egyptian education of Moses, and the influence this might warrantably be supposed to exert upon the institutions he was afterwards honoured to introduce,—a subject not formally discussed

¹ *Symbolik*, i. p. 34.

² *Ib.* 42.

by either of these authors—we submit the following propositions as at once grounded in reason, and borne out by the analogy of the divine procedure.

1. It is, in the first instance, to be held as a sacred principle, that whatever might be the acquaintance Moses possessed with the customs and learning of Egypt, this could in no case be the direct and formal reason of his imposing anything as an obligation on the Israelites. For the whole, and every part of his work, he had a commission from above, and nothing was admitted into his institutions, which did not first approve itself to divine wisdom, and carry with it the sanction of divine authority. “When the Lord was going to found a new commonwealth, as it was really new, he wished it also to appear such to the Israelites. Hence, its form or appearance, not as fabricated from the rubbish of Canaanite or Egyptian superstitions, but as let down from heaven, was first shewn to Moses on the sacred mount, that everything in Israel might be ordered and settled after that pattern. Nor did he wish liberty to be granted to the people, to determine by their own judgment even the smallest points in religion. He determined all things himself, even to the minutest circumstances ; so that, on pain of instant death, they were forbidden either to omit or to change anything. Thus, it became the majesty of the supreme God to subdue his people to himself, not by the wiles of a tortuous and crooked policy, but by a royal path, the simple exercise of his own authority ; and so, to accustom them from the first to lay aside all carnal considerations, and to take the will alone of their King and Lord as their common rule in all things.”¹ The passage in Deut. xii. 30–32, is alone sufficient to establish the truth of this : “Take heed, that thou inquire not after their gods (viz. of the nations of Canaan), saying, How did these nations serve their gods ? even so will I do likewise. Thou shalt not do so unto the Lord thy God ; for every abomination to the Lord, which he hateth, have they done unto their gods. What thing soever I command you, observe to do it ; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.”

That in point of fact, there was a marked difference between the religious customs and sacrificial system of the Israelites, and

¹ Witsius, *Ægyptiaca*, l. iii. c. 14, § 3.

those of other nations, sufficient to stamp theirs as peculiarly their own, even heathen writers have in the strongest terms affirmed.¹ That it would be so, was implied in the declaration of Moses to Pharaoh, when he insisted upon being allowed to leave the land of Egypt, lest "they should sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians." In whatever respects this might be the case—whether in the kind of victims offered, or in the manner of offering them, the statement at least indicates a strong contrariety between the worship to be instituted among them, and that already established among the Egyptians. And in the further statement of Moses: "We shall sacrifice to the Lord our God as he shall command us," (Ex. viii. 27), he grounds their entire worship, whether it might in some respects resemble or differ from that of the Egyptians, on the sole and absolute authority of God.

2. But as the laws and institutions which God prescribes to his people in any particular age, must be wisely adapted to the times and circumstances in which they live, so it is impossible but that the fact of the lawgiver of the Jewish people having been instructed in all the wisdom of the most civilized nation of antiquity, must have to some extent modified both the civil and religious polity of which he was instrumentally the author. No man legislates in the abstract, but with a careful and considerate adaptation to the present state and aspect of society; and this always the more, the higher the skill and wisdom of the legislator. Moses, it must be remembered, did not stand alone in his connection with what was counted wise and polished among the Egyptians; he only possessed, in a more eminent degree, what belonged also in some degree to his brethren. And that the people for whom he was to legislate, had grown up in a civilized country, and an artificial state of society, familiar, at least, with the results of Egyptian learning, if but little initiated into the learning itself, naturally called for a corresponding advancement in the whole structure of his religious polity. For, what was needed to develop and express either the civil or the religious life of a people so reared, would in many respects differ from what might have suited

¹ Moses, quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret, novos ritus, contrariosque cæteris mortalibus, indidit. Profana illic omnia, quæ apud nos sacra, &c.—Tacitus, Hist. L. v. 4, also Plin. H. N. xiii. 4.

a rude and uncultivated horde. So that a certain regard to the state of things in Egypt was absolutely necessary in the Hebrew polity, if it was to possess a suitable adaptation to the real progress of society in the arts and manners of civilized life. To instance only in one particular—the knowledge of the art of writing must alone have exercised a most material influence on the code of laws prescribed to this new people. Where such an art is unknown, the laws must necessarily be few, the institutions natural and simple, and the degree of instruction connected with them of the most elementary nature—such as oral tradition might be sufficient to preserve, or the verses of some popular bards to teach. But if, on the other hand, the legislation is for a people among whom writing is known and familiarly used, it will naturally embrace a much wider range, and branch itself out into a far greater variety of particulars. Nor can we doubt, that, for this reason, among others, the Israelites were associated with the manners of Egypt, and Moses was from his youth instructed in all its learning. For, whatever mystery hangs over the first invention of letters, there can no longer be any doubt, that Egypt was the country where the art of writing was first brought into general practice, and that at a period long prior to the birth of Moses. But, without an intimate and familiar acquaintance with this art, Moses could not have delivered such a system of laws as constituted the framework of his dispensation—which, from their multiplicity, could not otherwise have been remembered, and from their prevailing character, as opposed to the corrupt tendencies of the people, the people themselves were but too willing to forget. It was therefore necessary that they should all be written, and that what was pre-eminently *the law*, should even be engraved, for the sake of greater durability, upon tables of stone. All this implies a certain amount of learning on the part of the lawgiver, as requisite to fit him for being instrumentally the author of such a dispensation, and a certain influence necessarily exerted by his learning on his legislation. It implies also a considerable degree of civilization on the part of the people, whose circumstances were such as to admit of and call for such a legislator.¹

¹ We have already spoken, toward the close of chap. i. s. 1, of the connection between the civilization of the Israelites, and the ultimate purposes of God in respect to them. The particular point more especially noticed in the text here—the existence and

3. We can very easily, however, advance a step farther, and perceive how a still more direct and intimate connection might in some respects be legitimately, and even advantageously, established between the state of matters in Egypt, and that introduced by Moses among the Israelites. In things, for example, required for the maintenance of a due order and discipline among the people, or for the becoming support of the ministers and ordinances of religion—things which human nature is disposed, if not altogether to shun, at least improperly to curtail and limit, it might have been the part of the highest wisdom to take substantially the arrangements which already existed in Egypt. For as these must, from their very nature, have imposed a species of burden upon the Israelites, the thought, that the same had been borne even by the depraved and idolatrous people from whom they were now separated, would the more easily reconcile them to its obligations. This is a principle which we find recognised and acted on in gospel-times. There must be self-denial, and a readiness to undergo labour and

familiar use of the art of writing in Egypt, at the time of Israel's sojourn there, has given rise to a good deal of controversy, but is now virtually settled, so far as our immediate purpose is concerned. How alphabetical writing was invented, or by whom, or whether it was not transmitted from the ages before the flood, and might consequently be claimed by each of the more eminent races or nations that afterwards arose as their own, these are still unexplored mysteries, and likely to remain such. The opinion is now very prevalent, that the invention belongs to Egypt, and grew out of a gradual improvement of the original hieroglyphic or picture-writing. So especially Warburton, *Div. Leg. B. iv. s. 4*, and many of the recent writers on hieroglyphics. See the Article *Hieroglyphics*, in *Encyclop. Britan.* and Heeren's introduction to the second vol. on *Africa*. But this opinion is by no means universal, and it stands connected with such difficulties, that some of those who have devoted most attention to the subject, hold the order of things to have been precisely the reverse. They conceive that the most complicated was also the last, that out of the alphabetical writing came the phonetic hieroglyphic, and this again gave rise to the ideographic and figurative. So, in part at least, Zoega, also Klaproth, Latronne, and Hengstenberg, who remarks, in confirmation of this view, that "the hieroglyphic writing was exclusively a sacred one, and hence conveys the impression, that it was intended to darken what already existed in a simple form; if we seek in hieroglyphic writing the commencement of writing in general, we can scarcely comprehend how it should from the first have been exclusively employed by the priests" (*Authentic, des Pent. i. p. 444-6*, where also see quotations from the other writers mentioned as holding this view). But, however this may be, it is certain that the knowledge and use of letter-writing reaches back to a period beyond all authentic profane history, and dates from the very infancy of the human race. Hence, by most early nations, the invention of it was ascribed to one of their gods—by the Phœnicians to Thaaat, by

fatigue in the Christian ; and this the Apostle enforces by a reference to the toils of the husbandman, the hardships of the soldier, and even the pains-taking laborious diligence of the combatant in the Grecian games (2 Tim. ii. 3-6 ; 1 Cor. ix. 24). There must be a decent maintenance provided for those who devote their time and talents to the spiritual work of the ministry ; and the reasonableness and propriety of this, he in part grounds on what was usually done amongst men in the commonest occupations of life, as well as the custom, prevalent alike among Jews and Gentiles, for those who ministered at the altar to live of the altar (1 Cor. ix. 7-14 ; x. 21). It was absolutely necessary, however distasteful it might be to men of corrupt minds, that proper means should be employed in the church for the preservation of order, and the enforcement of a wholesome discipline ; and the state of things among the Gentiles is appealed to as in itself constituting a call to attend to this, sufficient even to shame the churches into its observance (1 Cor. v. ; xi. 1-16). Not only so, but the officers appointed in the Christian church to take

the Egyptians to Thot or Hermes, &c. The fact, also, that a person, whether personally designated, or characterised by the name of Cadmus, a supposed contemporary of Moses, brought letters from Phœnicia to Greece, is a sufficient proof that letter-writing was then in current use in the East. Even Winer (Real-Wört. art. Schreib Kunst) admits that Moses might *possibly* have become acquainted with it in Egypt. The Greek writers, Diodorus (iii. c. 3.), Plato (De Leg. L. vii.) speak of it as customary in Egypt for the multitude learning letters ; and the name given by Herodotus to the alphabetic kind of writing, *demotic* (popular), and by Clemens and Porphyry, *epistolic*, implies it to have been generally known and used. "In Egypt," says Wilkinson, "nothing was done without writing. Scribes were employed on all occasions, whether to settle public or private questions, and no bargain of any consequence was made without the voucher of a written document," (Vol. i. p. 183). He tells us also, that papyri of the most remote Pharonic period have been found with the same mode of writing as that of the age of Cheops (Vol. iii. p. 150). Rossellini says, that "they probably wrote more in ancient Egypt, and on more ordinary occasions than among us"—that "the steward of the house kept a written register"—that "their names used to be inscribed upon their implements and garments"—that "in levying soldiers, persons wrote down the names as the commanders brought the men up," &c. (Vol. ii. p. 241, ss). That this accords with the representations given in the Pentateuch, and that the Israelites partook in the privilege, is evident from the name given to their officers both in Egypt and Canaan, *shoterim*, or scribes (Ex. v. 15 ; Deut. xx. 5), and also from the very frequent references to writing in the books of Moses, for example, Ex. xxxii. 16 ; Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20, xxvii., where they were enjoined to have the whole law written upon stones covered with chalk or plaster (according to a practice common in Egypt, Wilkinson, iii. p. 300), that all might see it and read it.

charge of its internal administration, and preside over its worship and discipline, it is well known, were derived, even to their very names, from those of the Jewish synagogue, which was not immediately of divine origin, but gradually arose out of the exigencies of the times:—the Holy Spirit choosing, in this respect, to make use of what was known and familiar to the minds of the disciples, rather than to invent an entirely new order of things.¹

We should not, therefore, be surprised to find the application of this principle in the Mosaic dispensation—to find that some things there, especially of the kind supposed, bore a substantial conformity to those of Egypt. The officers, or *shoterim*, mentioned in the xxth ch. of Deuteronomy, were evidently of this class. And such also were some of the arrangements respecting the apportionment of the land, and the support out of its produce of those who were regarded more especially as the representatives of God. In these respects there was the closest resemblance between the Egyptian and Jewish politics, and in the points in which they agreed they differed from all the other nations of antiquity with which we are acquainted. It is an ascertained fact, confirmed by the reports of the Greek historians, that the king was regarded as sole proprietor of the land in Egypt, with the exception of what belonged to the priests, and that the cultivators were properly farmers under the king. Diodorus, indeed (L. i. 73), represents the military caste as having also a share in the land; and Wilkinson (vol. i. p. 263) says, that kings, priests, and the military order, these, but these only, appear to have been landowners. Herodotus, however, explains this apparent contradiction in regard to the military order, by stating (B. ii. sec. 141) that their land properly belonged to the king; that they differed from the common cultivators only in holding it free of rent, and in lieu of wages; that hence, while it

¹ Abrogata templi liturgia et cultu, utpote ceremoniali, cultum atque publicam Dei adorationem in Synagogis, quæ quidem moralis erat, Deus in ecclesiam transplantavit Christianam, publicum scilicet ministerium, etc. Hinc ipsissima nomina ministrorum evangelii, *Angelus ecclesiae*, atque *Episcopus*, quæ ministrorum in Synagogis, &c. Lightfooti, Op. ii. p. 279. But the full and satisfactory proof is to be found only in Vitringa, *De Synagoga Vet.* in the third part of which it is demonstrated, that the form of government and ministry belonging to the Synagogues was in great measure transferred to the Christian church.

had been given them by one king, it had been taken away by another. He also mentions, that not only had the priests property in land connected with the temples in which they served, but also that they had allowances furnished them out of the public or royal treasures, and along with the soldiers received a salary from the king (ii. 37, 168). These are very striking peculiarities, and, as Hengstenberg justly remarks,¹ imply, at least in regard to the king's proprietorship in the land, a historical fact through which it was brought about. We have such a fact in the history of Joseph (Gen. xlvii.), when he bought the land for Pharaoh, but rented it out again to the people on condition of their paying a fifth of the produce, with the exception, however, of the land of the priests, whose land Pharaoh had no opportunity, indeed, of purchasing, because they had a stated allowance from his stores.

It is perhaps not too much to say, that one of the reasons why this singular state of things was introduced into Egypt by the instrumentality of Joseph, was, that a similar arrangement in regard to the land of Canaan might the more readily be gone into on the part of the Israelites. The similarity is too striking to have been the result of anything but an intentional copying from the Egyptian constitution. For in the Jewish commonwealth God is represented as king, to whom the whole land belonged, and the people only as tenants under him—obliged also by the tenure on which they held it, to yield two-tenths, or a fifth of the yearly produce, unto God, who again provided out of this fifth for the support of the priests and Levites, the widow and the orphan, his peculiar representatives.² This large contribution from the regular increase of the land was necessary for the proper administration of divine ordinances, and the beneficent support of those who, according to the plan adopted, had no other resources to trust to for their comfortable maintenance. But it implied too entire a dependence upon God, and exacted too much at their hands, to meet with a ready compliance. And it was not only compatible, but we should rather say in perfect accordance, with the highest wisdom, to adopt an arrangement for securing it, which was thus

¹ Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 62, Trans.

² Deut. xviii.; Lev. xxv.; comp. also Michaelis' Laws of Moses, vol. ii. p. 258, and Hengstenberg's Authentie, ii. p. 401, ss.

grounded in the history and constitution of Egypt, rather than to contrive one altogether new. For it thus came to them on its first proposal, recommended and sanctioned by ancient usage. And the thought was obvious, that if the citizens even of a heathen empire, in consideration of a great act of kindness in the time of famine, gave so much to their earthly sovereign, and held so dependently of him, it was meet that *they* should willingly yield the same to the God who had redeemed them, and freely bestowed upon them everything they possessed.

In these, and probably some other matters of a similar kind, we can easily understand how the Egyptian learning of Moses, without the slightest derogation to his divine commission, might be turned to valuable account in executing the work given him to do. Nor have we any reason to suppose that the divine direction and counsel imparted to him, superseded the light he had obtained, or the benefit he had derived by his opportunities of becoming acquainted with the internal affairs of Egypt.

4. But there is a still farther point of connection between the Egyptian learning of Moses, coupled with the Egyptian training of the people, and what might justly be expected in the institutions under which they were to be placed, and one still more directly bearing on the religious aspect of the dispensation. For the handwriting of ordinances brought in by Moses was predominantly of a symbolical nature. But a symbol is a kind of language, and can no more than ordinary speech be framed arbitrarily, but must grow up and form itself out of the elements which are furnished by the field of nature or art, and be gathered from it by daily observation and experience. The language which we use as the common vehicle of our thoughts, and which forms the medium of our most hallowed intercourse with heaven, is constructed from the world of sin and sorrow around us, and if viewed as to its origin, savours of things common and unclean. But in its use simply as a vehicle of thought, or a medium of intercourse, it is not the less fitted to utter the sentiments of our heart, and convey even our loftiest aspirations to heaven. Why should it be thought to have been otherwise with the language of symbol? This too must have its foundation to a great extent in nature and custom, in observation and experience; for as it is addressed to the eye, it must, to be intelligible, employ the signs,

which by previous use the eye is able to read and understand: How should I imagine that white, as a symbol, represents purity, or crimson guilt, unless something in my past history or observation had taught me to regard the one as a fit emblem of the other? It would not in the least mar the natural import of the symbol, or destroy its aptitude to express, even on the most solemn occasions, the idea with which it has become associated in my mind, if I should have learned its meaning amid employments not properly sacred, or the practices of a forbidden superstition. No matter how acquired, the bond of connection exists in my mind between the external symbol and the spiritual idea; and to reject its religious use, because I may have seen it abused to purposes of superstition, would not be more reasonable than to have proscribed every epithet in the language of Greece or Rome, which had been appropriated to the worship and service of idolatry.

Now, it so happened in the providence of God, that the children of Israel were brought into contact with the religious rites and usages of a people deeply imbued, no doubt, with a spirit of depravity and superstition, but abounding, at the same time, with symbolical arts and ordinances. And it was in the nature of things impossible that another religion abounding with the same could be framed, without adopting to a large extent the signs with which, from the accident of their position, they had become familiar. The religion introduced might differ—in point of fact it did differ from that already established, as far as light from darkness, in regard to the spirit they respectively breathed and the great ends they aimed at. But being alike symbolical, the one must avail itself of the signs which the other had already seized upon as fitted to express to the eye certain ideas. This had become, so to speak, the current language, which might to some extent be modified and improved, but could not be dispensed with. And as such language consists, for the most part, of a figurative use of the sensible things of nature, the assertion of Bähr is undoubtedly correct, that a very large proportion of the symbols so employed must be common to all religions of a like nature. Yet as each nation also has its peculiarities of thought, of custom, of scenery, of art and commerce, it can scarcely fail to have some corresponding peculiarities of symbolical expression. And it should by no means surprise us—it is rather in accordance with just and

rational expectation, if since the Egyptians were in various respects so peculiar a people, and the Israelites in general, and Moses in particular, had been brought into such close and intimate connection with their entire system, the symbols of the Jewish worship should in some points bear a resemblance to those of Egypt, which cannot be traced in those of any other nation of heathen antiquity.

Such in reality is the case—as will afterwards appear—and we perceive in it a mark, not of suspicion, but of credibility and truth. It bears somewhat of the same relation to the authenticity of the Books of Moses, and the original genuineness of the revelation contained in them, that the language of the New Testament Scripture, the peculiar type of the period to which it belonged, does in reference to the truths and statements contained in them. Though certain critics, of more zeal than discretion, have thought it would be a great achievement for the literature of the New Testament, if they could establish its claim to be ranked in point of purity with the best of the Greek classics, no individual of sound judgment will dispute, that if they had succeeded in this, the loss would have been immensely greater than the gain ; that one most important proof for the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament record would have perished—that, namely, arising from the exact conformity of its language to the period of its origin, and to no other. So, it is no discredit to the religion of Moses, that its symbols can so generally be identified with those currently employed at the period when it arose ; and the peculiar resemblance borne by some of them to the customs and usages of Egypt, is like a stamp of veritableness impressed upon its very structure, testifying of its having originated in the time and circumstances mentioned in the original record. Nor can we fail to see in this the marvellous wisdom of the divine working, in connection with the history of the undertaking of Moses, that while he was to be commissioned to set up a symbolical religion among the Israelites, the reverse in all its great features of that prevalent in Egypt, he should yet have been thoroughly qualified by his original training to serve himself of whatever suitable materials were furnished by the land of his birth. These were in a sense a part of the spoils taken from the enemy, out of which the tabernacle of the wilderness was reared—though still all things there,

from the greatest to the least, were made after the divine pattern shewn to Moses in the mount, and in the truths it symbolised, and the purposes for which it was erected, it came forth, not the slimy product of the Nile, but the chaste and holy architecture of heaven.

It is not certainly for the purpose of finding any confirmation, in a theological point of view, to the argument maintained in the preceding pages, but only to shew the foundation in nature, or the scientific basis which it also has to rest upon, that we produce the following quotation from Müller. The quotation is farther valuable, as it exhibits the view of a profound thinker, and one who has made himself intimately conversant with the thoughts and customs of remote antiquity, in regard to the meaning treasured up in the symbols of ancient worship, and the aptitude of the people to understand them. It is possible, that in the work from which we give the extract, he carries his views to an extreme, as we certainly think he does, in often making too much of particular transactions, and also in making the instruction by myths and symbols, not only independent of, but in some sort inconsistent with, direct instruction in doctrine. The general soundness, however, of his view regarding the significance of those ancient forms of instruction, especially of symbol, there are few men of learning or judgment who will now be disposed to call in question. "That this connection of the idea with the sign, when it took place, was natural and necessary to the ancient world; that it occurred involuntarily; and that the essence of the symbol consists in this supposed real connection of the sign with the thing signified, I here assume. Now, symbols in this sense are evidently coeval with the human race; they result from the union of the soul with the body in man; nature has implanted the feeling for them in the human heart. How is it that we understand what the endless diversities of human expression and gesture signify? How comes it, that every physiognomy expresses to us spiritual peculiarities, without any consciousness on our part of the cause? Here experience alone cannot be our guide; for without having ever seen a countenance like that of Jupiter Olympus, we should yet, when we saw it, immediately understand its features. An earlier race of mankind, who lived still more in sensible impressions, must have had a still stronger feeling for them. It may be said that all nature wore to them a physiognomical aspect. Now, the wor-

ship which represented the feelings of the Divine in visible external actions, was in its nature thoroughly symbolical. No one can seriously doubt that prostration at prayer is a symbolic act ; for corporeal abasement very evidently denotes spiritual subordination : so evidently, that language cannot even describe the spiritual, except by means of a material relation. But it is equally certain that sacrifice also is symbolical ; for how would the feeling of acknowledgment, that it is a God who supplies us with food and drink, display itself in action, but by withdrawing a portion of them from the use of man, and setting it apart in honour of the Deity ? But precisely because the symbolical has its essence in the idea of an actual connection between the sign and the thing signified, was an inlet left for the superstitious error, that something palatable was really offered to the gods—that they tasted it. But it will scarcely do to derive the usage from this superstition ; in other words, to assign the intention of raising a savoury steam as the original foundation of all sacrifice. It would then be necessary to suppose, that at the ceremony of libation the wine was poured on the earth, in order that the gods might lick it up ! I have here only brought into view one side of the idea, which forms the basis of sacrifice, and which the other, certainly not less ancient, always accompanied, namely, the idea of atonement by sacrifice ; which was from the earliest times expressed in numberless usages and legends, and which could only spring from the strongest and most intense religious feeling : ‘ We are deserving of death ; we offer as a substitute the blood of the animal.’¹—He states a little further on, that we must not always presuppose, that a particular symbol corresponds exactly to a particular idea, such as we may be accustomed to conceive of it ; that the symbols will partly, indeed, remain the same as long as external nature continues unchanged, but that their signification will vary with the different national modes of intuition and other circumstances ; so that a moral and religious economy, like that of Judaism, might be engrafted on the nature-worship of Egypt—meaning, thereby, we suppose, that while many of the symbols were retained, a new and higher meaning was imparted to them.²

¹ Müller's *Introd. to Scientific System of Mythology*, p. 196, Eng. Trans.

² *Ib.* 219, 222.

Having given the sentiments of one high authority, bearing on the external resemblance in some points between Judaism and the religions of heathen antiquity, we shall give the sentiments of another as to the radical difference in spirit and character which distinguished the true from the false,—an authority whose low views on some vital points of doctrine only render his opinion here the less liable to suspicion. “Heathenism,” says Bähr, “as is now no longer disputed, was in all its parts a nature-religion; that is, the deification of nature in its entire compass. That mode of contemplation, which was wont to perceive the ideal in the real, proceeded in heathenism a step farther; it saw in the world and nature, not merely a manifestation of Godhead, but the very essence and being of nature were regarded in it as identical with the essence and being of Godhead, and as such thrown together; the ultimate foundation of all heathenism is pantheism. Hence the idea of the oneness of the Divine Being was not absolutely lost, but this oneness was not at all that of a personal existence, possessing self-consciousness and self-determination, but an impersonal One, the great *It*, a neuter abstract, the product of mere speculation, which is at once everything and nothing. Wherever the Deity appeared as a person, it ceased to be one, and resolved itself into an infinite multiplicity. But all these gods were mere personifications of the different powers of nature. From a religion, which was so physical in its fundamental character, there could only be developed an ethics which should bear the hue and form of the physical. Above all that is moral rose natural necessity—fate, to which gods and men were alike subject; the highest moral aim for man was to yield an absolute submission to this necessity, and generally to transfuse himself into nature as being identified with Deity, to represent in himself its life, and especially that characteristic of it, perfect harmony, conformity to law and rule.—The Mosaic religion, on the other hand, has for its first principle the oneness and absolute spirituality of God. The Godhead is no neuter abstract, no *It*, but *I*; Jehovah is altogether a personal God. The whole world, with everything it contains, is his work, the offspring of his own free act, his creation. Viewed as by itself, this world is nothing; he alone *is*—absolute being. He is in it, indeed, but not as properly one with it; he is infinitely above it, and can clothe himself with it, as with a garment, or

fold it up and lay it aside as he pleases. Now this God, who reveals and manifests himself through all creation, in carrying into execution his purpose to save and bless all the families of the earth, revealed and manifested himself in an especial manner to one race and people. The centre of this revelation is the word which he spoke to Israel; but this word is his law, the expression of his perfect holy will. The essential character, therefore, of the special revelation of God is holiness. Its substance is, "Be ye holy, for I am holy." So that the Mosaic religion is throughout ethical: it always addresses itself to the will of man, and deals with him as a moral being. Every thing that God did for Israel, in the manifestations he gave of himself, aims at this as its final end, that Israel should sanctify the name of Jehovah, and thereby be himself sanctified."¹

¹ Symbolik, i. p. 35-37, where also confirmatory testimonies are produced from Creuzer, Görres, Hegel, Schlegel.

SECTION SECOND.

THE TABERNACLE IN ITS GENERAL STRUCTURE AND DESIGN.

By the establishment of the Sinaitic covenant the relation between God and Israel had been brought into a state of formal completeness. The covenant of promise, which pledged the divine faithfulness to bestow upon them every essential blessing, was now properly supplemented by the covenant of law, which took them bound to yield the dutiful return of obedience he justly expected from them. The foundation was thus outwardly laid for a near relationship subsisting, and a blessed intercourse developing itself between the God of Abraham on the one hand, and the seed of Abraham on the other. And it was primarily with the design of securing and furthering this end, that the ratification of the covenant of Sinai was so immediately followed up by the adoption of measures for the erection of the tabernacle.

I. The command is first of all given for the children of Israel bringing the necessary materials; "and let them make me," it is added, "a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them" (Ex. xxv. 8.) The different parts are then minutely described, after which the general design is again indicated thus: "And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God; and they shall know that I am the Lord their God that brought them out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them; I am the Lord their God" (Ex. xxix. 45, 46.) With this representation of its general design, the names or designations applied to it perfectly correspond.

(1.) Most commonly when a single name is used, it is that which answers to our word *dwelling* or *habitation*,¹ although the word generally employed in our translation is *tabernacle*. Some-

¹ משכן.

times we find the more definite term *house*,¹ the house of God, or the Lord's house (Deut. xxiii. 18 ; Josh. ix. 23 ; Judg. xviii. 31), or *tent*,² (Ex. xxvi. 11.) The dwelling in its original form was a tent, because the people among whom God came to reside and hold converse, were then dwelling in tents, and had not yet come to their settled habitation. But afterwards this tent was supplanted by the temple in Jerusalem, which bore the same relation to the ceiled houses in the land of Israel, that the original tabernacle held to the tents in the wilderness. And coming, as the temple thus did, in the room of the tabernacle, and holding the same relative position, it was sometimes spoken of as the *tent* of God (Ez. xli. 1), though more commonly it received the appellation of the *house* of God, or his *habitation*.

(2.) Besides these names, certain descriptive epithets were applied to the tabernacle. It was called the *tent of meeting*;³ for which our version has unhappily substituted the *tent of the congregation*. The expression is intended to designate this tent or dwelling as the place in which God was to meet and converse with his people ; not, as is very often supposed, the place where the children of Israel were to assemble, and in which they had a common interest. It was this certainly ; but merely because it was another and higher thing—because it formed for them all the one point of contact and channel of intercourse between heaven and earth. This is clearly brought out in Ex. xxix. 42, 43, where the Lord himself gives an explanation of the “tabernacle of meeting,” and says concerning it: “Where I will meet with you, to speak there unto thee ; and there I will meet with the children of Israel, and it shall be sanctified by my glory.”

(3.) The tabernacle is again described as the *tabernacle of testimony*, or *tent of witness*,⁴ (Numb. ix. 15, xvii. 7, xviii. 2.) It received this designation from the law of the two tables, which were placed in the ark or chest that stood in the innermost sanctuary. These tables were called “the testimony,” (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 29), and the ark which contained them, “the ark of testimony,” (Ex. xxv. 21, 22) ; whence also the whole tabernacle was called the tabernacle or tent of testimony. The witnessing, as previously noticed (chap. ii. sec. 1), had a twofold respect—to the holiness of

¹ בית.² אהל.³ אהל מועד.⁴ משכן העדות, אהל העדות.

God on the one hand, and to the sinfulness of the people on the other. While the tables expressed the righteous demands of the former, they necessarily bore a condemnatory testimony respecting the latter. So that the meeting which God's people were to have with him in his habitation, was not simply for receiving the knowledge of the divine will, or holding fellowship with God in general, but all with an especial respect to the sins on their part, against which the law was ever testifying, and the means of their restoration to his favour and blessing.

Viewing the tabernacle, then, (or the temple), in this general aspect, we may state its immediate object and design to have been, the bringing of God near to the Israelites in his true character, and keeping up an intercourse between him and them. It was intended to satisfy the desire so feelingly expressed by Job, "Oh that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat;" and to provide, by means of a local habitation, with its appropriate services, for the attainment of a livelier apprehension of God's character, and the maintenance of a closer and more assured fellowship with him. To some extent this end might have been reached without the intervention of such an apparatus; for in itself it is a spiritual thing, and properly consists in the exercise of suitable thoughts and affections towards God, meeting with gracious manifestations of his love and blessing. But under a dispensation so imperfect as to the measure of light it imparted, the Israelites would certainly, without some outward and visible help, such as a worldly sanctuary, have either sunk into practical ignorance and forgetfulness of God, or betaken themselves to some wrong methods of bringing divine things more distinctly within the grasp and comprehension of their minds. It was thus that idol-worship arose, and was with such difficulty repressed in the chosen family itself. Till God was made manifest in flesh, in the person of Christ, even the pious mind anxiously sought to lay hold of some visible link of communion to connect it with heaven. So Jacob, after he had seen the heavenly vision on the plains of Bethel, could not refrain from anointing the stone on which his head was laid, and calling it "the house of God." He felt as if that stone now possessed a connection with heaven peculiar to itself; and with a mind less enlightened, he would assuredly have converted it in the days of his future prosperity into

an idol, and erected on the spot a fane where it might be enshrined and worshipped.

It was, therefore, with the view of meeting this natural tendency, or of assisting the natural weakness of men, in dealing with divine and spiritual things, that God condescended to provide for himself a local habitation among his people. His doing so was an act of great kindness and grace to them. At the same time, it manifestly bespoke an imperfect state of things, and was merely an adaptation or expedient to meet the existing deficiencies of their religious condition, till a more perfect dispensation should come. Had they been able to look, as with open eye, on the realities of the heavenly world, they would have been raised above the necessity of any such external ladder to bring them into contact with its affairs; they would have found every place alike suitable for communing with God. And hence, when the intercourse between him and his redeemed offspring shall be brought to absolute perfection—when “the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he shall dwell with them,” no temple shall any longer be seen;¹ for the fleshly weakness, which once required this, shall have finally disappeared; everywhere the presence of God will be realized, and direct communion with him maintained. But it was otherwise amid the dim shadows of the earthly inheritance. There a visible pattern of divine things was required to help out the manifold imperfection of the spiritual idea; a habitation was needed for the indwelling of Godhead in its communications with sinful men, such as might be scanned and measured by the bodily eye, and by serving itself of which the spiritual eye might rise to the clear apprehension of the realities of an unseen, spiritual existence.

II. But that this material dwelling-place of God might be a safe guide and real assistance in promoting fellowship with heaven—that it might convey only right impressions of divine things, and form a suitable channel of communication between God and man, it must evidently be throughout of God’s, and not of man’s devising. He must exhibit to Moses the pattern of things in the heavens, after which it was in every particular to be constructed;

¹ Rev. xxi. 3, 22.

and though it was to be a tabernacle built with men's hands, yet these, from Moses, who was charged with the faithful execution of the whole, to the artificers who were to be employed in the preparation of the materials, must all be guided by the Spirit of God, supplying "wisdom, and understanding, and knowledge" for the occasion. This plainly indicates the high importance which was attached in the mind of God to the proper construction of this divine habitation, and what a plenitude of meaning was designed to be expressed by it. Yet here, also, there is a middle path, which is the right one; and it is possible, in searching for the truths embodied in those patterns of heavenly things, to err by excess as well as by defect. We are not to suppose that a separate and distinct meaning attaches to each part by itself, or to the separate qualities, perhaps, of the materials of which the different parts were composed. Due regard must be had to the connection and order of the parts one with another—their combination so as to form one harmonious whole—the circumstances in which, and the purposes for which, that whole was constructed. And it is no more than we might expect beforehand, that in this sacred structure, as in erections of an ordinary kind, some things may have been ordered as they were from convenience, others from necessity, others again from the general effect they were fitted to produce, rather than from any peculiar significance belonging to them. Such, we think, will appear to be the case in regard to the only two points we are called to consider in the present section—the materials of which the tabernacle was formed, and its general structure and appearance.

(1.) In regard to the materials, one thing is common to them all, that they were to be furnished by the people, and presented as an offering, most of them also as a free-will offering, to the Lord: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering; of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering," (Ex. xxv. 2). That the materials were to be brought by the people as an offering, implied that the structure for which they were given was altogether of a sacred character, being made of things consecrated to the Lord. And that the offering should have been of a free-will description, implied that there was to be no constraint in anything connected with it, and that, as in the erection of the house, so, in the carrying out

of the purposes for which it was erected, there must be the ready concurrence of man's sanctified will with the grace and condescension of God. Other ideas have sometimes been sought in connection with the source from which the materials were derived, but without any warrant from Scripture. For example, much has frequently been made of the circumstance, that these materials formed a portion of the spoils of Egypt. They may, indeed, have been so, and in all probability were, to a considerable extent at least; but the text is silent upon the subject, and at the time when the people were called upon to give them, they were their own property, and simply as such (not as having been in any particular manner obtained) were the people called upon to give them. Again, a portion of the materials, the whole of the silver, it would seem, which was employed in the erection, was formed of the half-shekel of redemption-money, which Moses was ordered to levy from every male in the congregation; and as this was chiefly used in making the sockets of the sanctuary, special meanings have been derived from the circumstance. But that nothing peculiar was designed to be intimated by that, is clear from the twofold consideration, that a part of this silver was applied to a quite different use, to the making of hooks and ornaments for the pillars, and that *all* the sockets were not made of it; for those of the door or entrance were formed of the free-will offerings of brass.

The materials themselves were of various sorts, according to the uses for which they were required: Precious stones, of several kinds; gold, silver, and brass; shittim-wood; linen or cotton fabrics of blue, purple, and scarlet, and skins for external coverings. Separate and distinct meanings have been found in each of these, derived either from their inherent qualities, or from their colours, and by none with so much learning and ingenuity as Bähr; but still without any solid foundation. That the wood, for example, should have been that of the shittah-tree, or the acacia, as it is now generally supposed to have been, had a sufficient reason in the circumstance, which Bähr himself admits,¹ that it is the tree chiefly found in that part of Arabia, where the tabernacle was constructed, and the only one of such dimensions as to yield boards suitable for the purpose. It was not, therefore, as if a choice lay

¹ Symbolik, i. p. 262.

between this and some other kinds of trees, and this in particular fixed upon on account of some inherent qualities peculiar to itself. Besides, in the temple, which for all essential purposes was one with the tabernacle, the wood employed was not the acacia, but the cedar, and that, no doubt, for the same reason as the other had been, being the best and most suitable for the purpose which the region afforded. The lightness of the acacia wood, and its being less liable to corrupt than some other species,¹ were incidental advantages peculiarly fitting it for the use it was here applied to. But we have no reason to suppose that anything further, or more recondite, depended on them; according to the just remark of Hengstenberg, that in so far as things in the tabernacle differed from those in the temple, they must have been of an adventitious and external nature.²

In regard to the other articles used, it does not appear that any higher reason can be assigned for their selection, than that they were the best and fittest of their several kinds. They consisted of the most precious metals, of the finest stuffs in linen manufacture, with embroidered workmanship, the richest and most gorgeous colours, and the most beautiful and costly gems. It was absolutely necessary, by means of some external apparatus, to bring out the idea, of the surpassing glory and magnificence of Jehovah as the king of Israel, and of the singular honour which was enjoyed by those who were admitted to minister and serve before him. But this could only be done by the rich and costly nature of the materials, which were employed in the construction of the tabernacle, and of the official garments of those who were appointed to serve in its courts. It is expressly said of the high-priest's garments, that they were to be made "for glory (or ornament) and for beauty" (Ex. xxviii. 2); for which purpose they were to consist of the fine byss or linen cloth of Egypt (Gen. xli. 42; Luke xvi. 19), embroidered with needle-work done in blue, purple, and scarlet, the most brilliant colours. And if means

¹ That it was absolutely incorruptible, is not of course to be imagined, though the language of Josephus, Philo, and some heathen writers would seem to imply as much. It is called *ξύλον ἄσθητον* by the LXX., and Josephus affirms it could not "suffer corruption." For other authorities, see in Bähr, i. p. 262. The simple truth seems to have been, that it was light and stood the water well, hence was much used by the Egyptians in making boats, and was loosely talked of as incorruptible.

² Authentie, ii. p. 639.

were thus taken for producing effect in respect to the garments of those who ministered in the tabernacle, it is but reasonable to infer that the same would be done in regard to the tabernacle itself. Hence, we read of the temple, the more perfect form of the habitation, that it was to be made "so exceeding magnificent as to be of fame and glory throughout all countries" (1 Chron. xxii. 5), and that among other things employed by Solomon for this purpose, "the house was garnished with precious stones for beauty" (2 Chron. iii. 6). Such materials, therefore, were used in the construction of the tabernacle, as were best fitted for conveying suitable impressions of the greatness and glory of the Being, for whose peculiar habitation it was erected. And as in this we are furnished with a sufficient reason for their employment, to search for others were only to wander into the regions of uncertainty and conjecture.

We therefore discard (with Hengstenberg, Baumgarten, and others,) the meanings derived by Bähr, as well as those of the older theologians, from the intrinsic qualities of the metals, and the distinctive colours employed in the several fabrics. They are here out of place. The question is not, whether such things *might* not have been used, so as to convey certain ideas of a moral and religious nature, but whether they actually were so employed here—and neither the occasion of their employment, nor the manner in which this was done, in our opinion, gives the least warrant for the supposition. So far as the metals were concerned, we see no ground in Scripture for *any* symbolical meaning being attached to them, separate from that suggested by their costliness and ordinary uses. A symbolical use of certain colours, we undoubtedly find, such as of white, in expressing the idea of purity, or of red, in expressing that of guilt; but when so used, the particular colour must be rendered prominent, and connected also with an occasion plainly calling for such a symbol. This was not the case in either respect with the colours in the tabernacle. The colours there, for the most part, appeared in a combined form—and, if it had been possible to single them out, and give to each a distinctive value, there was nothing to indicate how the ideas symbolized were to be viewed, whether in reference to God, or to his worshippers. Indeed, the very search would necessarily have led to endless subtleties, and prevented the mind from receiving the

one direct and palpable impression, which we have seen was intended to be conveyed. (As examples of the arbitrariness necessarily connected with such meanings, Bähr makes the scarlet in the tabernacle symbolical of the life-giving property of God, while Sol. van Til had with equal reason described in it a sign of the blood of the martyrs ; and the gold with which so many articles were overlaid, is taken by Bähr to be the symbol of the splendour and majesty of God's holiness, while in this country typologists have considered it as representing the divine nature of Christ, giving infinite perfection to his holiness and services. In such cases, it is impossible to distinguish between one opinion and another, as there is no solid ground for any of them to stand upon).

The total value of the materials used in the construction of the tabernacle must have been very great. Estimated according to the present commercial value, the twenty-nine talents of gold alone would be equal to about L.173,000 ; and Dr Kitto's aggregate sum of L.250,000, might probably come near the mark of the entire cost. But there can be no doubt that the precious metal and stones were much more common, consequently of much less comparative value in remote antiquity than they are now. In some of the ancient temples, as well as treasure-houses of kings, we read on good authority of almost incredible stores of them. For example, in the temple of Belus at Babylon, there was a single statue of Belus, with a throne and table, weighing together 800 talents of gold ; and in the temple altogether about 7170 talents. Still, even this was greatly outdone by the amount of treasure which, on the most moderate calculation, we have reason to think was expended on the temple at Jerusalem. In such vast expenditure, whether on the tabernacle or the temple, it is not necessary to think of any accommodation to heathen prejudices, nor of anything but an intention to represent symbolically the greatness and glory of the divine Inhabitant.

(2). Looking now to the general structure and appearance of the tabernacle, we might certainly expect the following characteristics : that being a tent, or moveable habitation, it would be constructed in such a manner as to present somewhat of the general aspect of such tenements, and be adapted for removals from place to place ; and that being the tent of God, it would be

fashioned within and without, so as to manifest the peculiar sacredness and grandeur of its destination. This is precisely what we find to have been the case. Like tents generally, it was longer than broad, thirty cubits long by ten broad ; and while on three of the sides possessing wooden walls, yet these were composed of separate gilded boards, rising perpendicularly from silver sockets, kept together by means of golden rings, through which transverse bars were passed, and hence easily taken asunder when a removal was made. So also the larger articles of furniture belonging to the tabernacle, the ark, the table, and the altars of incense and burnt-offering, were each furnished with rings and staves, for the greater facility of transportation. But neither within nor without must the wooden walls be seen, otherwise the appearance of a tent would not be preserved. Hence a series of coverings was provided, the innermost of which was formed of fine linen—ten breadths, five of which were joined together to make each one curtain, and the two curtains were again united together by means of fifty loops. This innermost covering was not thrown over the boards of the tabernacle, so as to hang down outside, but was suspended within by means of hooks and eyes, so that the whole interior of the sides, as well as the roof, was covered by it. Internally, it might be regarded as the tabernacle itself, and, indeed, is so named in Ex. xxvi. 6, where, after describing how the several curtains were to be coupled together, it is added respecting the whole, “and it shall be one tabernacle.”¹ Then, above this, and forming an outer covering, reaching to the foot of the boards outside, was a cloth made of goat’s hair—which, to the present day, is the usual external covering of the Arabian tents. As this gave to the sacred tabernacle externally the appearance of a tent, it is also, as well as the internal tapestry, designated as the tabernacle itself (Ex. xxvi. 11). And above both of these curtains, a double coating of skins was thrown, evidently for protection—the first consisting of ram’s skins dyed red, the other and outermost, of what, in our version, are called badger’s skins, but which are now commonly under-

¹ Bähr’s *Symbolik*, i. p. 222, 223. The usual descriptions respecting these coverings (not excepting Dr Kitto’s) representing them all as thrown over the boards simply for protection, are by no means correct.

stood to have been some kind of deer-skin, or perhaps seal-skin, peculiarly adapted for withstanding the atmospheric influences.

These parts and properties, or things somewhat similar, were essential to this sacred erection as a tent; it could not have preserved its tent-like appearance without them, and been adapted for moving from place to place. Therefore, to seek for some deeper and spiritual reasons for such things as the boards and bars, the rings and staves, the different sorts of coverings, the loops and taches, &c. is to go entirely into the region of conjecture, and give unbounded scope to the exercise of fancy. A plain and palpable reason existed for them in the very nature and design of the erection; and why should this not suffice? Or, if licence be granted for the introduction of other reasons, who shall determine, since it must ever remain doubtful which ought to be preferred? It is enough to account for the things referred to, that as God's house was made in the fashion of a tent, these, or others somewhat similar, were absolutely necessary; they as properly belonged to it in that character, as the members of our Lord's body and the garments he wore belonged to his humanity; and it is as much beside the purpose to search for an independent and separate instruction in the one, as for an independent and separate use in the other. Hence, when the house of God exchanged the tent for the temple form, it dropt the parts and properties in question, as being no longer necessary or suitable; which alone was sufficient to prove them to have been only outward and incidental.

But other things, again, were necessary, on account of the tabernacle being, not simply a tent, but the tent of the Most High God, for purposes of fellowship between him and his people: Such as, the ornamental work on the tapestry, the division of the tabernacle into more than one apartment, and the encompassing it with a fore-court, by means of an enclosure of fine linen, which in a manner proclaimed to the approaching worshippers, *Procul profani!* That the apartments should have consisted of no more than an outer and inner sanctuary; or that the figures wrought into the tapestry should have been precisely those of the cherubim, in these we may well feel ourselves justified in searching for some more special instruction; for they might obviously have been ordered otherwise, and were doubtless

ordered thus for important purposes. On which account, both characteristics reappear in the temple, as being of essential and abiding significance. But considered merely in a general point of view, the embroidery, the separate apartments, and the surrounding enclosure, may all be regarded as having the reason of their appointment in the sacred character of the tabernacle itself, and the high ends for which it was erected. Such things became it as the tent which God took for his habitation.

III. This habitation of God, whether existing in the form of a tent, or of a temple, was at once the holiest and the greatest thing in Israel; and therefore required, not only to be constructed of such materials and in such a manner as have now been described, but also to be set apart by a special act of consecration. For it was the seat and symbol of the divine kingdom on earth. The *one* seat and symbol; because Jehovah, the God of Israel, being the one living God, and, though filling heaven and earth with his presence, yet condescending to exhibit in an outward, material form, the things concerning his character and glory, behoved to guard with especial care against the idea, so apt to intrude from other quarters, of a divided personality. In heathen lands generally, and particularly in Canaan, every hill and grove had its separate deity, and its peculiar solemnities of worship (Deut. xii.) God, therefore sought to check this corruption in its fountainhead, by presenting himself to his people as so essentially and absolutely one, that he could have but one proper habitation, and one throne of government. Here alone must they come to transact with God in the things that concerned their covenant relation to him. To present elsewhere the sacrifices and services, which became his house, was a violation of the order and solemnities of his kingdom;¹ while, on the other hand, to have free access to this chosen residence of Deity, was justly prized by the wise among the people as their highest privilege. Exclusion from this, was like banishment from God's presence, and excision from his covenant. And, as appears from

¹ Hence, sacrificing in the high places, though occasionally done by true worshippers, always appears as an imperfection. In times of war, or great internal disorder, such as those of Samuel, when the ark was separated from the tabernacle, and the stated ordinances suffered a kind of suspension, sacrifices in different places became necessary.

the experience of the Psalmist, pious Israelites, in the more flourishing periods of the Theocracy, counted it among the most dark and trying dispensations of Providence, when events occurred to compel their separation from this appointed channel of communion with the Highest.

Still enlightened worshippers understood, that the enjoyment of God's presence and blessing was by no means confined to that outward habitation, and that while it was the *seat*, it was also the *symbol* of the kingdom of God. They perceived in it the image of his character and administration in general, and understood that the relations there unfolded were proper to the whole church of God. Hence, the Psalmist represents it as the common privilege of an Israelite to dwell in the house of God, and abide in his tabernacle (Ps. xv., xxiv), though in the literal sense not even the priests could be said to do so. Of himself he speaks as desiring to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of his life (Ps. xxvii.), by which he could only mean, that he earnestly wished continually to realize and abide in that connection and fellowship with God, which he saw so clearly symbolized in the form and services of the tabernacle. And, indeed, this symbolical import of the tabernacle was plainly indicated by the Lord himself to Moses, in the words, "And I will set my tabernacle among you, and I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people" (Lev. xxvi. 11, 12.) The least in spiritual discernment could scarcely fail to learn here, that what was outwardly exhibited in the tabernacle, of God's nearness and familiarity with his people, was designed to be the image of what should always and everywhere be realizing itself among his people; that the tabernacle, in short, was the visible symbol of the church.

Now, to fit it for this high destination and use, a special act of consecration was necessary. It was not enough that the materials of which it was built, were all costly, and sacred as well as costly, having been presented as the people's offerings to the Lord; nor that the pattern, after which the whole was constructed, was furnished immediately by the hand of God. After it had been thus constructed, and before it could be used as the Lord's tabernacle, it had to be consecrated by the application to all its parts and furniture of the holy anointing oil, which Moses was particularly

instructed how to prepare (Ex. xxx. 22, sq).¹ “And thou shalt sanctify them,” was the word to Moses regarding this anointing oil, “that they may be most holy; whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.”

Old Testament Scripture itself provides us with abundant materials for explaining the import of this action. It expressly connects this with the communication of the Spirit of God; as in the history of Saul’s consecration to the kingly office, to whom Samuel said, after having poured the vial of oil upon his head, “And the Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee” (1 Sam. x. 6). And still more explicitly in the case of David is the sign coupled with the thing signified, “Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward—but the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul” (xvi. 13, 14). The gift, symbolized by the anointing, having been conferred upon the one, it was necessarily withdrawn from the other. More emphatically, however, than even here, is the connection between the outward rite and the inward gift, marked in the prophecy of Isaiah, lxi. 1, “The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, *because* he hath anointed me to preach good tidings,” &c.

This passage may fitly be regarded as the connecting link between the Old and the New Testament usage in the matter. It designated the Saviour as *the Christ*, or Anointed One, and because anointed, filled to overflowing with the grace of the Spirit, and in this grace travelling on with blessed power and energy in the execution of his redemption-work. In his case, however, we know there was no literal anointing. The symbolical rite was omitted, as no longer needed, and the direct spiritual action proceeds by itself, the Spirit being given to abide with him in all his fulness. He was hence said by Peter to have been “anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power” (Acts x. 38). And because believers are spiritually united to Christ, and what He has without measure, is also in a measure theirs, they too are said to be “anointed by God,” or “to have the unction (*χρῆσμα*) of the Holy One, which teacheth them all things” (2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 20). Even

¹ It consisted of olive-oil, mixed with the four best kind of spices, myrrh, sweet cinnamon, calamus, and cassia, producing, when compounded together, the most fragrant smell.

under the dispensation of the New Testament, in regard to its earlier and more outward, its miraculous operations, we find the external symbol still retained : The apostles anointed many sick persons with oil, and made them whole in the name of the Lord" (Mark vi. 13), and James even couples this anointing with prayer, as means proper to be employed by the elders of the church for drawing down the healing power of God (v. 14). But the external rite could now only be regarded as appropriate in such operations of the Spirit as those referred to, in which the natural and symbolical use of oil ran, in a manner, into each other.

We do not mean, that oil was used in such cases merely as " a salutary and approved medicament" (Bib. Cyclop. Art. Anointing), as if the miraculous agency of the Spirit needed such external aid. But neither is it necessary to regard the action, with Hengstenberg, *Christol. on Dan. ix. 24*, as purely symbolical. The use of oil in sickness, as a kind of outward cordial and refreshment, or even a sort of healing ointment, is frequently referred to in Scripture (*Isa. i. 6* ; *Luke x. 34*), and as the operation of the Spirit was here itself outward, the outward action at once as a symbol and a natural ointment, might fitly be employed.

This sacred use of oil, however foreign to our apprehensions, grew quite naturally out of its common use in the East, especially in Egypt, Arabia, and Palestine. There, it has from the earliest times been regarded as singularly conducive to bodily health and vigour, and the heat of the climate may actually render it so. Even in Greece, where the heat is less enervating, the bodies of the combatants in the public games, it is well known, were always copiously rubbed and supplied with oil. And when mixed with perfumes, as the oil appears generally to have been, the copious application of it to the body may, partly from usage, and partly also from physical causes, have produced the most agreeable and invigorating sensations. So much, indeed, was this the case, especially in respect to the head, that the Psalmist even mentions his " being anointed with oil" among the tokens of kindness he had received from the hand of God ; and in entertainments, it was so customary to administer this species of refreshment to the guests, that our Lord charges the omission of it by Simon the Pharisee as an evident mark of disrespect (*Luke vii. 46*), and in ancient

Egypt "it was customary for a servant to attend every guest as he seated himself, and to anoint his head."¹

As the body, therefore, which was anointed with such oil, felt itself enlivened and refreshed, and became expert and agile for the performance of any active labour, it was an apt and becoming symbol of the Spirit-replenished soul, which is thus endowed with such a plentitude of grace, as disposes and enables it to engage heartily in the divine service, and to run the way of God's commandments. So that, in the language of Vitranga, "the anointed man was he, who being chosen and set apart by God for accomplishing something connected with God's glory, was furnished for it by his good hand with necessary gifts. And the more noble the office to which any one was anointed, the greater was the supply of the Spirit's grace, which the anointing brought him."² Understood thus in reference to persons, to whom the outward symbol was both most naturally and most commonly applied, we can have no difficulty in apprehending its import, when applied to the tabernacle and its furniture. This being a symbol of the true church as the peculiarly consecrated, God-inhabited region, the anointing of it with the sacred oil was a sensible representation of the effusion of the Holy Spirit, whose part it is to sanctify the unclean, and draw them within the sphere of God's habitation, as well as to fit them for occupying it. And as the anointing not only rendered the tabernacle and its vessels holy, but made them also the imparters of holiness to others—"whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy"—the important lesson was thereby taught, that, while all beyond is a region of pollution and death, they who really come into a living connection with the church or kingdom of God, are brought into communion with his spiritual nature, and made partakers of his holiness. It is within the church that all purification and righteousness proceeds.³

¹ Wilkinson, *Manners, &c. of Eg.* ii. 213.

² *Com. in Isa.* vol. ii. p. 494, comp. also i. p. 289.

³ In connecting the spiritual with the natural use of this symbol, Bähr does not appear to us to be happy. He throws together the two properties of oil: its capacity for giving light, and for imparting vigour and refreshment; and holds the anointing symbolical of the Spirit's gift, as the source of spiritual light and life in general—or rather (for he evidently does not hold the personality of the Spirit), as symbolical of the principle of light and life, or, in one word, of the holiness which was derived from the knowledge of God's law (ii. p. 173.) But to say nothing of the doctrinal errors here involved,

IV. In turning now to gospel-times for the spiritual and heavenly things, which answer to the pattern exhibited in that worldly sanctuary, we are not, of course, to think of outward and material buildings, which, however necessary for the due celebration of divine worship, must occupy an entirely different place from that anciently possessed by the Jewish tabernacle or temple. What is true of the divine kingdom generally, must especially hold in respect to the heart and centre of its administration ; viz. that everything about it rose, when the antitypes appeared, to a higher and more elevated stage ; and that the ideas which were formerly symbolized by means of outward and temporary materials are now seen embodied in great and abiding realities. Of what, then, was the tabernacle a type ? Plainly of Christ, as God manifest in the flesh, and reconciling flesh to God. This is heaven's grand and permanent provision for securing what the tabernacle, as a temporary substitute, aimed at accomplishing—the indwelling of God with his people, and the maintaining of a holy fellowship between them. In Christ personally the idea was in the first instance visibly realized, when, as the divine Word, “he became flesh, and dwelt (*ἐσκήνωσεν* tabernacled) among us.” For the flesh of Jesus, though literally flesh of our flesh, yet being sanctified in the womb of the virgin by the power of the Holy Ghost, possessed in it “the whole fulness of the Godhead bodily” (*σωματικῶς*, in a bodily receptacle or habitation) ; and held such pre-eminence over other flesh, as the tent of God had formerly done over the tents of Israel. But this was still merely the first stage in the developement of the great mystery of godliness ; only as in the seed-corn was the indwelling of God with men seen in the person of the incarnate Word. For Christ's flesh was the representative and root of all

why should those two quite distinct properties of oil be confounded together ? The qualities and uses of oil as an ointment, had nothing to do with those which belong to it as a source of light, and should no more be conjoined symbolically than they are naturally. Oil as an ointment does not give light, and it is of no moment whether it were capable of doing so or not. When used as an ointment, it was also usually mixed with spices, which still more took off men's thoughts from its light-giving property, and especially was this the case in regard to its symbolical application in the tabernacle.—When oil began to be applied symbolically for consecrating persons and things is unknown. It was so used by Jacob on the plains of Bethel, and there is undoubted proof of its having been used in consecrating kings and priests in Egypt.—(Wilkinson, v. 279, ss.)

flesh as redeemed ; in him the whole of an elect humanity stands as its living head, and there alone finds the bond of its connection with God, the channel of a real and blessed fellowship with heaven. So that as the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ, he again dwells in the church of true believers as his fulness ; and the idea symbolized in the tabernacle is properly realized, not in Christ personally and apart, but in him as the head of a redeemed offspring, vitally connected with him, and through him with God. Consequently the idea, as to its realization, is still in progress ; and it shall have reached its perfect consummation only when the number of the redeemed has been made up, and all are set down with Jesus amid the light and glories of the New Jerusalem.

Every reader of New Testament Scripture is aware, how prominently the truths involved in this representation are brought out there, and how much the language it employs of divine things bears respect to them. The transition from the outward and shadowy to the final and abiding state of things, is first marked by our Lord in the words, " Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John ii. 19), by which he plainly wished it to be understood, that his body had now become, what the temple had hitherto been—or rather, that the great idea symbolized in the temple was now actually embodied in his person, in which Godhead had really and properly taken up its dwelling, that men might draw near and have fellowship with it. As there could be but one such place and medium of intercourse, Christ's saying this of his body, of necessity implied, that the outward temple, built with men's hands, had served its purpose, and was among the things ready to vanish away. But the peculiar expression he uses implies somewhat more than this. For when he speaks of the destroying of the temple, and the raising of it up again in three days, he so identified his body with the temple, as in a manner to declare that the destruction of the one would carry along with it the destruction of the other ; that *that* alone should henceforth be the proper dwelling-place of Deity, which, from being instinct with the principle of an immortal life, could be destroyed only for a season, and should presently be raised up again to be the perpetual seat and centre of God's kingdom. From that time, therefore, the other must necessarily lose its significance and use, and must become, indeed, a habitation left desolate.

But this inhabitation of God in the man Christ Jesus, being not for himself alone, but only as the medium of intercourse and communion between God and the church, we find the idea extended so as to embrace both each individual believer and the entire company of believers as one body. The church is, "the house of God," or "his habitation through the Spirit" (1 Tim. iii. 15 ; Eph. ii. 21, 22); and as the Church universal of believers, is only an aggregate of individuals, who must each be in part what the whole is, so they also are designated "a building of God," and more especially "the temple of the living God;" or, as St Peter describes them, "lively stones built up on Christ the living stone, into a spiritual house" (1 Cor. iii. 9, vi. 19 ; Eph. iii. 17 ; 1 Pet. ii. 5, 6.) In this apparent complexity of meaning, there is still a radical oneness ; and it is by no means as if the tabernacle or temple-idea were applied to so many objects properly distinct and apart. There is an essential unity in the diversity, arising from the vital connection subsisting between Christ and his people ; for all redeemed humanity is linked with his, as his is linked with the Godhead, so that what belongs to the one, is the common property and distinction of the whole. This was unfolded in the sublime words of Christ himself, which describe the ultimate realization of what was typified in the temple: "And the glory, which thou gavest me, I have given them ; that they may be one, even as we are one ; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one ; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me" (John xvii. 22, 23.)

And as everything in the original tabernacle required to be sprinkled with the holy anointing oil, to fit it for its sacred destination and use, so in these higher and ultimate realities of the divine kingdom, all is pervaded and consecrated by the living Spirit of God. It is as connected with His working, that humanity in Jesus becomes the fit dwelling-place of Deity. It is as replenished with His fulness that Jesus accomplished in his own person the work of reconciliation, and placed on a secure foundation the intercommunion between God and man. It is, again, as having received from the Father the promise of the Spirit, and shedding forth his regenerating grace through the divine kingdom, that it becomes a hallowed region, consecrating whatever really

comes within its borders, and that every one, whom a living faith brings into contact with Christ, is made partaker of his holiness. So indeed from the divine head downwards to the very skirt of his garments. The ordinances of the church are sources of life and blessing, only in so far as they are the instruments and channels of the Spirit's working. He who, through baptism, has become savingly united to the one spiritual body, must have been baptised into it by the one Spirit, (1 Cor. xii. 13). He who, through the word of the Gospel, has been convinced of sin, righteousness and judgment, and received of the things of Christ, has found them thus powerful, because accompanied with the inward grace of the Spirit (John xvi. 8, 14.) Only as endowed with the Spirit is the believer constituted a temple of God (1 Cor. vi. 19), and only as being wrought in him by the same Spirit, do the works which proceed from his hand possess the essential element of righteousness, and attain to a place and a memorial in the kingdom of God. In a word, it is by the Spirit that all in this kingdom is sanctified and cemented in holy union with the Godhead.¹

In the preceding remarks we have made no allusion to the views of other writers respecting the tabernacle, but have simply unfolded what we conceive to be the true idea of it, and its relation to Christ and his kingdom. It may be proper, however, to give here a brief outline of other views, noticing, as we proceed, what is mainly erroneous or defective in them.

1. By Philo, the tabernacle was taken for a pattern of the universe: to the two sanctuaries belonged *τὰ νοητὰ*, and to the open fore-court *τὰ αἰσθητὰ*; the linen, blue, purple, and scarlet, were the four elements; the seven-branched candlestick represented the

¹ The supplanting of the Old Testament temple by this new consecration through the Spirit of something unspeakably better and higher, is referred to in that part of Daniel's prophecy which makes mention of "anointing the most holy" (ix. 24), or, as Dathe, Stonard, and especially Hengstenberg, have clearly shewn, it should rather be, "anointing a holy of holies," *i. e.* a new temple for the Lord, the Church of the New Covenant, consisting of Christ and all his spiritual members. In the coming and better state of things, not one part merely, but the whole, should be a holy of holies; and while this was being done, the old fabric should be made desolate because of the overspreading of abominations in it (v. 26.) Instead of being a holy thing, sanctifying all that touched it, it is regarded as having become a seat of pollution; and not only must be dispensed with, as no longer needed on account of the new dwelling-place provided, but must even be swept away, as an abomination, from the earth.

seven planets,—the light in the centre, however, at the same time representing the sun ; the table with the twelve loaves pointed to the twelve signs of the zodiac and months of the year, &c. Josephus adopts the same view, only differing in some of the details ; as do also many of the fathers,—in particular, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. Several of the Jewish Rabbis also concur in regarding the erection as an image of the creation in heaven and on earth, references to whom, as well as the others, are given by Bähr, i. p. 104, 105. He justly objects to this view, however, that it places the symbols of the Mosaic religion substantially on a footing with those of heathenism ; both alike would have been employed in the service of a mere nature-worship. Not only would the peculiar ideas and principles of the true religion have been excluded from the one sanctuary and centre of all its services, but religious symbols of a precisely opposite kind must have occupied their place. This was plainly impossible.

2. But Bähr's own view so far coincides with the one just mentioned, that he also holds the tabernacle to have been a representation of the creation of God, which, he endeavours to shew, is frequently exhibited in Scripture as the house or building of God ; not, however, in the heathen sense—not as if the Deity and creation were identified, but in the sense of creation being the workmanship and manifestation of God—the outgoing and witness of his glorious perfections. In like manner, the tabernacle was the place and structure, through which God gave to Israel a testimony or manifestation of himself ; and, therefore, it must contain in miniature a representation of the universe—the habitation, in its two compartments, representing heaven, God's peculiar dwelling-place, and the fore-court the earth, which he has given to the sons of men.

It may be regarded as alone fatal to this view, that amid the many allusions in Scripture to the tabernacle, and express explanations of the things belonging to it, the view in question is never once distinctly brought out. And as a great deal is found there in direct confirmation of the view we have presented, we are fully entitled to consider it as involving a substantial repudiation of the other. No doubt heaven and earth are often represented in Scripture as a building of God ; but, as Hengstenberg justly re-

marks,¹ “there is not to be found, in all Scripture, a single passage in which the universe is described as *the* building or dwelling-place of God ; so that the view of Bähr fails in its very foundation.” He further remarks, that it provides no proper ground for explaining the separation between the Holy and the Most Holy place, and that Bähr has hence been obliged to put a false interpretation upon the furniture belonging to the Holy place. As for the confirmation, which the learned author seeks for the basis of his view, in the opinion of Philo and Josephus, as if that were the originally Jewish mode of contemplating the tabernacle, no one unbiassed by theory can regard it in any other light than as the fruit of that anxiety, which these writers constantly display, to bring the Jewish Scriptures and religion into some degree of conformity with the heathen philosophy.

3. The work of Bähr has called forth a laboured defence of another view, equally unsupported in Scripture, and still more arbitrary—according to which the tabernacle was made in imitation of man, as the image of God. This view had been briefly indicated by Luther, not as a formal explanation of the proper design and purpose of the tabernacle, but rather by way of illustration and similitude, when expounding the words of Mary’s song: “My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit rejoiceth in God my Saviour.” There, after mentioning the different divisions of the tabernacle, he says: “In this figure there is represented a Christian man ; his spirit is the Holy of holies, God’s dwelling, in dark faith without light ; for he believes what he sees not. His soul is the Holy place, where are the seven lights, that is all sorts of understanding, discernment, knowledge, and perception of corporeal and visible things. His body is the fore-court which is open to all, so that every one can see what it does, and how it lives.” Bähr had justly said of this, that it was only an allegorical explanation, and intimated that he conceived it impossible to carry out such a view into the particulars. But a zealous Lutheran, Ferdinand Friederich, offended at the slight thus put upon “the words of the blessed Luther,” has undertaken a vindication of the view, in a volume of considerable size, and accompanied by twenty-three plates. The work contains some

¹ Authentic, ii. p. 639.

good remarks on the more objectionable parts of Bähr's system, yet adopts a number of its errors, displays throughout, indeed, the want of a sound discrimination, and utterly fails to establish the main point at issue. The objections given above to Bähr's view apply with increased force to this.

4. The view of what are distinctively called the typical writers, errs primarily and fundamentally in considering the tabernacle as too exclusively typical, in seeking for the adumbration of Christ and his salvation as the only reason of the things belonging to it. Hence no proper ground or basis was laid for the work of interpretation, and unless where Scripture itself had furnished the explanation, the most arbitrary and even puerile meanings were often resorted to, without the possibility of applying, on that system, any check to them. Not keeping in view the great idea or design of the tabernacle, everything for the most part was understood personally of Christ; and even where a measure of discretion was observed in abstaining from too great minutiae, and keeping in view the larger features of the Christian system, as in Witsius' (*Miscellanea Sacra*), still all swims in a kind of uncertainty, because no care was taken to investigate the meaning of the symbols, before they were interpreted as types.

5. The only remaining view requiring a separate notice is what is commonly regarded as the Spencerian, although Spencer did not originate it, but found its leading principles already laid down by Maimonides.¹ It proceeds on the ground of an accommodation in the grossest sense to the heathenish tendencies and dispositions of the people. The Egyptians and other nations had dwellings for their gods; it was not convenient or practicable at

¹ He is substantially followed by many of the later Rabbis, who represent the tabernacle and temple as constructed with the view of imitating, and, at the same time, outdoing the palaces of earthly monarchs. Various quotations may be seen in Outram. That from R. Schem Tob is the most distinct and graphic, and is held in great account by Spencer: "God, to whom be praise, commanded a house to be built for himself, such as a royal house is wont to be. In a royal house all these things are to be found, of which we have spoken: namely, there are some to guard the palace; others, whose part it is to do things belonging to the royal dignity, to prepare banquets, and do other things necessary for the monarch. There are others, besides, who serve with vocal and instrumental music. There is a place also for making ready victuals; a place for burning perfumes; a table also for the king, and an apartment appropriated to himself, where none are permitted to enter, excepting his prime minister, and those who are specially favoured by him. In like manner God," &c.

once to abolish the custom ; and God must, therefore, to prevent his people from lapsing into heathenism, suit himself to this state of things, have a tabernacle for his dwelling, with its appropriate furniture and ministering servants. We have already, in the introductory chapter, substantially met this view ; as it rests upon the same false principles which pervade the whole system of Spencer. According to it God accommodates himself, not merely to what is weak and imperfect in his creatures, but to what is positively wrong ; and lowers and adjusts his requirements to suit their depraved tastes and inclinations. Consequently the views of God, which such a structure was fitted to impart, and the services connected with it, must have been quite opposed to the spiritual nature of God, and an obstruction, rather than a help, to pious Israelites in their endeavours to worship and serve God aright. It was not a temporary and fitting expedient to aid men's conceptions of divine things, and to render the divine service more intelligible and attractive ; but a sop put into the mouth of a rude and heathenish people, to keep them away from the grosser pollutions of idolatry. God's house could never be built on such a foundation.—Some of the older typical writers, such as Outram (*De Sac. L. i. 3*), trod too closely upon this view of the tabernacle, as regards its primary intention for Israel, and so also, we regret to say, does Dr Kitto of recent writers (*Hist. of Palestine, i. 245-6.*)

SECTION THIRD.

THE MINISTERS OF THE TABERNACLE—THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

THE general divisions of the tabernacle, and even its particular parts and services, were so peculiarly connected with the persons who were appointed to tread its courts, that it is necessary, before proceeding farther, to understand distinctly the place which these held in the Mosaic dispensation, and especially, how they stood related to God, on the one hand, and to the people on the other. This section must therefore be devoted to the consideration of the Levitical priesthood.

I. It is somewhat singular, that the earliest notices we have of a priesthood in Scripture, refer to other branches of the human family than that of the line of Abraham. The first person with whom the name of *priest* is there associated, is Melchizedec, who is described as “king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God.” To him Abraham, though the head of the whole chosen family, paid tithes of all, and thus virtually confessed himself to be no priest as compared with Melchizedec. Then, in the days of Joseph, we meet with Potipherah, priest of On, or Heliopolis in Egypt, and of the priests generally, as a distinct and highly privileged order in that country (Gen. xli. 45 ; xlvii. 22) ; and a few generations later still, mention is made of Jethro, the priest of Midian. Not till the children of Israel left the land of Egypt, and were placed under that peculiar polity which was set up among them by the hand of Moses, do we hear of any individual, or class of individuals, holding the office of the priesthood as a distinct and exclusive prerogative. How, then, did they make their approach to God and present their oblations ? Did each worshipper transact for himself with God ? Or, did the father of a family act as priest for the members of his household ? Or,

was the priestly function among the privileges of the first-born ? This last position has been maintained by many of the leading Jewish authorities (Jonathan, Onkelos, Saadiah, Jarchi, Abenezra, &c.), and also by some men of great learning in Christian times (Grotius, Selden, Bochart, &c.). They have chiefly grounded their opinion on the circumstance of Moses having employed certain young men to offer the sacrifices, by the blood of which the covenant was ratified (Ex. xxiv. 5), connecting this fact, on the one hand, with the profaneness of Esau in having despised his birth-right, which is thought to have been a slighting of the priesthood, and, on the other, with God's special consecration of the first-born, after their redemption in Egypt. This opinion, however, may now be regarded as almost universally abandoned. The consecration of the first-born on the eve of Israel's departure from Egypt, did not, as we shall see, include their appointment to the priestly office ; nor was this reckoned among the rights of primogeniture. These rights Scripture itself has plainly restricted to pre-eminence in authority among the brethren, and the possession of a double portion in the inheritance (1 Chron. v. 1-4). And it would appear, from the scattered notices of patriarchal history, that there was no bar then in the way of any one drawing near and presenting oblations to God, who might feel himself called to do so. So long, however, as the patriarchal constitution prevailed, it was by common consent felt due to the head of the family, as the highest in honour, and the proper representative of the whole, that he should deal with God in their behalf by the presentation of sacrifice. By degrees, as families grew into communities, and the patriarchal became merged in more general and public authorities, the sacerdotal office also naturally came to be vested, at least on all great and special occasions, in the persons of those who occupied the rank of heads in their respective communities, or of others, who, being regarded as peculiarly qualified for exercising the priestly function, were expressly chosen and delegated to discharge it. So in particular with the chosen family. In earlier times each patriarch did the work of a sacrificer ; but when they had become a numerous people, and were going *as* a people to offer sacrifice to God, while they were primarily represented by Moses, whom God had raised up for their head, and who, therefore, alone properly did the part

of a priest at the ratification of the covenant, by sprinkling the blood, they appear, as was natural, to have appointed certain of their number, pre-eminent in rank, in comeliness of person, or qualities of mind, to assist in priestly offices. These, no doubt, were the persons from whom Moses selected a few to furnish him with the blood of sprinkling on the occasion referred to, and who had previously been spoken of as a body under the name of priests (Ex. xix. 22).¹

¹ Vitringa, Obs. Sac. I. De Prærogativis Primogenitorum in Eccl. Vet. This subject, and the closely related one of the consecration of the Levites in the room of the first-born, is so ably and satisfactorily discussed there, that little has been left for subsequent inquirers. Of the general practice in appointing persons to exercise priestly functions, where no separate order existed for the purpose, and which prevailed in common with God's more ancient worshippers and many heathen nations, he says, "Nothing is more certain, than that the ancients required sacrifices to be performed, either by princes and heads of families, or by persons singularly gifted in body and mind, as being deemed more deserving than others of the divine fellowship." This holds especially of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Of the former, Müller says, that "the worship of a deity peculiar to any tribe was, from the beginning, common to all the members of the tribe; that those who governed the people in the other concerns of life, naturally presided over their religious observances, the heads of families in private, and the rulers in the community; and that it might be said with just as much truth, that the kings were priests, as that the priests were kings." And so much was it the practice in the properly historical periods of Greece, to have priestly offices performed by means of public magistrates or persons delegated by the community, that he does not think "there ever was in Greece a priesthood, strictly speaking, in contradistinction to the laity."—(Introd. to Mythology, p. 187, 188, Trans.) Livy testifies that among the early Romans, the care of the sacred things devolved upon their kings, and that after the expulsion of these, an officer was appointed for the purpose, with the name of Rex Sacrorum (L. II. 2). It was still customary, however, as is well-known, for private families to perform their own peculiar sacrifices and libations to the gods. On special occasions, besides, persons were temporarily appointed for the performance of sacred offices, as on the occasion of the taking of Veïæ, thus related by Livy, v. c. 22: "Delecti ex omni exercitu juvenes, pure lotis corporibus, candida veste, quibus deportanda Romam Regina Juno assignata erat, venerabundi templum inire, primo religiose admoventes manus; quod id signum more Etrusco, nisi certæ gentis sacerdos, attractare non esset solitus." In Virgil, we find: Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos" (Æn. iii. 80), on which Servius remarks: "Sane majorum hæc erat consuetudo, ut rex etiam esset sacerdos vel pontifex, unde hodieque Imperatores pontifices dicimus." So also Aristotle, speaking of the heroic times, says: *στρατηγὸς γὰρ ἦν καὶ δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος* (Pol. iii. 14).

There was nothing peculiar, therefore, in the fact of Melchizedec having been at once a king and a priest. The only remarkable thing was, that among such a people he should have been a priest of "the Most High God," and so certainly called of God to the office, that even Abraham recognised his title to the honour. It is impossible with any certainty to trace the transition from this to that other state of things, which prevailed in some ancient countries, and in which the

Indeed, so far from wondering that there was no distinct class invested with the office of priesthood during the patriarchal period of sacred history, it should rather have been matter of surprise if any had appeared. For, in those times, every thing in religion among the true worshippers of God was characterized by the greatest simplicity and freedom. They possessed as yet no temple, nor even any select consecrated place, in which their offerings were to be presented and their vows paid. Wherever they happened to dwell, in the open field or under the shade of a spreading tree, they built an altar and called upon the name of God. And it would have been a sort of anomaly, an institution at variance with the character of the worship and the general state of things, if there had been so artificial an arrangement as a distinct order of persons appointed exclusively to minister in holy things.

But this being the case, does it not seem like a travelling in the wrong direction, to institute at last an order of priests for that purpose? Was not this to mar the simplicity of God's worship, and throw a new restraint around the freedom of access to him? In one sense unquestionably it was; and separating, as it did, between the offering and him in whose behalf it was presented, it introduced into the worship of God an element of imperfection which cleaves to all the sacrifices under the Law. In this respect it was a more perfect state of things which permitted the offerer himself to bring near his offering to God, and one that has, there-

priests existed as an entirely separate class, a distinct caste. Yet, in regard especially to Egypt, the country where such a state of things probably originated, the transition may have implied no very great change, and may have been quite easily effected. For it is now understood that the earlier kings there were *priest-kings*, either belonging to the priest-caste, or held in great dependence by that body; that the land was originally peopled by a kind of priest-colonies, who either appointed one of their number to rule in the name of a certain god, or at least formed, in connection with the ruler, the reigning portion of the community. The members of this caste consequently were the first proprietors of lands in each district. Even by the account of Herodotus, they appear still in his day to have been the principal landed proprietors; each temple in a particular district had extensive estates, as well as a staff of priests connected with it, which formed the original territory of the settlement, and were subsequently farmed out for the good of the whole; so that "the families of priests were the first, the highest, and the richest in the country; they had exclusively the transacting of all state affairs, and carried on many of the most profitable branches of business (judges, physicians, architects, &c.), and were to a certain extent a *highly privileged nobility*" (Heeren. Af. i. p. 368; ii. p. 122-129; Wilkinson, i. 245, &c.)

fore, been restored under the Gospel dispensation. But in other respects the worship of God made a great advance under the ministration of Moses, and an advance of such a nature as imperatively to require the institution of a separate priesthood. So that what was in itself an imperfection, became relatively an advantage, and a necessary help to something better.—The patriarchal religion, while it was certainly characterized by simplicity, was at the same time vague and general in its nature. The ideas it imparted concerning divine things were few, and the impressions it produced upon the minds of the worshippers must, from the very character of the worship, have been somewhat faint and indefinite. By the time of Moses, however, the world had already gone so far in the pomps and ceremonies of a false worship, that on that ground alone it became necessary to institute a much more varied and complicated service ; and the Lord, taking advantage of the evil to accomplish a higher good, ordered the religion he now set up in such a manner, as to bring out far more fully his own principles of government, and prepare the way more effectually for the work and kingdom of Christ. The groundwork of this new form of religion stood in the erection of the tabernacle, which God chose for his peculiar dwelling-place, and through which he meant to keep up a close and lively intercourse with his people. But this intercourse would inevitably have grown on their part into too great familiarity, and would thus have failed to produce proper and salutary impressions upon the minds of the worshippers, unless something of a counteracting tendency had been introduced, fitted to beget feelings of profound and reverential awe toward the God who condescended to come so near to them. This could no otherwise be effectually done, than by the institution of a separate priesthood, whose prerogative alone it should be to enter within the sacred precincts of God's house, and perform the ministrations of his worship. And so wisely was every thing arranged concerning the work and service of this priesthood, that an awful sense of the holiness and majesty of the Divine Being could hardly fail to be awakened in the most unthinking bosom, while still there was given to the spiritual worshipper a visible representation of his near relationship to God, and his calling to intimate communion with him.

For, the Levitical priesthood was not made to stand, as the

priesthood of Egypt certainly stood, in a kind of antagonism to the people, or in such a state of absolute independence and exclusive isolation, as gave them the appearance of a class entirely by themselves. On the contrary, this priesthood in its office was the representative of the whole people in its divine calling as God's seed of blessing; it was a priesthood formed out of a kingdom of priests; and, consequently, the persons in whom it was vested, could only be regarded as having, in the higher and more peculiar sense, what essentially belonged to the entire community. In them were concentrated and manifestly displayed the spiritual privileges and dignity of all true Israelites. And as these were represented in the priesthood generally, so especially in the person of the High-priest, in whom again every thing belonging to the priesthood gathered itself up and reached its culmination. "This high-priest," to use the words of Vitranga,¹ "represented the whole people. All Israelites were reckoned as being in him. The prerogative held by him belonged to the whole of them, but on this account was transferred to him, because it was impossible that all Israelites should keep themselves holy, as became the priests of Jehovah. But that the Jewish high-priest did indeed personify the whole body of the Israelites, not only appears from this, that he bore the names of all the tribes on his breast and his shoulders—which unquestionably imported that he drew near to God in the name and stead of all—but also from the circumstance, that when he committed any heinous sin, his guilt was imputed to the people. Thus, in Lev. iv. 3, 'If the priest that is anointed sin to the trespass or guilt of the people,' (improperly rendered in the English version, 'according to the sin of the people'). The anointed priest was the high-priest. But when he sinned, the people sinned. Wherefore? Because he represented the whole people. And on this account it was, that the sacrifice for a sin committed by him, had to be offered as the public sacrifices were, which were presented for sin committed by the people at large: the blood must be brought into the Holy Place, and the body burned without the camp."

There was even more than what is here mentioned to impress the idea, that the priesthood possessed only transferred rights.

¹ Obs. Sac. i. p. 292.

For, as the sins of the high-priest were regarded as the people's, so theirs also were regarded as his, and on the great day of atonement, when the most peculiar part of his work came to be discharged, he had, in their name and stead, to enter into the Most Holy Place with the blood of sprinkling, and thereafter confess all their sins and iniquities over the head of the live goat. On other occasions also, we find this impersonation of Israel by the high-priest coming distinctly out, as in Judges xx. 27, 28, where, not the people (as the construction in our version might seem to imply) but Phinehas in the name of the people asks, "Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin, my brother?" and receives the answer: "Go up, for to-morrow I will deliver them into thine hand." Besides, in one most important respect, the priestly function was still allowed to remain in the hands of the people, even after the consecration of Aaron and his family. The paschal lamb, which might justly be regarded as in a peculiar sense the sacrifice of the covenant, was by the covenant-people themselves presented to the Lord and its flesh eaten; which was manifestly designed to keep up a perpetual testimony to the truth of their being a kingdom of priests. So Philo plainly understood it, when he describes it as the custom at the passover, "not that the laity should bring the sacrificial animals to the altar, and the priests offer them, but the whole people," says he, "according to the prescription of the law, exercise priestly functions, since each one for his own part presents the appointed sacrifices."¹ And as thus the priestly functions of the people were plainly not intended to be destroyed by the institution of the Aaronic priesthood, but were only, at the most, transferred to that body, and represented in them, we can easily understand how pious Israelites, like the Psalmist, could read their own privileges in those of the priests, and speak of "coming into the house of God," and even of "dwelling in it all the days of their life."² Betokening, however, as the institution of such a priesthood did, a relative degree of imperfection on the part of the people, we can also easily understand how the spirit of prophecy, when pointing to a higher and more perfect dispensation, should have intimated the purpose of God to make the priestly order again to cease, by the unreserved communication to the people of its distinctive privileges: "Ye shall be

¹ Vita Mosis, iii. p. 686.

² Ps. v. 7; xxvii. 4, &c.

named the priests of the Lord, men shall call you the ministers of our God.¹ This purpose began to be realized from the time that, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, believers were constituted a “royal priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices to God,” and is destined to be realized in the fullest sense in the future kingdom of glory, when the redeemed shall be able with one voice to say, “Thou hast made us kings and priests unto our God.”

The relation, then, in which the Levitical priesthood stood to the people, still consisted with the preservation, to a considerable extent, of their spiritual privileges. Even through such an institution they could see the dignity of their standing before God, and their right to hold near communion with him. But if, in this part of the arrangement, care was taken to keep up a sense of the grace and condescension of God toward the whole covenant-people, care was also taken, on the other hand, by means of the priesthood’s peculiar relation to God, to keep up a sense of his adorable majesty and untainted righteousness. For, however the people were warranted to regard themselves as admitted by representation into the dwelling-place of God, they were yet obliged personally to stand at an awful distance. One tribe alone was selected and set apart to the office of handling the things that concerned it. But not even the whole of this tribe was permitted to enter the sacred precincts of God’s house and minister in its appropriate services. That honour was reserved for one family of the tribe—the family of Aaron—and even the members of that family could not be allowed to discharge the duties of their priestly office without the most solemn rites of consecration; nor, when consecrated, could they all alike traverse with freedom the courts of the tabernacle; one individual of them alone could pass the veil into its innermost region, the presence-chamber of God, and he only in such a manner as must have impressed his soul with the awful sanctity of the place, and made him enter with trembling step. Guarded by so many restrictions, and rising through so many gradations, how high must have seemed the dignity, how sublime and sacred the privilege of standing in the presence of the Holy One of Israel, and ministering before him!

¹ Isa. lxi. 6; lxvi. 21; Jer. xxxiii. 22; on which last see Hengstenberg’s *Christol.* as also on Zech. iii. 1, for some good remarks on the subject now under discussion.

II. But we must now inquire into the leading characteristics of this priestly office: what peculiarly distinguished those who exercised it from the nation at large? Nothing for certain can here be learned from the name (כֹּהֵן, *cohen*), the derivation of which is differently given by the learned, and the original import of which cannot now be correctly ascertained. But looking at their position and office in a general light, we cannot fail to regard them as occupying somewhat of the place of God's friends and familiars.¹ Their part was not to do much in the way of active and laborious service, but rather to receive and present to God, as his nearest friends and associates, what properly belonged to him. And on this account also was a great proportion of the sacrifices divided between God and them; and the shew-bread, as well as other meat-offerings, were consumed by them, there being such a close relationship and intimacy between them and God, that it might be regarded as immaterial whether anything were appropriated by them or consumed on the altar of God. But there were evidently three elements entering into this general view of their position and office, which together made up the characteristics of the priestly calling, and which are distinctly brought out as such in the description given by Moses on the occasion of Korah's rebellion: "And he spake unto Korah, and unto all his company saying, To-morrow the Lord will shew who is his, and who is holy, and whom he makes to draw near to him; and him, whom he chooses, will he make to draw near to himself;" (Numb. xvi. 5). There can be no doubt, from the connection in which this stands, that it was intended to be a description of the properties, or personal characteristics of a divine calling to the priesthood; for it was intended to meet the assumption of Korah

¹ Vitringa (*Obs. Sac.* i. p. 272) gives this even as the radical signification of the name *cohen*, "familiarioris accessionis amicum," appealing for proof to Isa. lxi. 10. In this he followed Cocceius, who makes the fundamental idea of the verb to be that of drawing near to a superior. Many after Kinchi, understand it of the performing of honourable and dignified service; while many again in recent times, resort to the Arabic, and find the sense of discovering secret things, prophesying, which they consider as the original one (Pye Smith on Priesthood of Christ, p. 82). There can be no doubt, however, that whether from usage, or from original meaning, the word came to convey the idea of something like a familiar or chosen friend and counsellor. Hence, David's sons being *priests* (2 Sam. viii. 18), is explained in 1 Chron. xviii. 17, by their being *at the hand* of the king.

and his company, that as the whole congregation was holy, they had an equal right with Aaron to enter into the tabernacle of God and minister in holy things. The person to whom such a right belonged, must be in a peculiar sense God's property, or election, a possessor of holiness, and privileged to draw near to God; which the family of Aaron alone were, and so, to the exclusion of all others, were invested with the priestly function.¹

(1.) They were in a peculiar sense God's property, or the objects of his election—for these two expressions properly involve but one idea. The choice of God as well in respect to the priesthood, as to the people at large, exercised itself in selecting a particular portion from the general property of God, to be his peculiar possession. As thus chosen and set apart for God, Israel was his heritage in the earth; and as similarly chosen and set apart for the special work of the priesthood, the family of Aaron was his heritage in Israel. The privilege was to be theirs of drawing peculiarly near to God, and their first qualification for using it, was that they were the objects of his choice. Their designation and appointment must be from above—not assumed as of their own authority, or derived from the choice of their fellow-men—“for no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron” (Heb. v. 4.) Referring to this, and recognizing in it the essential distinction of every true Israelite, the Psalmist says, “Blessed is the man *whom thou chooseth*, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts” (Ps. lxxv. 4.) The grounds of the divine choice in the case of Aaron are nowhere given; nor even when Korah contested with him the right to the office, did the Lord condescend to assign any reason for having selected that family in preference to the other families of Israel. He wished his own election to be regarded as the ultimate ground of the distinction, and by making the office hereditary in the family of Aaron, he kept the appointment for all coming

¹ It could only be as having these things in a *peculiar sense* that the Aaronic priesthood were here meant to be described by them. For they were also the characteristics of the congregation generally as a kingdom of priests, and are mentioned as such in the 19th of Exodus. The people are there described as having been “brought unto God,” as being chosen for “a peculiar treasure to him,” and as “an holy nation.” So that every thing was affirmed to be theirs, which was peculiarly to distinguish the family of Aaron. And there can be no doubt, that it was on the ground of this passage, which had made a deep impression upon all the people, that the rebellion of Korah was raised.

time, as it were, in his own hands. This does not, however, preclude the possibility of such ostensible grounds of preference existing in Aaron and his family, as might have been sufficient to commend the divine choice to the people: such as his distinguished rank as the first-born of the house to which Moses belonged, the services he had already rendered in the cause of Israel, or his personal fitness for the office. But there is no authority for holding with Philo, Maimonides, and other Jewish writers, that the priesthood was conferred on this family as a reward for their zeal and devotedness to the service of God. So far from this, at the very time when the appointment of Aaron was intimated to Moses, he was going along with the people in the worship of the golden calf.¹

(2.) The second element in the distinctive properties of the priesthood, was the possession of holiness. Expressly on the ground of holiness being the general characteristic of the people, did the company of Korah assert their claim to the prerogatives of the priesthood; and on this point especially was the trial by means of the twelve rods laid up before the Lord, designed to bear a decisive testimony. The rod of the house of Aaron alone being made to bud, and blossom, and yield almonds, was a visible, miraculous sign from heaven, of a holiness belonging to the family of Aaron, which did not belong to the congregation at large. For what is holiness but spiritual life and fruitfulness? And of this there could not be a more natural emblem than a rod flourishing and yielding fruit after its kind. Such singular and pre-eminent holiness became those, who were to be known as the immediate attendants and familiars of Jehovah, who revealed himself as "the Holy One of Israel." Hence, not only is it said in the general, that "holiness becometh God's house," that is, those who dwell and minister in its courts, but Aaron is called by way of distinction "the saint of the Lord," and the law enjoins with special emphasis respecting the priests as a body, that they should be "holy unto their God;" "for," it is added, "I the Lord, that sanctify you, am holy."—(Ps. xciii. 5, cvi. 16; Lev. xxi. 6). Hence also, as holiness in the priesthood derived the necessity of

¹ Spencer, *De Leg. L. i. c. 8*, concurs with the Jewish writers in the reason they assign, and quotes Philo with approbation: naturally enough, as his grand reason for the institution of the priesthood was simply the prevention of idolatry!

its existence from the holiness of the Being whose attendants they were, it must have been holiness of the same character and description as his ; the law of the ten commandments, which was the grand expression of the one, must undoubtedly have been intended to form the fixed standard of the other. It was an excellence, which, however it might be symbolized by outward things, could not possibly be formed of these, but must have been a real and personal distinction. This is distinctly brought out in the description given of the character of those, who were originally appointed to fill the sacred functions of the priesthood in Mal. ii. 1-7, and it is also clearly implied in the threatenings uttered against the house of Eli, and their ultimate degradation and ruin, on account of the *moral* impurities into which they fell. Their wicked course of life disqualified them from holding the sacred office, which must therefore have indispensably required purity in heart and conduct.

(3.) The last distinction belonging to the priesthood, was their right to draw near to God ; a right which grew out of their election of God and their eminent holiness, as the end and consummation to which these pointed. The question in the rebellion of Korah was, who were in such a sense chosen by God, and holy, as to be privileged to draw near to him ; and the decision of God was given on the two former, with a special respect to this latter prerogative : “ And him, whom He chooses, will He make to draw near to himself.” Hence, “ those who draw near to Jehovah,” is not uncommonly given as a description of the priests (Ex. xix. 22 ; Lev. xxi. 17 ; Ez. xlii. 13, xliv. 13), and the distinctive priestly act in all sacrificial services is called “ the bringing near,” (קָרַב) as also the thing sacrificed, is called in its most general designation *corban* (קָרְבָּן)—the thing brought near, offering. On this account what is mentioned in one place as “ an offering of burnt-offerings,” is described in another as a “ bringing near” of them (2 Sam. vi. 17 ; 1 Chron. xvi. 1). But this right of the priesthood, of themselves standing peculiarly near to God, and alone being permitted to bring near to him the gifts and offerings of the congregation, of necessity involved the idea of their occupying an intermediate position between God and the people, and gave to their entire work the character of a mediation. “ They were ordained for men in things pertaining to God,” charged to a cer-

tain extent with the interests of both parties, and having especially to transact with God in the behalf of those, whom sin had removed to a distance from him. In consequence of their relation of nearness to God and personal interest in his favour, the power was conferred on them of presenting the oblations of others, so as to procure their favourable acceptance and the bestowal in return of the divine blessing. Through them the families of Israel were blessed, as through Israel—the kingdom of priests—all the families of the earth were to be blessed. In the High-priest alone, however, was this function fully realized, as was plainly indicated by the outward distinctions held by him above the other priests, as well as above the people at large. “For to the outward of the High-priest it belonged: First, that while the people, remaining at a greater or less distance from the sanctuary, approached to it only at befitting times, the High-priest, on the contrary, was always in the midst—so that though his functions were few, and confined to certain times, yet his whole existence appeared consecrated; and, secondly, that though the people presented their offerings to God by the collective priesthood, still the sacrifice of the great day of atonement was necessary as an universal completion of the rest; and this the High-priest alone could present. The idea, therefore, of his office seems to be, that while to the Jewish people their national life appeared as an alternation of drawing near to God, and withdrawing again from him, the High-priest was the individual whose life, compared with these vacillating movements, was in perpetual equipoise; and as the people were always in a state of impurity, he was the only person who could present himself as pure before God.”¹

III. It was not, however, the sole end of the appointment of the priesthood, to represent the people in the sanctuary, and mediate between them and God and holy things. It belonged also to their office to secure the diffusion among the people of sound knowledge and instruction; so that there might be a right understanding among the people of the nature of God’s service, and a fitness for entering in spirit into its duties, while the priests

¹ Schleiermacher’s *Glaubenslehre*, as quoted by Tholuck, in *Diss. ii. in Com. on Ep. to Hebr.*, *Bib. Cabinet*, xxxix. p. 265.

were personally employed in discharging them. A certain amount of such knowledge was necessary, in order that the people might be disposed to bring their gifts and offerings at suitable times, and a still greater, that, in the presentation of these by the hand of the priests, they might be blessed as acceptable worshippers. With the oversight of this, therefore, so nearly connected with their sacred employments about the tabernacle, the priesthood were charged: "And that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses" (Lev. x. 11). So again in Deut. xxxiii. 10, "They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law." The words of Malachi also are express on this point: "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts" (ii. 7). It was therefore justly charged against them there, as an entire subversion of the great end of their appointment, that instead of teaching others the law, "they caused many to stumble at it;" and the prophet Hosea even ascribes the general ruin to their neglect of this part of their functions: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge; because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me" (iv. 6).

The office of the priesthood thus necessarily involved somewhat of a prophetic or teaching character, and in after times, when those destined lights of Israel became themselves sources of darkness and corruption, prophets were raised up, and generally from among the priesthood, for the express purpose of correcting the evil, and supplying the information which the others had failed to impart. It is plain, however, that even if the priests had been faithful to this part of their calling, they were quite inadequate, from their limited number, to be personally in any proper sense the teachers of all Israel. It is true, they enjoyed peculiar advantages for this in the frequent recurrence of the stated feasts, which caused the people to assemble in one place thrice every year, and kept them on each returning solemnity for a week at the very centre of priestly influence. But much beside what could then be accomplished would require to be done, to diffuse a sufficient acquaintance with the law of God, and give instruction from time to time concerning numberless cases of doubt or difficulty, which in daily life would be certain to arise. On this account

more particularly, were the Levites associated with the priesthood, and planted at proper distances in certain cities throughout the tribes of Israel. They were "given to Aaron and his sons," to minister unto him in subordinate and preparatory offices, while he was doing the service of the tabernacle, and generally "to execute the service of the Lord" (Numb. iii. 5-10, viii. 11).¹ In fulfilling this appointment, it fell to them to keep the tabernacle and its instruments in a proper state for the divine service, to bear its different parts, when removing from place to place, to occupy in later times the post of door-keepers in the temple, to take part in the musical arrangements connected with the public service, to assist at the larger feasts in the killing and flaying of victims, &c. (1 Chron. xxiii. 28-32; 2 Chron. xxxv. 6. 11.) But separated as the Levites were from secular employments, without lands to cultivate, and "wholly given to the service of the Lord," it was obviously but a small number of them who could be regularly occupied with such ministrations about the sanctuary; and as both their abundant leisure and their dispersion through the land, gave them many opportunities of acting as the spiritual instructors of the people, it must have been chiefly through their instrumentality, that the priests were to keep the people acquainted with the statutes and judgments of the Lord. This is clearly implied, indeed, in those passages which speak most distinctly of the obligation laid upon the priesthood to diffuse the knowledge of the law, and which refer equally to the priests and the Levites. Thus their common calling to "teach Jacob God's judgments and Israel his law," is announced in the blessing of Moses upon the whole tribe (Deut. xxxiii. 8-11); and in Malachi the failure of the priesthood to instruct the people in divine knowledge, and their guilt in causing many to err from the law, is called a "corruption of the covenant of Levi."

Indeed, common discretion and self-interest, as well as the prin-

¹ They were given to Aaron, the Lord's familiar, as a sacrifice offered up and consecrated to the Lord in the room of the first-born. The first-born, at the deliverance from Egypt, had represented all the people, in them all the people were redeemed; so now the people, when substituting the Levites in their place, had to lay their hands on their heads, and Aaron waved them before the Lord as an offering; and as originally God accepted the blood of the lamb for the blood of the first-born, so now he accepted a burnt-offering and a sin-offering for the Levites, on which they had to place their hands (Numb. iii. and viii).

ciples of piety, must have enforced upon them this obligation, and dictated the employment of active measures for the diffusion of divine knowledge by the instrumentality of the Levites. If these possessed the spirit of their office as men dedicated to the Lord's service, in subordination to the priesthood, they must have felt it their duty to prepare the minds of the people for the solemnities of the tabernacle-worship, much more than to prepare the instruments of the tabernacle itself for the same. A moment's reflection must have taught them, that their services, as ministering helps, to promote the ends of the priesthood, were greatly more necessary for the one purpose than the other. But if higher considerations should fail to influence them in the matter, they were still urged to exert themselves in this direction from a regard to their own comfortable maintenance, which was made principally to depend upon the tithes and offerings of the people. The chief source of revenue was the tithe, which belonged to the tribe of Levi, from their being more peculiarly the Lord's—the whole property being represented by the number ten, and one of these being constantly taken as a tribute-money or pledge, that the whole was held in fief or dependence upon him. Then, out of this tithe accruing to the entire tribe, another tithe was taken and devoted to the family of Aaron, as the peculiarly sacred portion of the tribe. But for the actual payment of these tithes and the other offerings of the people in which they had a share, the priests and Levites were dependent on the enlightened and faithful consciences of the people. The rendering of what was due, was simply a matter of religious obligation, and where this failed, the claim could not be enforced by any constraint of law. It consequently became indispensable to the very existence of the sacred tribe, that they should be at pains to preserve and elevate the religious sense of the community, as with this their own respect and comfort were inseparably connected. And when they proved unfaithful to their charge, as the representatives of God's interest, and the expounders of his law among the people (as they appear to have done in the age of Malachi) their sin was visited upon them, in just retribution, by a withdrawal on the part of the people of the appointed offerings. So that although nothing was said as to the particular means proper to be employed for the purpose (the church being left then, as in New Testament times, to discharge the obligation laid upon it by

suitable arrangements), there can be no doubt that the obligation was imposed upon the priesthood to be partly themselves, and still more through their ministers the Levites, the teachers of the people in divine knowledge. The proper discharge of the priestly, pre-supposed and required a certain discharge of the prophetic function ; and prophets, as extraordinary messengers, were only sent to chastise their unfaithfulness and rouse them from their lethargy, and were at last instituted as a distinct and separate order, only to supply what was found to be a lack of service on the part of those regular instructors. Indeed, as the members of the prophetic order seem generally to have been taken from the tribe of Levi, the institution of that order may be regarded as a perfecting of the Levitical office in one of its departments of duty.¹

IV. Now, the outward and bodily prescriptions which were given respecting the priesthood, were merely intended to serve, by their observance, as symbolical expressions of the ideas we have seen to be involved in the nature of their calling and office. It is

¹ Vit. Synag. Vet. L. i. P. 2, c. 8, where also see various Jewish authorities in proof of the calling of the Levites to be teachers and expounders of the law, and especially one from Baal Hatturim, which expressly assigns this as the reason of the dispersion of the Levites among the Israelites (*dispergentur per omnes Israelitas ad docendam legem.*) See also Movers' *Kronik*, p. 300, and Graves on Pent. ii. Lec. 4. Michaelis (*Com. on Laws of Moses*, i. art. 35, 52), has asserted, that a great many civil and literary offices belonged to the priests and Levites—that they were not only ministers of religion, but physicians, judges, scribes, mathematicians, &c. holding the same place in Israelitish, that the Egyptian priesthood did in Egyptian society—and that on this account alone were such large revenues assigned them. This view has been too often followed by divines, especially by the rationalist portion of them, and is still too much countenanced in the *Bib. Cyclop. Art. Priest*, and even by Mr Taylor in his *Spiritual Despotism*, p. 99. It is entirely, however, without foundation, and has been thoroughly disproved by Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 34, 53), and by Hengstenberg, who has shewn that the Levites, as well as the priests, were set apart only for religious purposes, and that in particular the civil constitution as to judges, as settled by Moses, was merely the revival and improvement of that patriarchal government, which had never been altogether destroyed in Egypt (*Authentic*, ii. p. 260, 341, 654, &c.) There can be no doubt that the Egyptian and Indian priests held many of the offices referred to ; that their political, went hand in hand with their religious influence ; and that, especially in Egypt, the most fertile lands belonged to them, with many other lucrative privileges. It was very different with the Levitical priesthood—no lands worth naming—a dependence upon the offerings of the people for their livelihood—so that they are commended to the care of the people as objects of kindness with the widow and orphan (*Deut.* xii. 12, xvi. 11, 14) and were often, from the low state of religion, in comparative want.

not necessary for us to enter into any minute detail concerning them ; and we shall content ourselves with briefly noticing some of the leading points.

(1.) There were, first, personal marks and distinctions of a bodily kind, the possession of which was necessary to qualify any one for the priesthood, and the absence of which was to prove an utter disqualification. These, therefore, being manifestly given or withheld by God, bore upon the question of a person's election ; and when not possessed, bespoke the individual not to be chosen by God in the peculiar sense required for the priestly office. Such were all kinds of bodily defects ; it was declared a profanation of the altar or the sanctuary for any one to draw near in whom they appeared (Lev. xxi. 16-24.) Not that the Lord cared for the bodily appearance in itself, but through the body sought to convey suitable impressions regarding the soul. For completeness of bodily parts is to the body what, in the true religion, holiness is to the soul. To the requirement or the production of this holiness, as the perfection of man's spiritual nature, the whole of the Mosaic institutions were bent. And as signs and witnesses to Israel concerning it, those who occupied the high position of being at once God's and the people's representatives, must bear upon their persons that external symbol of the spiritual perfection required of them. The choice of God had to be verified by their possessing the outward symbol of true holiness.¹—The age prescribed for the Levites (which was also probably intended to be the same for the priests) entering upon their office, and again ceasing from active service, carried substantially the same meaning. It comprehended the period of the natural life's greatest vigour and completeness, and, as such, indicated that the spiritual life should be in a corresponding state. The age of entry is stated

¹ The Greeks and Romans, it is well known, were very particular in regard to the corporeal soundness and even beauty of their priests. Among the former, every one underwent a careful examination as to his bodily frame before he entered on the priestly office, and among the Romans there are instances of persons resigning the office on receiving some corporeal blemish—such as M. Sergius, who lost his hand in the defence of his country. But holiness was not the perfection aimed at in those religions ; and such regard was paid to bodily completeness merely because it was thought a token of divine favour, and of good success. Hence Seneca, *Controv.* iv. 2 : *Sacerdos non integri corporis quasi mali ominis res vitanda est.* See Bähr, ii. p. 59.

in Numb. iv. at thirty, while in ch. viii. twenty-five is given ; but the former has respect simply to the work of the Levites about (not *at* or *in*) the tabernacle, in transporting it from place to place ; the latter speaks of the period of their entering on their duties generally ; and it would seem that the practice latterly made it even so early as twenty (1 Chron. xxiii. 27 ; 2 Chron. xxxi. 17.)¹

(2.) Then, certain restrictions of an external kind were laid upon the priests, as to avoiding occasions of bodily defilement ; such as, contact with the dead, excepting in cases of nearest relationship, cutting and disfiguring the hair of the beard, as in times of mourning, marrying a person of bad fame, or one that had been divorced ; and the high-priest, as being in his own person the most sacred, was still farther restricted, so that he was not to defile himself even for his father or mother, and should marry only a virgin. These observances were enjoined as palpable symbols of the holiness, in walk and conduct, which became those who stood so near to the Holy One of Israel. Occupying the blessed region of life and purity, they must exhibit, in their external relations and deportment, the care and jealousy with which it behoves every one to watch against all occasions of sin, who would live in fellowship with the righteous Jehovah.

(3.) The garments appointed to be worn by the priesthood in their sacred ministrations were also, in some respects, strikingly expressive of the holiness required in their personal state, while in certain parts of the high-priest's dress other ideas were besides symbolized. The stuff of all of them was linen, and, with the exception of the more ornamental parts of the high-priest's dress, must be understood to have been white. They are not expressly so called in the Pentateuch, but are incidentally described as white in 2 Chron. v. 12 ; and such also was known to be the usual colour of the linen of Egypt, as worn by the priests. The coolness and comparative freedom from perspiration attending the use of linen garments had led men to associate with them, especially in the burning clime of Egypt, the idea of cleanliness. Their symbolical use, therefore, in an ethical religion like the Mosaic, must have been expressive of inward purity ; and

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, ii. p. 393 ; Relandi, *Antiq.* ii. 6, 3 ; Lightfoot, *Op.* ii. p. 691.

hence, in the symbolical language of Revelation, we read so often of the white and clean garments of the heavenly inhabitants, which are expressly declared to mean "the righteousness of saints" (Rev. xix. 8 ; iv. 4 ; vi. 11, &c.) Hence, also, on the day of atonement, the plain white linen garments which the high-priest was to wear, are called "garments of holiness"—evidently implying that holiness was the idea more peculiarly imaged by clothing of that description. It was this idea, too, that was emblazoned in the plate of gold which was attached to the front of the high-priest's bonnet or mitre, by the engraving on it of the words, "Holiness to the Lord." This became the more necessary in his case, on account of the rich embroidery and manifold ornaments which belonged to other parts of his dress, and which were fitted to lessen the impression of holiness, that the fine white linen of some of them might otherwise have been sufficient to convey. The representative character of the high-priest was symbolized by the breast-plate of the Ephod, which in twelve precious stones bore the names of the tribes of the children of Israel, indicating, that in their name and behalf he appeared in the presence of God. The Urim and Thummim (lights and perfections) connected with the breast-plate, if not identical with it, and through which, in cases of emergency, he obtained unerring responses from heaven, bespoke the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the mind and will of God, with which he should be endowed to fit him for giving a clear direction to the people in the things of God, and the perfect rectitude of the decisions he would consequently pronounce respecting them.—The girdle with which his flowing garments were bound together, denoted the high and honourable service in which he was engaged ; and the bells and pomegranates, which were wrought upon the lower edge of the tunic below the Ephod, bespoke the distinct utterances he was to give of the divine word, and the fruitfulness in righteousness of which this should be productive. Finally, the fine quality of the stuff of which all the garments of the priests were made, and the gold, and diversified colours, and rich embroidery appearing in the ordinary garments of the high-priest, were manifestly designed to express the elevated rank and dignity of those who are recognized by God as sons in his house, per-

mitted to draw near with confidence to his presence, and to go in and out before him.¹

(4.) Lastly, the rites of consecration proclaimed the necessity of holiness—a holiness not their own, but imputed to them by the grace of God, and following upon this, and flowing from the same source, a plentiful endowment of gifts for their sacred office, with the manifest seal of heaven's fellowship and approval. They were first brought to the door of the tabernacle and washed—as in themselves impure, and requiring the application

¹ We have not specified in detail the different parts of the priest's garments; they consisted, in the case of the priesthood generally, of breeches or drawers of linen, a coat or tunic reaching from the neck to the ankles and wrists, an embroidered girdle, and a mitre or turban (the usual parts, in fact, of an oriental dress). But in the case of the high-priest, there were beside these a mantle or robe of blue, worn over the inner coat or tunic, and immediately under the ephod, then the ephod itself, a sort of short coat, very richly embroidered and ornamented, with its corresponding girdle and breast-plate, with the Urim and Thummim, which was regarded as the peculiar and distinctive garment of the high-priest, who is thence often described as he "who wore the Ephod." (Common linen ephods, however, were worn by the priests generally, and sometimes even by laymen.) That there was much in these garments peculiar to the Israelites, and differing from what existed in Egypt, we think Bähr has sufficiently established. For example, the tunics of the Egyptian priests appear to have reached only from the haunch to the feet, leaving the upper part naked, the mitres were of a different shape, and fell back upon the neck, the girdle seems not to have been used, but they wore shoes, and on great occasions leopard skins, which the Israelitish priests did not (Symbolik, ii. p. 92). It is clear, therefore, there could be no slavish imitation, as Spencer and others have laboured to prove. Yet this by no means proves that there might not have been in some leading particulars the same symbols employed to represent substantially the same ideas. That this was the case in regard to the white linen garments seems indisputable; Spencer's proofs there, as Hengstenberg remarks against Bähr (Egypt and books of Moses, p. 146), are quite conclusive. Such dresses were peculiar only to the priests of Egypt and Palestine, as symbolic of cleanliness or purity—hence the former were called by Juvenal "grex liniger," by Ovid "linigera turba," by Martial "linigeri calvi," by Seneca "liniteali senes."—Spencer, de Leg. L. iii. c. 5, s. 2. There does seem also to have been a reference in the Urim and Thummim to the practice in Egypt of suspending the image of the goddess Thmei, who was honoured under the twofold character of truth and justice, from the neck of the chief judge (see Hengstenberg as above, p. 150, with the quotations there, especially from Wilkinson). Still there was a very characteristic difference in that the high-priest did not act properly as a judge, but as a spiritual servant of God, and was only represented as having a sure revelation, if he faithfully waited upon God, and sought in earnest to guide the people into the right knowledge of God, and a true judgment of matters as between them and God. For direct consultation with God, the Urim and Thummim seems only to have been used in cases of emergency, when ordinary resources failed. And what it was precisely, or how responses were obtained by it, cannot now be ascertained.

of water—the simplest and commonest element of cleansing. Then, the body being thus purified, the pontifical garments were put on, and on the high-priest first, afterwards on the other priests, was poured the holy anointing oil, which ran down upon the garments. This was the peculiar act of consecration, and symbolized the bestowal upon those who received it, of the Spirit's grace, so as to make them fit and active instruments in discharging the duties of God's service. As such anointing had already stamped the tabernacle as God's hallowed abode, so now did it hallow them to be his proper agents and servitors within its courts (p. 233). But, different from the senseless materials of the tabernacle, these anointed priests have consciences defiled with the pollution, and laden with the guilt of sin. And how, then, can they stand in the presence of Him who is a consuming fire to sinners, and minister before him? The more they partook of the unction of the Holy One, the more must they have felt the necessity of another kind of cleansing than they had yet received, and raised in their souls a cry for the blood of atonement and reconciliation. This, therefore, was what was next provided, and through an entire series of sacrifices and offerings they were conducted, as from the depths of guilt and condemnation, to what indicated their possession of a state of blessed peace and most friendly intercourse with God. Even Jewish writers did not fail to mark the gradation in the order of the sacrifices. "For first of all," says one of them, "there was presented for the expiation of sin the bullock of sin-offering, of which nothing save a little fat was offered (on the altar) to God (the flesh being burned without the camp); because the offerers were not yet worthy to have any gift or offering accepted by God. But after they had been so far purged, they slew the burnt-offering to God, which was wholly laid upon the altar. And after this came a sacrifice like a peace-offering (which was wont to be divided between God, the priests, and the offerers), shewing that they were now so far received into favour with God, that they might eat at his table."¹

This last offering is called the "ram of consecration," or of "filling," because the portions of it to be consumed upon the altar, with its accompanying meat-offering, were put into Aaron's

¹ R. Levi Ben Gerson, as quoted by Outram, *De Sac.* p. 56.

hands, that he might present and wave them before the Lord. Being counted worthy to have his hands filled with these, the representatives of what he was to be constantly presenting and eating before the Lord, he was thereby, in a manner, installed in his office. But first he had to be sprinkled with the blood of the victim—the blood in which the life is—and which, after being sprinkled on the altar, and so uniting him to God, was applied to his body, signifying the conveyance of a new life to him, a life out of death from God, and in union with God. Nor was Aaron's body in the general only sprinkled with this holy life-giving blood, but also particular members apart:—his right ear, to sanctify it to a ready and attentive listening to the law of God, according to which all his service must be regulated; his right hand, and his right foot, that the one might be hallowed for the presentation of sacred gifts to God, and the other for treading his courts and running the way of his commandments. And now, to complete the ceremony, he receives on his person and his garments a second anointing—not simply with the oil, but with the oil and this blood of consecration mingled together—symbolizing the new life of God, in which he is henceforth to move and have his being, in conjunction with the Spirit, on whose softening, penetrating, invigorating influence all the powers and movements of that divine life depend. So that the Levitical priesthood appeared emphatically as one coming “by water and by blood.” It spoke aloud, in all its rites of consecration, of sin on man's part, and holiness on God's. The memorials of human guilt, and the emblems of divine sanctity, must at once meet on the persons of those who exercised it. Theirs must be clean hands and a pure heart, regenerated natures, a heaven-derived and heaven-sustained life, such as betokened a real connection with God, and a personal interest in the benefits of his redemption.

The full meaning however, of the offerings connected with the consecration of the priests will only appear when we have considered the various kinds of sacrifices employed on the occasion. We could not give at present more than the general import. The whole was repeated seven times, on as many successive days—because seven was the symbol of the oath or covenant, and indicated here that the consecration to the priestly office was a strictly covenant transaction. That it was done, not merely seven times,

but on seven successive days, might also be intended to indicate its completeness—a week of days being the shortest complete revolution of time. That the parts of the peace and the bread-offering, which were put into Aaron's hand, and which were to be his for ever, were burnt on the altar, and not eaten by Moses (who here acted by virtue of his special commission as priest), may have simply arisen from Moses not being able to eat the whole; he had to eat the wave-bread, which might be enough; as also what remained over of the parts given to Aaron to be eaten, were to be burnt (Ex. xxix. 34.) We see nothing, therefore, in that arrangement to be regarded as a difficulty, though Kurtz has noted it as one (Mosaische Opfer, p. 249.) The action of the second anointing, we have explained substantially with Baumgarten, and not differing very materially from Bähr (Symb. ii. 424, &c.) We cannot with Mr Bonar (Comm. on Lev. p. 160) regard the first anointing as the consecration of the *man*, and the second as that of the *priest*—for at the first as well as the second, Aaron had on the priest's garments, and nothing could more distinctly intimate, that what was afterwards done had respect to him as priest. The fire which came out from before the Lord and consumed the burnt-offering on the altar, the first which Aaron presented for the people (Lev. ix. 24) was the public seal of God to Aaron as high-priest. It openly denoted that he was accepted in his office, and that the offerings presented by him and his sons would be owned and blessed. The rites of consecration differ materially from those used in Egypt. In particular the shaving of the whole body, which was practised in Egypt every three days (Herod. ii. 37,) and kept the head as well as the body generally bald, was quite omitted here. It was done at first, but only then, with the Levites (Numb. viii.) as an act of cleansing, along with sprinkling with water and washing of the clothes. It hence appears to have been regarded as a symbol of an inferior kind, as the consecration of the Levites was much less solemn than that of the priests.

V. In applying now what was ordained respecting the Levitical priesthood to the higher things of Christ's kingdom, we find, indeed, everywhere a shadow of these, but "not the very image" of them. The resemblances were such as imperfect, earthly materials,

and an instrumentality of sinful beings could present to the heavenly and divine—invariably presenting, therefore, some important and palpable differences. Thus, from the high-priest being taken from among men, he necessarily partook of their sinfulness, and required to be himself cleansed by rites and offerings, to be invested with what might be denominated an artificial, imputed holiness, in order that he might mediate between the holy God and his sinful fellow-men. And then, that he might go through such a process of purification as might raise him to a proper religious elevation above his brethren, there were meanwhile needed the ministrations of one standing between him and God. The mediator of the covenant, who consecrated, had of necessity to be different from, and higher than the person who was consecrated for high-priest. These were obvious, though unavoidable imperfections, even as regarded the preparatory dispensation itself; and it must have suggested itself as manifestly a more perfect arrangement, could it have been obtained, if the high-priest had been possessor of the nature, without being partaker of the guilt of his brethren, and by his inherent qualities had united in his own person what fitted him to be at once mediator and high-priest over the house of God.

Now, this is precisely what first meets us in the gospel-constitution of the kingdom; and the defects and imperfections, which gave a sort of anomalous and arbitrary character to the arrangements under the Old Testament, have no place whatever here. He who is the Mediator, is also the High-priest of his people; and while partaker of flesh and blood like the brethren, yet being “without sin,” “holy, harmless, and undefiled,” he needed no offerings and ablutions to consecrate him to the office of priesthood. At once very God and true man, the Eternal Son in personal union with real though spotless humanity, he was thoroughly qualified to act the part of the day’s-man between the Father and his sinful children, being able to “lay his hand upon them both.” Who could appear as he the friend and familiar of God?—he, who was in the bosom of the Father, and who could say in the fullest sense, “I and the Father are one?”—who even as the Son of Man, appearing in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet himself had no fellowship with the accursed thing, but ever shunned and abhorred it? With the divine and human thus meeting, all purely

in his person, he has every thing that could be desired to render him the proper Head and High-priest of his people. The arrangement for reconciling heaven and earth, and re-establishing the intercourse between lost man and his Creator, is absolutely perfect, and leaves nothing to be desired. On the one side, as the Beloved Son of God, in whom the Father is well-pleased, he has at all times free access to the presence of the Father, and in whatever he asks must also have power as a prince to prevail. On the other, as the representative of his people, and one in nature with themselves, they can at all times make known with confidence to him the sins and sorrows of their condition, and, recognizing what is his as also theirs, can rise with holy boldness to realize their near relationship to God, and their full participation in the favour and blessing of heaven.

It is impossible, surely, to contemplate the God-man as the head of restored humanity, and the pattern after which all believers shall be formed, without feeling constrained to say, not only how admirable is the arrangement, but also how amazing the condescension ! How wonderful, that the Most High should thus accommodate himself to man's nature and necessities ! And how wonderful, on the other hand, that he should elevate this nature into such near and personal union with himself, and for the sake of establishing a fit medium of interpretation and intercourse between the creature and the Creator, should make it his own eternal habitation and instrument of working ! It is this pre-eminently which crowns our nature with dignity and honour, and tells to what a peerless height our humanity is destined. We know not what we shall be, but we know that we shall be like *him* in whom our nature is linked in closest union with the Godhead ; and to have our lot and destiny bound up with his, is to be assured of all that it is possible for us to enjoy of blessing and glory.

In accomplishing this great work of mediation, however, the High-priest of our profession, like the earthly type, "must have somewhat to offer." And here, again, where the very heart and centre of his work is concerned, such differences appear as betoken the one only to have been the imperfect shadow, not the exact image of the other. For under the Old Testament priesthood, the offerer was different, not only from the thing offered, but also, for the most part, from the person on whose behalf the offering was

presented. And so impossible was it, amid the imperfections of the shadow, to combine these properly together, that on the great day of atonement it was found necessary to cause the high-priest to offer first for himself apart and then for the people apart. But now that the perfect things of God's kingdom have come, this imperfection also has disappeared. The one grand offering, through which Christ has finished transgression, made an end of sin, and brought in the everlasting righteousness, was at once furnished by himself, and offered by himself. He gave himself to death as thus laden with their guilt, an offering of a sweet smelling savour to God, and rose again for their justification, as one fully able of himself to provide and to do everything to close up the breach which sin had made between man and God.

Yet, while there were such imperfections as we have noted, rendering the Levitical priesthood but a defective representation of the Christian, there were, at the same time, many striking resemblances, and the fundamental principles connected with the priesthood of Christ, were as fully embodied there, as it was possible for them to be in a single institution. For,

(1.) The Levitical priesthood was for Israel the one medium of acceptable approach to God. Aaron and his sons were called, and alone called, to the office of presenting all the offerings of the people at the house of God, and securing for them the blessing. And the attempt made on one occasion to supersede the appointment, and dispense with their ministrations, only led to the discomfiture and perdition of those who impiously attempted it. What else can be the result of any similar attempt under the Gospel? A far higher necessity, indeed, reigns here, and any dishonour done to Jesus in his priestly function must be revenged with a much sorer condemnation. The one mediator between God and man, no one can come to the Father but by him; and they only who are redeemed by his blood, and presented by him to the Father as his own ransomed and elect church, can be accepted to blessing and glory. Therefore, it is the Father's will that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; and salvation by any other name than that of Jesus is absolutely unattainable.

(2.) The personal holiness of Christ in his priesthood was also strikingly typified in the consecrations and garments of the Levi-

tical priesthood, and especially in the purifications by water and blood. In his case, however, the holiness was not acquired, but original, inherent and complete, manifesting itself in the fulfilment of all righteousness, and magnifying the law of God to the fearful extent of bearing the penalty it had denounced against numberless transgressions. His obedience was such as left no demand of righteousness unsatisfied, and his blood was that of the Lamb of God, without spot or blemish—blood of infinite value. If God accepted the services, and heard the intercessions of the priesthood of old, all lame and imperfect as their righteousness was, how much more may his people now count on the blessing, if they approach in humble reliance on the worth and sufficiency of Christ?

(3.) Then, we see the representative character of his priesthood, and all its functions imaged in that of the High-priest, possessing as he did the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast when he entered the tabernacle, and having their cause and interest ever before him. Christ, in like manner, does nothing for himself, but only as the shepherd and Saviour of his people. “For their sakes he sanctified himself,” by laying down his life to purchase their redemption. And none of them escapes his regard. “He knows his sheep.” All the real Israel whom the Father has given to him, are borne upon his bosom within the veil, and shall assuredly reap the fruits of his successful mediation.

(4.) Further, his thorough insight into the mind of God, and capacity to give forth clear revelations and unerring judgments of his will, was prefigured in the Urim and Thummin of the Jewish high-priest, through which the priesthood gave oracular decisions in regard to the things of God, and in the authority generally committed to the priesthood of declaring the divine will. “No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he, to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” Himself the Divine Word, through whom Godhead, as it were, speaks and makes itself known to the creatures, it is his part in all his operations, but especially in the discharge of his priestly functions, to declare the Father. In him, as fulfilling the work connected with these, is seen, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord; and while he conducts his people to an interest in what he has done for their redemption, it is as the truth that he manifests himself to them. He has even promised to lead

them into all the truth, and to fill them with the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

(5.) Once more, in the anointing of the High-priest, we plainly read the connection between the work of Christ and the agency of the Holy Spirit. As the oil there sanctified all, so the Spirit here seals and works in all. By the power of the Spirit was the flesh of Christ conceived ; with the fulness of the Spirit was he endowed at his baptism ; all his works were wrought in the Spirit, and by the Spirit did he offer himself without spot to God. The Father had given the Spirit not by measure to him ; and as the oil that was poured on the head of Aaron flowed down upon his garments, so is this Spirit ever ready to descend from Christ upon all who are members of his body.

The priesthood of Aaron was certainly highly honoured in being made to represent beforehand, in so many points, the eternal priesthood of Christ. But in one respect a manifest blank presents itself, which required to be met by a special corrective. As seen in the Old Testament institution, the priestly bore a distinct and easily recognised connection with the prophetic or teaching office ; but none, or at least a very distant and obscure one, with the kingly. This of necessity arose from God himself being king in Israel when the priesthood was instituted ; so that no nearer approximation to the ruling authority could be allowed to the members of the priesthood, than that of being expounders and revealers of the law of the divine king. Something more than this, however, was required to bring out the true character of the Eternal priesthood, especially after the time that an earthly head of the kingly function was appointed, and the priesthood became still less immediately connected with an authority to rule in the house of God. Hence, no doubt, it was that the Spirit of prophecy, in directing the expectations of the church to the coming Messiah, began then so peculiarly to supply what was lacking in the intimations of the existing type, and to make promise of him as "a priest after the order of Melchizedec" (Ps. cx.) There were in reality far more points of similitude to Christ's office in the priesthood of Aaron than in that of Melchizedec ; but in one very important and prominent respect the one supplied what the other absolutely wanted—Melchizedec being at once a king and a priest, a priest upon the throne. And it was more especially to teach that

Messiah should be the same, and in this should differ from the Aaronic priesthood, that such a prediction was then given. It was virtually an assurance to the church, that the sacerdotal and regal functions, then obviously dissevered, should be united in the person of Him who was to come ; and that as the power and splendour of royalty was, in his hands, to be tempered by the tenderness and compassion of the priest, the coming of his kingdom should on that account be looked for with eager expectation. The prediction was again renewed, though without any specific reference to Melchizedec, by Zechariah after the restoration (ch. vi. 13.) But while this was the main reason and design of the reference,—when the Jews of our Lord's time not only overlooked the leading point of the prediction, but entirely misconceived also the relation that the Levitical priesthood bore to Christ's work and kingdom, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews took occasion to bring out various other and subordinate points of instruction from the prophecy in the 110th Psalm, which it was also fitted to convey. These were mainly directed to the purpose of establishing the conclusion, that the priesthood of our Lord must, by that reference to Melchizedec, have been designed to supersede the priesthood of Aaron, and to be constituted after a higher model ; that both in his person and his office, he was to stand pre-eminent above the most honoured of the sons of Abraham, as Melchizedec appears in the history rising above Abraham himself.

It only remains, to notice, that in virtue of the law in Christ's kingdom, by which all his people are vitally united to him, and have, in a measure, every gift and property which belongs to himself, sincere believers are priests after his order and pattern. Chosen in him before the foundation of the world, consecrated by the sprinkling of his blood on their consciences, and the unction of his Spirit, and brought near to God, they are "an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." It is their privilege, to go nigh through him even into the holiest of all, and minister and serve before him as sons and daughters in his kingdom. And as in their Great Head, so in them the priestly calling bears relation to the prophetic office on the one hand, and to the kingly on the other. As those who are privileged to stand so high and come so near to God, they obtain the "unction which teaches them all things"—"leads them into

all the truth," makes them "children of light," and constitutes them "lights of the world." And along with this spirit of wisdom and revelation, there also rests on them the spirit of power, which renders them a "royal priesthood." Even now, in a measure, they reign as kings over the evil in their natures, and in the world around them ; and when Christ's work in them is brought to its proper consummation, they shall, as kings and priests, share with him in the glories of his everlasting kingdom.

Hence, in the Christian priesthood, as well as in the Jewish, every thing in the first instance depends upon the condition of the person. It is not the offering that makes the priest, but the priest that makes the offering. He only, who has attained to a state of peace and fellowship with God, who has been regenerated by divine grace, and brought to a personal interest in the blessings of Christ's salvation, is in as fit condition for presenting to God the spiritual sacrifices of the New Testament. For what are these sacrifices ? They are the fruits of grace, yielded by a soul that has become truly alive to God ; and simply consist in a person's willing and active consecration of himself, through the varied exercises of love, to God and his fellow-men. It is only, therefore, in so far as he is already a subject of grace, standing on the ground of Christ's perfected redemption, and replenished with the life-giving influences of the Holy Spirit, that his good deeds possess the character of sacrifices, acceptable to God. They are, otherwise, but dead works, of no account in the sight of heaven, because presented by unclean hands, the offerings of persons unsanctified ; and even though formally right, they still rank among the things of which God declares, that he has not required them at men's hands. (Isa. i, 12 ; Hag. ii. 10-13.)

But those, on the other hand, who are in the spiritual condition now described, have freedom of access for themselves and their offerings to God ; and let no man spoil them of their privilege. Chosen, as they are, in Christ, and constituted in him a royal priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, to interpose any others as priests between them and Christ, were to traverse the order of God, and subvert the arrangements of his house. It were to block up anew the path into the Holiest, which Christ has laid fully open. It were to degrade those whom he has called to glory and virtue, to dishonour and deny Christ himself, the living root

out of which his people grow, in whose life they live, and in whose acceptance they are accepted. A priesthood, in the strict and proper sense, apart from what belongs to believers as such, can have no place in the church of the New Testament ; and the institution of a distinct priestly order, such as exists in the Greek and Roman communities, is an unlawful usurpation, proceeding from the spirit of error and of antichrist. In such a kingdom as Christ's, where every real member is a priest, there can be room only for ministerial functions necessary for the maintenance of order and the general good. But as regards fellowship with heaven, there can be no essential difference, since all have access to God by faith, through the grace wherein they stand, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.

SECTION FOURTH.

THE DIVISION OF THE TABERNACLE INTO TWO APARTMENTS—THE FORE-COURT WITH ITS LAVER AND ALTAR OF SACRIFICE—THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEA OF SACRIFICE BY BLOOD, AND THE IMPORT OF THE THREE MAIN POINTS CONNECTED WITH IT, VIZ. THE CHOICE OF THE VICTIMS, THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS, AND THE SPRINKLING OF THE BLOOD.

IN the preceding chapter, we have considered the tabernacle and its officiating priesthood only in a general point of view, with reference simply to the great design of the one, and the distinctive character and privileges of the other. But we must now descend more into particulars; and endeavour to ascertain what was the precise import of its several parts, and of the services in connection with these, which the priests were appointed to discharge. It is here so important to have a sure foundation laid, and the landmarks well fixed for future explanations, that we must in the present section confine our attention to what may be called a general survey of the particulars, the relation which one part bore to another, and the connection in which the whole stood to the most essential part of the Old Testament worship—the rite of sacrifice. This will, of course, lead us to inquire into the exact nature of a sacrifice, and the import of the actions connected with it—those, especially, of the imposition of hands on the victim, and the sprinkling of its shed blood.

1. We look first to the tabernacle itself, which, though one habitation, is presented to our view as divided into two compartments. By a richly embroidered curtain or veil, suspended from top to bottom, the innermost portion, consisting of ten cubits square, was cut off from the outer; and was designated “the Most Holy Place,” while the other was simply called “the Sanctuary,” or the Holy Place. Why should such a division have

been formed—a division into two and only two apartments? A reason very naturally suggests itself for this in the general character and design of the erection. It was the Lord's dwelling-place; not as in a state of isolation, however, but as the symbol of his presence among his people, and the medium of intercourse between them and him; at once, therefore, God's and the people's dwelling—the *tent of meeting*. But however near God may come to his creatures, and however close the fellowship to which he admits them, there must still be something to mark his incomparable greatness and glory. Even in the sanctuary above, where all is stainless purity, the ministering spirits are represented as veiling their faces with their wings before the manifested glory of Godhead; and how much more should sinful men on earth be alive to his awful majesty, and feel unworthy to stand amid the splendours of his throne? If, therefore, he should so far condescend as to pitch among them a tent for his dwelling, we might certainly have expected that it would consist of two apartments—one which he would reserve for his own peculiar residence, and another to which they should have free access, who, as his familiars, were to be permitted to dwell with him in his house. For in this way alone could the two grand ideas of the glorious majesty of God, which raises him infinitely above his people, and yet of his covenant-nearness to them, be reconciled and imaged together.

Besides, this tabernacle for the Lord's house, being the centre of a symbolical religion, must be itself the pattern of the whole kingdom to which the religion belonged. It was constructed so as to embody and express the principles of truth and holiness, on which God's connection and intercourse with his people was to be maintained. And in this respect also a twofold division was obviously required, as the instruction to be afforded naturally fell into two parts—what concerned the relation of God to his people, and what concerned the people's relation to God. The necessities of the case required this, and we may certainly conclude, the plan actually adopted was formed with the design of securing it. The most holy place—the peculiar region of the divine presence and glory—with its furniture and service, represented what God was to his people, how and on what terms he would dwell among them and hold converse with them. The Sanctuary, which was assigned to the priests, the people's representatives, in like man-

ner represented by means of its furniture and services, what it behoved them to be and do, as admitted to such intimate nearness to God, with what divine graces they should be furnished, and with what fruits of righteousness they should abound. Thus, in the symbolical structure of the tabernacle, were to be seen the two great branches into which the tree of divine knowledge always of necessity falls, viz. the things to be believed concerning God, and the things to be done by his believing people. Had this been understood and kept properly in view, it would have prevented many false interpretations, and much inextricable confusion.¹

2. It is obvious, however, that while the tabernacle was thus fitted, by means of its two apartments, to give a just representation of the relations between God and his people—and while the people at large could not be permitted to enter its courts on account of its peculiar sacredness, a place connected with it was still needed, where they might personally appear before God, and hold communion with him as locally present among them. For this purpose a space was marked off around the tabernacle, an hundred cubits long by fifty broad (about 150 feet by 75), called the fore-court, or simply the court of the tabernacle. It was enclosed by curtains made of fine twined linen, of the height of five cubits (about $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet). These curtains were suspended from rods of silver, which reached from one column to another; the columns being of brass (20 on each side and 10 at each end), supported also on bases of brass, and having near the top silver hooks, in which the rods that sustained the hooks were inserted. The doorway into this fore-court, as into the tabernacle itself, was by a veil or curtain, of rich embroidery, which was drawn up with cords, as often as any one had occasion to enter. That any

¹ The right view here was first distinctly brought out by Hengstenberg, against Bähr, *Authen.* ii. p. 635, and has been since adopted also by Tholuck in the last edition of his *Com.* on Heb. ch. ix. 5. The typical explanations prevalent in the Cocceian school, and still current in this country, overlooked this distinction as a whole; although the view taken of particular parts and services is often correct in the main. The error chiefly discovers itself in the interpretation given of the things belonging to the *Sanctuary*, in which Christ is commonly found as directly represented as in those of the Most Holy Place. See, for example, among the last works on the subject, Mudge's *Tabernacle of Moses, and the Holy Vessels and Furniture of the Tabernacle*, recently published by Baxter and Sons, which, not less than the older ones in this country, fail to draw the proper line of demarcation between the two apartments.

worshipping Israelite might enter, though not expressly said, is yet evidently implied ; and according to Jewish authority, it was absolutely essential that one part of the service in every blood-sacrifice—the imposition of the offerer's hands upon the victim—should take place within the court. And in the more complete and ample accommodations connected with the temple, not only was the court of Israel within the sacred enclosure, and commanded a full view of the services about the altar, but the worshippers, who had sacrifices to offer, were wont to go even into the court of the priests and lay their hands upon the victim.

This court of the tabernacle was furnished with two articles of worship, the laver and the altar of burnt-offering ; both of which stood in a close and intimate connection with the tabernacle itself and its most peculiar services. The laver was a kind of basin, or vessel of brass, but is nowhere exactly described, though generally supposed to have been of a circular shape, and was placed on a foot or base of brass. Some difference of opinion still prevails regarding the meaning of the passage, in which the making of it is described, Ex. xxxviii. 8. In the authorized version it is : “ And he made the laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the looking-glasses of the women assembling, which assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.” Bähr, following Fort. Sacchus, understands the looking-glasses, not of the materials of which it was made, but of the furniture with which it was provided : he provided it with looking-glasses for the women, &c. His chief reason for this is a grammatical one ; viz. that the verb עָשָׂה (to make) has the substance out of which the thing is made always in the accusative, without any preposition prefixed, and that, therefore, the preposition before the looking glasses (ב) must be taken in the sense of *with*. If the learned author had only examined the concluding verses of this very chapter, he could not have made such an assertion ; for, in v. 30, speaking of what was done with the brass of the offering, it is said, “ And therewith, or thereof, he made the sockets” (וַיַּעַשׂ בָּהֶם). Besides, what were women going to do with looking-glasses in connection with the laver, or at the door of the tabernacle ? Indeed, it is not conceivable that a place was assigned to women in the neighbourhood of the laver, and close beside the door of the tabernacle, as no part of the minis-

trations about the tabernacle was committed to their charge. By the door of the tabernacle here, and in 1 Sam. ii. 22, we should suppose, must be meant the door of the court of the tabernacle, corresponding to the court of the women in the temple, which was at a still greater distance than that of the men from the entrance into the temple. It would appear, however, that even so early as the construction of the tabernacle, there was a company of pious women dedicating themselves to frequent attendance on the worship of God, and having a place assigned them in connection with the tabernacle. Their duties of service seem to have consisted much in fasting and prayer. The LXX. on this account, interpreting rather than rendering the meaning of the original, have, "of the looking-glasses of the fasting-women who fasted." And Abenezra, as quoted by Lightfoot (*Op. i. p. 643*), gives the following explanation of the matter: "It is the custom of all women to behold their face every morning in a mirror, that they may be able to dress their hair, but lo! there were women in Israel who served the Lord, abandoning this earthly sort of pleasure, and yielding up their mirrors as voluntary oblations; nor did they any longer need these, but daily came to the door of the tabernacle to pray, and hear the words of the law." In later times, Anna was evidently one of these priest-like females, "departing not from the temple, but serving God with fastings and prayers night and day" (*Luke ii. 37*; comp. also *1 Tim. v. 5*.) The latter part of *Ex. xxxviii. 8*, should run, "Of the serving-women who served at the gate of the tabernacle of the congregation." The expression in the original has respect properly to military service, but is also often used of the stated services of the priests, *Numb. iv. 23, 35, 49*; *viii. 25*.

The laver was placed between the altar and the tabernacle, as the most convenient position, its design being to provide a ready supply of water, with which the priests were to wash their hands and their feet, before ministering at the altar on the one hand, or going into the tabernacle on the other. "When they go into the tabernacle of meeting they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the tabernacle to minister, to burn offerings made by fire unto the Lord" (*Ex. xxx. 20*). That merely the hands and the feet of the officiating priests were to be washed at this laver, arose simply from these being the

parts of their bodies immediately employed in their sacred ministrations—their hands, when engaged in presenting the sacrifices upon the altar, their feet, when going to tread the floor of the sanctuary. The strict injunction to have these acting members washed beforehand, denoted the personal holiness with which the work of God must be performed, and which is the ultimate aim, indeed, of all the institutions of worship. As the sanctification or holiness of Israel was the object of the services connected with the altar and the sanctuary, it was absolutely necessary, that they who did the service, should appear to be in a state of personal cleanness. The Psalmist clearly indicates the meaning of the rite, and shews also, that in the spirit of a true Israelite he regarded it as not less applicable to himself than to the priests, when he said, “I will wash mine hands in innocency, so will I compass thine altar, O Lord” (xxvi. 6). And that this washing in his view had respect to an internal purification, is evident from the whole tenor of the Psalm, which speaks throughout of moral cleanness and impurity, and especially from the preceding verses, in which the Psalmist declares his separation from “the wicked,” “evil doers,” and “dissemblers,” and even entreats God to “try his reins and his heart.” So also in Ps. xxiv., he points from the symbol to its spiritual import, when he asks, “Who shall ascend into the hill of God, or who shall stand in his holy place?” And answers by saying, “He that hath clean hands and a pure heart.”

The symbol here employed is of so natural a kind, and so fitly adapted for conveying spiritual instruction to all ages of the church, that it has been to some extent retained also in the New Testament dispensation,—in the rite of baptism. For, however administered, whether by immersing, washing, or sprinkling, there can be no question that the cleansing nature of the element is the natural basis of the ordinance, and that from which it derives its appropriate character, as the initiatory service of a Christian life. Symbolically, it conveys the salutary instruction, that he who becomes Christ's, and through Christ would dedicate himself to the work and service of God, must be purified from the filth and pollution of sin; he must be regenerated and made holy. Believers are therefore described as “having their bodies washed with pure water” (Heb. x. 22, where the symbolical lau-

guage is still entirely retained), or as having undergone "the washing of regeneration," Tit. iii. 5, where the internal character of the work is distinctly intimated, and also coupled with the efficient cause in the additional expression, "the renewing of the Holy Ghost"; or again, as being "sanctified and cleansed by the washing of water, by the word" (Eph. v. 26)—by the word, namely, the truth of Christ's salvation; for this received into the heart, and cordially embraced, is internally the means of cleansing, the instrumental cause through which the spiritual sanctification is accomplished. So that he who would acceptably approach God and discharge aright the duties of his service, must first have his heart purified by faith, he must receive the light, and through the light become a partaker in the holiness of God. The unclean, those who are still living in the guilt and pollution of sin, can have no place in his kingdom, and even "their prayers are abomination to him." As Aaron had the sentence of death suspended over him, in case he should go about the ministrations of the tabernacle with unwashed hands or feet, so the services of ungodly persons, instead of procuring the blessing of God, only provoke the eyes of his glory, and prepare for them a heavier condemnation.

But the other piece of sacred furniture belonging to the fore-court, the altar of burnt-offering, had in some respects a still closer connection with the interior of the tabernacle and its holy ministrations. For, it was with live coals taken from it, that the priest constantly furnished his censer when he went in to burn incense before the Lord, and only after being himself sprinkled with blood from that altar could he go into the tabernacle and perform the service of God. On these accounts, and also because it was the one altar of sacrifice, where the people could directly meet with God and present to him their offerings, the altar of burnt-offering held a place of peculiar importance. It was directed to be made of boards of shittim-wood, covered with brass; and of this latter material also were made the several instruments attached to it—pans, shovels, flesh-hooks, &c. Hence, it is frequently called the *brazen* altar, to distinguish it from the altar of incense within the tabernacle, which, from having been overlaid with gold, is sometimes named the *golden* altar. In form, it was a square of five cubits, and about four and an half feet high, with what were called

horns, or projecting corners. Its ever-burning fire-place consisted of a moveable grate, sunk down from the top in the centre, suspended by four rings, so that the fire was at some distance from the boards of the altar, there being a space between these, and the grating of net-work, which held the fire—"hollow with boards shalt thou make it." And this hollow space is justly supposed to have been left for being filled with earth or stones, so that the brazen altar might still correspond with the description given in Ex. xx. 24, 25, "An altar of earth shalt thou make me, and if thou wilt make it of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone."¹ The reason of which is to be sought, not in any repudiation of external pomp or splendour in the divine worship, which would have placed the altar in direct contrast to many things in the tabernacle, nor in the intention of meeting certain idolatrous tendencies (as Spencer represents), but in the proper nature and design of the altar itself.

For, this altar of sacrifice was to be the grand point of meeting between God and sinful men, between God and men *as sinful*; and only by first meeting there, and entering into a state of reconciliation and peace, could they afterwards be admitted into his house, as those who had the privilege of communion and fellowship with him. The altar was in a sense God's table, at and around which, the Holy One of heaven and the guilty children of dust might come together, and transact respecting life and blessing. But as such it must be a table peculiarly of blood, the place for things killed and slaughtered (hence called זבחייה from זבח to kill or slaughter), for the way to fellowship with God, for guilty beings, could only be found through an avenue of death. And since this table must thus perpetually bear on it the blood-stained memorials and fruits of sin, what so suitable for the mate-

¹ Spencer (De Leg. L. ii. c. 6), conceives this altar to have been such only as was to be raised on extraordinary occasions, and not to apply at all to the brazen altar. Some of the Jewish writers, however, judge better: "Altare terreum est hoc ipsum æneum altare, cujus concavum terra implebatur."—Jarchi on Ex. xvii. 5; "Cavitas vero altaris terra replebatur, quo tempore castra ponebant."—Bechai in ib. And Bähr properly remarks, after Von Meyer, that this hollow space was not merely to be thus filled up with earth or stones, but that so filled, it formed the more essential and distinctive part of the materials of the altar—the boards being chiefly intended as a form or casing to hold it together. Hence, also, that the earthen matter might appear prominent, the brazen altar was to have no covering or top, like the altar of incense.

rials, of which it was to be principally formed, as the naked dust of earth, or earth's unhewn, unpolished stones, taken just as God and nature provided them? For thus the worshippers might most easily discern the appointed place of meeting to be of God's providing, and his in such a sense, that no art or device of theirs could be of any avail to fit it for the high end it was intended to serve, nay, that their workmanship, being that of sinful creatures, had rather a contrary tendency, a polluting effect. Materials directly fashioned by the hand of God were alone suitable here, and these not of the more rare and costly description, but the simple earth, made originally for man's support and nourishment, but now the witness of his sin, the drinker in of the blood of his forfeited life, the theatre and home of death.

This altar, then, being in a sense God's table, what was properly God's part, and especially what he required as the means of atonement and reconciliation for sin, fell to be presented there. Whether actually consumed or not, everything of this description had to be offered, and, as it were, served up on it. But the things which God claimed as peculiarly his own, were also consumed; and the element, which was employed for this purpose, was the flaming fire, which is the most fitting representative of a holy God—and fire, not as lighted up by the hand of man, but sent down directly from above to make it the more strikingly expressive of his nature, and more surely indicative of his acceptance of the offerings. For the fire, which fell from heaven at the first institution of the tabernacle-service, and consumed the burnt-offering and the fat (Lev. ix. 24), it was the part of the priesthood to keep perpetually burning; so that the same fire from heaven, which at first consumed, might, by being constantly preserved, never cease to consume the people's offerings, and as the people's gifts, so God's acceptance of the gifts, might have an abiding representation on the altar. "The fire upon the altar," says Vitranga rightly, though he errs respecting the altar, in making it represent God himself, "the fire upon the altar signified anything in God, and indeed what is *holy in God*—either the holy will of God, as righteous, loving excellence, delighting in every good work, and vindicating his own glory; or the Holy Spirit of God, which is in God, and from God, himself holy, and the administrator of the dispensation of holiness." And as the fire thus fitly symbolized

God, so its consumption of the offerings and carrying them upwards to the visible heavens in a flame and smoke, not less fitly symbolized their acceptance by Him. Hence, also, the name given to those sacrifices, in which the whole was consumed on the altar, *olah*, ascension, denoting their going up bodily to God. And hence also the expression, so often used of acceptable sacrifice, "of fire, a sweet-smelling savour (or, a savour of rest) for Jehovah," ascending, as it were, with a grateful odour to the God above. But the keeping of the fire perpetually alive was, no doubt, also a sign of the unceasing presentation of offerings, that ought to be ever proceeding on the altar.

3. From what has been said, we are prepared to understand, that what most of all gave to this altar its distinctive character, and rendered it available to the grand purpose of reconciliation, and fellowship between God and man, was its being on all ordinary occasions the one place for presenting before God the blood of slain victims. This was its primary use, because it respects the ground of a sinner's intercourse with God; other things were but subordinate and accessory. And the reason is given by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, when he testifies, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins," consequently no peace or fellowship with God for the sinner. It is still more fully brought out, however, in a declaration of Moses himself, the precise import and bearing of which deserves the most careful consideration. The passage is in Lev. xvii. 11, which should be rendered, not as in our version, but with Bähr: "For the soul (^{שׁוּל}) of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to atone for your souls, for the blood atones through the soul" (^{שׁוּל}). It is scarcely possible to mistake the general sense of this important passage, but its precise and definite meaning has been somewhat obscured, by not perceiving that the *soul* at the close of the verse refers back to the *soul* at the beginning, and expresses the principle or seat of life, not in him who is to be atoned for, but in the creature by which the atonement is made for him. And the full and correct import of the passage is to the following effect: "You must not eat the blood, because God has appointed it as the means of atonement for your sins. But it is the means of atonement, as the bearer of the soul. It is not, therefore, the matter of the blood that atones, but the soul or life

which resides in it ; so that the soul of the offered victim atones for the soul of the man who offers it.”¹

The ground upon which this merciful arrangement plainly proceeds, is the doomed condition of men as sinners, and the purpose of God to save them from its infliction. Their soul or life, has through sin, been forfeited to God, and, as a debt due to his justice, it should in right be rendered back again to Him who gave it. The enforcement of this claim, of course, inevitably involves the death of transgressors, according to the sentence from the very first hung over the commission of sin, denouncing its penalty to be death. But as God appears in the institution of sacrifice providing a way of escape from this deserved doom, he mercifully appoints a substitute—the soul or life of a beast, for the soul or life of the transgressor ; and as the seat of life is in the blood, so the blood of the beast, its life-blood, was given to be shed in death, and served up on the altar of God, in the room of that other higher, but guilty life, which had become due to divine justice. When this was done, when the blood of the slain victim was poured out or sprinkled upon the altar, and thereby given up to God, the sinner’s guilt was atoned (covered) ; a screen, as it were, was thrown between the eye of God and his guilt, or between his own soul and the penalty due to his transgression. In other words, a life that had not been forfeited, was accepted in the room of his own, that *was* forfeited ; and this was yielded back to him as

¹ The passage, indeed, is intended simply to provide an answer to two questions : Why they should not eat blood? viz. because the blood was appointed by God for making atonement. And, why should blood have been appointed for this purpose? viz. because the soul or life is there, and hence is most suitably taken for the soul or life of man forfeited by sin. This is also the only sense of the passage that can be grammatically justified ; for the preposition בְּ after the verb to atone (כִּפֶּה) invariably denotes that *by which* the atonement is made ; while לְ invariably the person or object *for which* is denoted by לְ , or לְפָנָיו —See Gesen. Lex. or Bähr on the passage before us. We are surprised, therefore, that Hengstenberg in his recent treatise, *Opfer der heiligen Schrift*, should adhere to the old rendering, and give nothing but his own authority for doing so. Abenezra, quoted by Bähr, had briefly indicated the right interpretation : “ Sanguis animâ, quæ sibi inest, expiat ;” also Gussetius : “ Per animam, *i. e.* vi animæ in eo sanguine constantis.” Though Bähr, however, has given the right view of this passage, he has again neutralized the benefit by the misapplication of the passage, which he has laboriously striven to make in support of his own false views of atonement. We shall throw into the form of an appendix, an examination of his grounds, and shall chiefly meet his erroneous statements by the sounder ones which have been urged by an opponent in his own country—Kurtz, in his *Mosaische Opfer*. See appendix B.

now again a life in peace and fellowship with God—a life out of death.

It is clear, however, that while in one respect the life or soul of the sacrifice was a suitable offering or atonement for that of the sinner, as being unstained by guilt, innocent; in another, it was entirely the reverse, and could not in any proper and satisfactory sense take away sin. This imperfection or inadequacy arose from the vast disproportion between the two—the one soul being that of a rational and accountable creature, free to think and act, to determine and choose for itself, the other that of an irrational creature, destitute of independent thought and moral feeling, and so incapable alike of sin or of holiness. It is, therefore, only in a negative sense that the sacrificed victim could be regarded even as innocent; for, strictly speaking, the question of guilt or innocence belongs to a higher region than that which, by the very law of its being, it was appointed to occupy. And being thus so inferior in nature, how far was it from possessing what yet the slightest reflection could easily discern to be necessary to constitute a real and valid atonement or covering for the sinner's deficiency, viz. an equivalent for his life. The life-blood, then, which God gave for this purpose upon the altar, must obviously have been but a temporary expedient; his offended holiness could not rest in that, nor could he have intended more by the appointment than the keeping up of a present testimony to the higher satisfaction, which justice demanded for the sinner's guilt, and a symbolical representation of it. Then, out of these radical defects there inevitably arose others, which still farther marked with imperfection and inadequacy the sacrifices of irrational victims. For here there was necessarily wanting that oneness of nature between the sinner and his substitute, and in the latter that consent of will to the mutual interchange of parts, which are indispensably requisite to the idea of a perfect sacrifice. Nor could the sacrifice itself—which was a still more palpable incongruity—be like the sin, for which it was offered in atonement, a voluntary and personal act; the priest and the sacrifice were of necessity divided, and the work of atonement was done, not *by* the victim in willing self-dedication, but *upon* it, all unconsciously, by the hand of another.

Such defects and imperfections inhering in the very nature of ancient sacrifice, it could not possibly have been introduced or

sanctioned by God as a satisfactory and ultimate arrangement. Nor could he have adopted it even as a temporary one, so far as to warrant the Israelitish worshipper to look for pardon and acceptance by complying with its enactments, unless there had already been provided in his eternal counsels, to be in due time manifested to the world, a real and adequate sacrifice for human guilt. Such a sacrifice, we need scarcely add, is to be found in Christ ; who is, therefore, called emphatically “ the Lamb of God ” —“ foreordained before the foundation of the world ”—and of whose precious blood, it is written, that “ it cleanseth from all sin.”

How far, however, the Jewish worshippers themselves were alive to the necessity of this alone adequate provision, and realised the certainty of its future exhibition, can only be matter of probable conjecture, or reasonable inference. As the light of the church, generally, differed at different times, and in different individuals, so undoubtedly would the apprehension of this portion of divine truth have its diversities of comparative clearness and obscurity in the Jewish mind. If there were faith only to the extent of embracing and acting upon the existing arrangements—faith to present the appointed sacrifices for sin, and to believe in humble confidence, that imperfect and defective as these manifestly were, they would still be accepted for an atonement, and that God himself would know how to supply what his own provision needed to complete its efficacy—if faith only to this extent existed, we have no reason to say it was insufficient for salvation ; it might be faith very much in the dark, but still it was faith in a revealed word of God, implicitly following the path which that word prescribed. It was the child relying on a father’s goodness, and committing itself to the guidance of a father’s wisdom, while still unable to see the end and reason of the course by which it was led.

But it was scarcely possible for thoughtful and reflective minds, for any length of time at least, to stand simply at this point. The felt imperfection and deficiency in the appointed sacrifices could not fail in such minds to connect itself with the Messiah, with whose coming there was always associated the introduction of a state of order and perfection. Some even of the Rabbinical writers speak as expressly upon this point as the New Testament itself does.¹

¹ Schœttgen (*Hor. Heb. et Tal.* ii p. 612) produces from Jewish authorities the following plain declarations : “ In the times of the Messiah all sacrifices will cease, but the

And "when the conscience of the Israelite (to use the words of Kurtz *Mos. Opfer*, p. 43, 44) was fairly awakened to the insufficiency of the blood of irrational creatures to effect a real atonement for sin, there was no other way for him to obtain satisfaction, than in the supposition that a perfect ever available sacrifice lay in the future. This supposition was the more natural to him, and must have readily suggested itself, as the Israelite, according to his constitutional temperament, was "a man of desire," and was farther stimulated and encouraged by the whole genius and tendency of his religion to look forward to the future. Besides, his entire life and history, his ancestors, his land, his people, his law, all bore a typical character, which his own spiritual tendency prompted him to search for, and which antecedent divine revelations instructed him to find....And had not Moses himself given some indication of the typical character of the whole ritual introduced by him, when he testified that the eternal archetype of it was shewn him upon the holy mount? How natural was it, moreover, to bring the heart and centre of the entire worship into connection with the promises respecting the seed of the woman and of the patriarchs, and possibly with still other elements in the earlier revelations or devout breathings? How natural to connect together the centre of his expectations with the centre of his worship—to descry a secret, though still perhaps incomprehensible connection between them, and in that to seek the explication of the sacred mystery?"

4. The directions given in the law of Moses respecting the sacrificial blood, as well before as after its being shed in death, tend

sacrifice of praise will not cease:" "When the Israelites were in the holy land, they took away all diseases and punishments from the world, through the acts of worship and the sacrifices which they performed; but now Messiah takes these away from the sons of men." One quoted by Bähr from Eisenmenger (*Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. p. 720) goes so far as to say, "that he would pour out his soul unto death, and that his blood would make atonement for the people of God."—It is right to state, however, that the value of such testimonies is greatly diminished by the multitude of directly opposite ones, which are also to be found in the Rabbinical writings. In the very next page, Schottgen has passages affirming that the day of expiation should never cease, and the mass of the Jews in our Lord's time certainly believed in the perpetuity of the law of Moses. The utmost that can be fairly deduced from the quotations noticed above is, that there were minds among them seeking relief from felt wants and deficiencies, in the expectation of that more perfect state of things, which was to be brought in by Christ.

in every respect to confirm the views already exhibited of its vicarious import. They relate chiefly to the selection of the victims—the imposition of the offerer's hands on its head—and the action with (the sprinkling of) the blood.

(1.) The choice in respect to the victims to be offered was limited to "the herd and the flocks" (oxen, sheep, and goats), and to individuals of these without any manifest blemish. Why animals from such classes alone were to be taken, was briefly, but correctly answered even by Witsius,¹ when treating of the connection between the restriction as to clean animals for food, and the appointment of the same for sacrifice upon the altar: "God wished (says he) these two to be joined together, partly that man might thereby exhibit the more clearly his gratitude to God, in offering what had been given him for the support of his own life; and partly that the substitution of the sacrifice in his stead might be rendered the more palpable. For man offering the support of his own life, appeared to offer that life itself." This last thought, we have no doubt, indicates what may be called the primary reason, and brings the selection of the victim into closest contact with the essential nature of the sacrifice. It was not permitted to offer in sacrifice human victims, because none such could be found free from guilt, and so they were utterly unfit for being presented as a substitution for sinful men. But to make the gap as small as possible between the offerer and the victim—to secure that at least the animal natures of the two should stand in the nearest relation, the offerer was obliged to select his representative from the tame domestic animals of his own property and of his own rearing, the most *human* in their natural disposition and mode of life; and not only that, but such also, as might in a certain sense be regarded as of one flesh with himself—so far homogeneous, that the flesh of the one was fit nutriment for the flesh of the other. The principle which lay at the bottom of this selection, like every other in the ancient economy, is seen rising to its perfect form and highest manifestation in Christ—who, while the eternal Son of God, and as such infinitely exalted above man, yet brought himself down to man's sphere, became literally flesh

¹ Miscel. Sac., Lib. ii. Diss. 2. § 14.

of man's flesh, and, sin alone excepted, was found in all things like to man, that he might be a suitable offering, as well as High-priest, for the heirs of his salvation.¹

It was for a reason very closely related to the one noticed, that the particular animal offered in sacrifice was to be always perfect in its kind. In the region of the animal life it was to be a fitting representative of what man should be—what his real and proper representative *must* be, in the region of the moral and spiritual life. Any palpable defect or blemish, rendering it an imperfect specimen of the natural species it belonged to, would have visibly marred the image it was intended to present of the holy beauty which was sought by God first in man, and now in man's substitute and ransom. For the reality we are again pointed by the inspired writers of the New Testament to Christ, whose blood is described as that "of a lamb without blemish, and without spot," and who is declared to have been such an High-priest as became us, because "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners."

In cases of extreme poverty, when the worshipper could not afford a proper sacrifice, the law permitted him to bring pigeons or turtle-doves, the blood of which was to be brought to the altar as that of the animal victim. That these rather than poultry are specified, the domestic fowls of modern times, arose from the manners prevalent among the ancient Israelites. These doves were, in fact, with them the tame, domesticated fowls, and in the feathered tribe corresponded to sheep and oxen among animals. No mention whatever is made of home-bred fowls or chickens in Old Testament scripture.

(2.) The second leading prescription regarding the victim, viz.

¹ The reasons often given for the choice of the victims being confined to the flock and the herd, such as that these were the more valuable, were more accessible, ever at hand, horned (emblematical of power and dignity), and such like, fall away of themselves, when the subject is viewed in its proper connection and bearings. It is, of course, quite easy to find many analogies in such respects between the victims and Christ; but they are rather beside the purpose, and tend to lead away the mind from the main idea. The view of Bähr is an ingenious and plausible modification of the notion, which represents the materials of ancient sacrifice as property-gifts; he regards oxen, sheep, and goats, as the pastoral, as bread, oil, and wine, were the agricultural products of the land—so that the things sacrificed were representatives of the people's whole property. The view is radically defective, for it omits all reference to sin, punishment, substitution, the prime elements in ancient sacrifice.

that before having its blood shed in death, the offerer should lay his hand or hands upon its head, was still more essentially connected with the great idea of sacrifice. This imposition of hands was common to all the bloody sacrifices, and is given as a general direction before each of the several kinds of them, except the trespass-offering (Lev. i. 4; iii. 2; iv. 4-15; xvi. 21; 2 Chron. xxix. 23), and was no doubt omitted in regard to it on account of its being so much of the same nature with the sin-offering, that the regulation would naturally be understood to be applicable to both. There can be no question that the Jewish writers held the necessity of the imposition of hands in all the animal sacrifices except the passover.¹ What the rite really imported would be easily determined, if the explanation were sought merely from the materials furnished by Scripture itself. There the custom, viewed generally, appears as a symbolical action, bespeaking the communication of something in the person who imposes his hands, to the person or being on whom they are imposed. Hence it was used on such occasions as the bestowal of blessing (Gen. xlviii. 13; Matt. xix. 15); and the communication of the Holy Spirit, whether to heal bodily disease (Matt. ix. 18; Mark vi. 5; Acts ix. 12-17, &c.), or to endow with supernatural gifts (Acts xix. 6), or to designate or qualify for a sacred office (Num. xxvii. 18; Acts vi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22). In all such cases there was plainly a conveyance to one who wanted from another who possessed, and the hand, the usual instrument of communication in the matter of gifts, simply denoted, when laid upon the head of the recipient, the fact of the conveyance being actually made. What, then, in the case of the bloody sacrifices did the offerer possess which did not belong to the victim? What had the one to convey to the other? Primarily and indeed always guilt. This, as we have already shewn, was the grand and fundamental distinction between the offerer and his victim. It was especially, as being the representative of him in his state of guilt and condemnation, that its blood required to be shed in death, to pay the wages of his sin.

¹ Omnibus victimis, quæ a quopiam privato offerebantur, sive ex præcepto, sive ex arbitrio offerentur, oportebat ipsum imponere manus dum vivebant adhuc, exceptis tantum primitiis, decimis, et agno paschali. Maimon. Hile. Korbanoth 3. See also Outram De Sac. L. i. c. 15; Ainsworth on Lev. i. 4; xvi. 6, 11. Magee on Atonement Note, 39.

And as God had given it to be used for such a purpose, so the offerer's laying his hands upon its head, indicated that he willingly appropriated it to the same, and made over to it as innocent the burden of guilt with which he felt himself to be charged. Besides this, however, other things in the offerer might also be symbolically transferred to the sacrifice, according to the more special design and object of the sacrifice. As his substitute, presented to God in his room and stead, it might be made to embody and express whatever feelings toward God had a place in his bosom—not merely convictions of sin, and desires of forgiveness, but also such feelings as gratitude for benefits received, or humble confidence in the divine mercy and loving-kindness. And when the law entered with its more complete sacrificial arrangements, appointing sin and trespass-offerings, as a distinct species of sacrifice, there can be no doubt, that in these would more especially be represented the sense of guilt on the part of the offerer, while in the peace or thank-offerings, it would be the other class of feelings, those of gratitude or trust, which were more particularly expressed. But still not to the exclusion of the other. In whatever circumstances, and with whatever special design man may approach God, he must come as a sinner, conscious of his unworthiness and his guilt. Nor, if he comprehends aright the relation in which he naturally stands to God, will anything tend more readily to awaken in his bosom this humble and contrite feeling, than a sensible participation of the mercies of God; for he will regard them as tokens of divine goodness, of which his sinfulness has made him altogether unworthy. So that the nearer God may have come to him in the riches of his grace, the more will he always be inclined to say with Jacob: "I am not worthy of all the mercies and the truth which thou hast shewn unto thy servant;" or with the Psalmist: "Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him? Or the son of man, that thou visitest him?" It was, therefore, of necessity that there should have been even in such offerings a sense of guilt and unworthiness on the part of the worshipper, and hence the stress laid on *all* the animal sacrifices under the law, on the shedding and sprinkling of the blood, a peculiarity quite unknown to heathenism. Even in the thank-offerings, the atoning property of the blood was kept prominently in view.

It is impossible, then, we conceive, to separate in any case the imposition of hands on the head of the victim from the expression and conveyance of guilt ; because the worshipper could never approach God in any other character than that of a sinner, consequently in no other way than through the shedding of blood. The specific service the blood had to render in all the sacrifices, was to be an atonement for the sinner's guilt upon the altar ; and in reference to that part of the victim—always the most essential part—the imposition of the offerer's hands was the expression of his desire to find deliverance through that blood from his burden of iniquity, and acceptance with God. In those offerings especially—such as sin and trespass-offerings—in which the feeling of sin was peculiarly prominent in the sinner's bosom, the outward ceremony would naturally be used with more of this respect to the imputation of guilt ; the whole desire of the offerer would concentrate itself here. And in perfect accordance with what has been said, we learn from Jewish sources, that the imposition of hands was always accompanied with confession of sin, but this varying, as to the particular form it assumed, according to the nature of the sacrifice presented. And in the only explanation which Moses himself has given of the meaning of the rite, namely as connected with the services of the day of atonement, it is represented as being accompanied not only with confession of sin, but also with the sin's conveyance to the body of the victim : “ Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat.*”¹

¹ Lev. xvi. 21. The Jewish authorities referred to may be seen in Outram, L. i. c. 15, § 10, 11 ; Ainsworth on Lev. i. 4 ; Magee, Note 39. Upon the sin-offering the offerer confessed the iniquity of sin, upon the trespass-offering the iniquity of trespass, upon the burnt-offering the iniquity of doing what he should not have done, and not doing what he ought, &c. Outram gives several forms of confession, of which we select merely the one for a private individual, when confessing with his hands on his sin-offering : “ I beseech thee, O Lord, I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have rebelled, I have done so and so (mentioning the particular transgression) ; but now I repent, and let this victim be my expiation.” So closely was imposition of hands associated in Jewish minds with confession of sins, that it passed with them for a maxim, “ where there is no confession of sins there is no imposition of hands ;” and they also held it equally certain, that the design of this imposition of hands “ was to remove the sins from the individual

The principle involved in this transaction is equally applicable to New Testament times, and, stripped of its external form, is simply this, that the atonement of Jesus becomes available to the salvation of the sinner, only when he comes to it with heartfelt convictions of sin, and with mingled sorrow and confidence disburdens himself there of the whole accumulation of his guilt. Repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ, must grow and work together like twin sisters, in the experience of his soul. And assuredly, if there be no genuine sense of sin, shewing itself in a readiness to make full confession of the shortcomings and transgressions in which it has appeared, and an earnest desire to turn from it and be delivered from its just condemnation through the blood of sprinkling, as there is then no real preparedness of heart to receive, so there can be no actual participation in, the benefits of Christ's redemption.

(3.) The only remaining direction of a general kind, applicable to all the sacrifices of blood, was the action with the blood after it was shed. It was to be sprinkled—on ordinary occasions, upon the altar round about, but on the day of atonement, also upon the mercy-seat in the inner, and the altar of incense in the outer apartment of the Tabernacle. For the present, we confine our attention to the ordinary use of it. "This sprinkling of the blood," Outram remarks, "was by much the most sacred part of the entire service, since it was that by which the life and soul of the victim were considered to be given to God as supreme Lord of life and death; for what was placed upon the altar of God was supposed, according to the religion of the Old Testament, to be rendered to him."¹ But in what relation did the blood stand, when thus rendered to God? Was it as still charged with the guilt of the offerer, and underlying the sentence of God's righteous condemnation? So the language just quoted would seem to import. But

and transfer them to the animal" (Outram, L. i. c. xv. 8; xxii. 5). The circumstance of the hearers of blasphemy being appointed to lay their hands on the head of the blasphemer before he was stoned (Lev. xxiv. 14), is no contradiction to what has been said, but rather a confirmation; for till the guilt was punished, it was looked upon as belonging to the congregation at large (comp. Jos. vii., 2 Sam. xxi), and by this rite it was devolved entirely upon himself, that he might bear the punishment.—Bähr finds nothing in the rite but a symbolical declaration, that the victim was the offerer's own property, and that he was ready to devote it to death.

¹ De Sac. L. i. c. 16, § 4.

how then shall we meet the objection, which naturally arises on such a supposition, that a polluted thing was laid upon the altar of God? And how could the blood with propriety be regarded as so holy when sprinkled on the altar, that it sanctified whatever it touched? We present the following as in our judgment the true representation of the matter: By the offerer's bringing his victim, and with imposition of hands confessing over it his sins, it became symbolically a personation of sin, and hence must forthwith bear the penalty of sin—death. When this was done, the offerer was himself free alike from sin and from its penalty. But was the transaction by which this was effected owned by God? And was the offerer again restored, as one possessed of pure and blessed life, to the favour and fellowship of God? It was to testify of these things—the most important in the whole transaction—that the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar took place. Having with his own hands executed the deserved penalty on the victim, the offerer gave the blood to the priest, as God's representative. But that blood had already paid, in death, the penalty of sin, and was no longer laden with guilt and pollution. The justice of God was (symbolically) satisfied concerning it; and by the hands of his own representative, he could with perfect consistence receive it, as a pure and spotless thing, the very image of his own holiness, upon his table or altar. In being received there, however, it still represented the blood or soul of the offerer, who thus saw himself, through the action with the blood of his victim, re-established in communion with God, and solemnly recognized as possessing life, holy and blessed, as it is in God himself. His soul had come again into peaceful and approved contact with God, and was thence admitted to participate of a divine nature.¹

How exactly this representation accords with what is written of Christ, must be obvious on the slightest reflection. When dying as man's substitute and representative, he appeared laden with the

¹ This representation, which is so perfectly simple, that it cannot be regarded as having lain beyond the reach of the commonest worshipper, completely disposes of the objection urged by Sykes, Priestley, and others, that if the guilt of the offerer was laid upon the victim, men must have offered to God what was polluted. The objection was taken up, but in its main point, rather evaded than satisfactorily answered, by Magee in his 39th Note. Kurtz has come the nearest to a right explanation of this part of the sacrificial idea (*Mos. Opfer.* p. 80-85), but spoils its simplicity and truthfulness by considering the altar as in a sense representative of the offerer.

guilt of innumerable sins, as one who, though he knew no sin, yet had "been made sin," bearing in his person the concentrated mass of his people's pollution; and on this account he received upon his head the curse due to sin, and sank under the stroke of death, as an outcast from heaven. But the moment he gave up the ghost, an end was made of sin. With the pouring out of his soul unto death, its guilt and curse were exhausted for all who should be heirs of salvation. Godhead was glorified concerning it with a perfect glory; and when the life laid down in ignominy and shame, was again resumed in honour and triumph, and this, or the blood in which it resided, was presented before the Father in the heavenly places, it bespoke his people's acceptance in him to the possession of the life out of death, to nearest fellowship with God, and the perpetual enjoyment of the divine favour; so that they are even said to "sit with him in heavenly places," and to have "their life hid with him in God." Hence also the peculiar force and significancy of the expression in 1 Pet. i. 2, so generally misunderstood, "unto," not only obedience, but also "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus;" which literally means the participation of his risen, divine, heavenly life—a life that is full of the favour and purity and blessedness of God. It is there spoken of as the end and consummation of a Christian calling. Not as if such a calling could really be entered upon without an interest in Christ's risen life; but there must be a growing participation; and the spiritual life of a child of God approaches to perfection, according as he becomes "complete in Jesus," and is through him "filled into the fulness of God."

But we need not enter more at length here into the elucidation of the truth, as it will again occur, especially in connection with the service of the day of atonement; and for a fuller illustration of the passage just alluded to, we refer to the former volume (p. 182. sq.) The sprinkling was there viewed with a more special reference to the service at the ratification of the covenant, when the blood was partly sprinkled on the altar, and partly on the people, to denote more distinctly their participation and fellowship in what belonged to it. In the case of ordinary sacrifices, however, this was not done; nor could it be said to be necessary to complete the symbolical action. The offerer, after having brought his victim to the altar, laid his hands on its head with confession

of sin, and having solemnly given it up for his expiation, could have no difficulty in realizing his connection with the blood, and his interest in its future application. The difficulty rather stood in his realizing God's acceptance of such blood in his behalf, and on its account restoring him to life and blessing. Now, however, the difficulty is entirely on the other side, and stands in realizing, not the acceptance of Christ's soul or blood by the Father, but our personal interest in it—in apprehending ourselves to be really and truly represented in the pouring out of his soul for sin, and its presentation for acceptance and blessing in the heavenly places. Hence, while respect is also had to the former in the New Testament, yet in the practical application of the doctrine of redemption, the latter is commonly made more prominent—viz. “the sprinkling of the believer's heart,” or “the purging of his conscience” with the blood of Jesus. This is done, however, simply out of respect to the difficulty referred to; and stripped of their symbolical colouring, the essential and radical idea in all such representations is, God's owning in the behalf of his people, and receiving into fellowship with himself, as pure and holy, that life which has borne in death the curse and penalty of sin; so that its new, undying life becomes their life, and its inheritance of blessing their inheritance. This owning and receiving on the part of God, is what is meant by Christ's sprinkling with his blood the heavenly places. And to realize on solid grounds the fact of its having been done *for us*, is on our part to come to the blood of sprinkling, and enter into the participation of its pure and blessed life.

SECTION FIFTH.

THE MOST HOLY PLACE, WITH ITS FURNITURE, AND THE GREAT ANNUAL SERVICE CONNECTED WITH IT, ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

THOUGH the tabernacle, as a whole, was God's house or dwelling-place among his people, yet the innermost of its two apartments alone was appropriated for his peculiar place of abode—the seat and throne of his kingdom. It was there, in that hallowed recess, where the awful symbol of his presence had its settled abode, and from which, as from his very presence-chamber, the High-priest was to receive the communications of his grace and will, to be through him made known to the people. The things, therefore, which concern it, most immediately and directly respect God; we have here in symbol, the revelation of what God himself is in relation to his people.

I. The apartment itself was a perfect cube of ten cubits, thus bearing on all its dimensions the symbol of completeness—an image of the all-perfect character of the Being who condescended to occupy it as the region of his manifested presence and glory. The ark of the covenant, with the tables of the testimony, and the mercy-seat, with the two cherubims at each end, formed originally and properly its whole furniture. The ark or chest, which was simply made as a depository for holding the two tables of the law, the tables of the covenant, was formed of boards of shittim-wood, overlaid with gold, two and a half cubits long, by one and a half broad, with a crown, or raised and ornamented border of gold around the top. This latter it had in common with the table of shew-bread, and the altar of incense; so that it could not have been meant to denote anything connected with the peculiar design of the ark, and in all the cases, indeed, it seems merely to

have been added for the purpose of forming a suitable and becoming ornament.

The mercy-seat, as it is called in our version, was a piece of solid gold, of precisely the same dimensions in length and breadth as the ark, and ordered to be placed above, on the top of it, probably so as to go within the crown of gold, and fit closely in with it. The Hebrew name is *caporeth*, or covering; but not exactly in the sense of being a mere lid or covering for the ark of the covenant. This might rather be said to suggest than to express the real meaning of the term as used in the present connection. For the *caporeth* is never mentioned as precisely the lid of the ark, or as simply designed to cover and conceal what lay within. It rather appears as occupying a place of its own; though connected with and attached to the ark, yet by no means a mere appendage to it; and hence, both in the descriptions and the enumerations given of the holy things in the tabernacle, it is mentioned separately, (Ex. xxv. 17, xxvi. 34, xxxv. 12, xxxix. 35, xl. 20). It sometimes even appears to stand more prominently out than the ark itself, and to have been peculiarly that for which the Most Holy Place was set apart—as in Lev. xvi. 2, where this Place is described by its being “within the veil before the mercy-seat,” and in 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, where it is simply designated “the house of the *caporeth*,” or mercy-seat.

What then was the precise object and design of this portion of the sacred furniture? It was for a covering, indeed, but for that only in the sense of atonement. The word is never used for a covering in the ordinary sense; wherever it occurs, it is always as the name of this one article—a name which it derived from being peculiarly and pre-eminently the place, where covering or atonement was made for the sins of the people. There was here, therefore, in the very name, an indication of the real meaning of the symbol, as the kind of covering expressed by it, is covering only in the spiritual sense—atonement. Hence the rendering of the LXX. was made with the evident design of bringing out this: *ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα* (a propitiatory covering). Yet, while the name properly conveys this meaning, it was not given without some respect also to the external position of the article in question, which was immediately above and upon, not to the ark merely, but the tables of the testimony within: “And thou shalt put the mercy-

seat upon the ark of the testimony" (Ex. xxvi. 34) ; "the mercy-seat that is over the testimony" (xxx. 6) ; "that the cloud of incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony" (Lev. xvi. 13). The tables of the covenant, as formerly explained (p. 104), contained God's testimony, not simply for holiness in general, but for holiness as opposed to his people's transgressions—his testimony against them on account of sin ; and as they could not stand before it when thundered with terrific majesty in their ears from Mount Sinai, neither could they spiritually stand before the accusations it was constantly raising against them in the presence of God, in the Most Holy Place. A covering was, therefore, needed for them between it, on the one hand, and God on the other—but an *atonement*-covering. A mere external covering would not do ; for the searching, all-seeing eye of Jehovah was there, from which nothing outward can conceal, and the law itself also, from which the covering was needed, is spiritual, reaching to the inmost thoughts of the heart, as well as to every action of the life. That the mercy-seat stood over the testimony, and shut it out from the bodily eye, was a kind of shadow of the provision required ; but still even under that dispensation, no more than the shadow, and fitted, not properly to be, but only to suggest what was really required—viz. a covering in the sense of an atonement. The covering required must be a propitiatory, a place on which the holy eye of God may ever see the blood of reconciliation ; and the Most Holy Place, as designated from it, and deriving thence its most essential characteristic, might fitly be called "the house of the propitiatory," or the "atonement-house" (1 Chron. xxviii. 11).

At the two ends of this mercy-seat, and rising, as it were, out of it—a part of the same piece, and constantly adhering to it—there were two cherubim, made of beaten gold, with outstretched wings over-arching the mercy-seat, and looking inwards towards each other, and towards the mercy-seat, with an appearance of holy wonder and veneration. The symbolical import of these ideal figures has already been fully investigated,¹ and nothing more is necessary here than a brief indication of their design as connected with the mercy-seat. Placed as they were with their outstretched

¹ Vol. I. B. ii. s. 3.

wings rising aloft and overshadowing the mercy-seat, they gave to this the appearance of a glorious seat or throne, suited for the occupation or residence of God in the symbolic cloud as the King of Israel. That forms of created beings were made to surround this throne of Deity, and impart to it an appearance of becoming grandeur and majesty, this was simply an outward embodiment of the fact, that God ever makes himself known as the God of the living, of whom, not only have countless myriads been formed by his hand, but attendant hosts also continually minister around him and celebrate his glory. And that the particular forms here used were compound figures, representations of ideal beings, and beings whose component parts consisted of the highest kinds of life on earth in its different spheres—man first and chiefly, and with him the ox, the lion, and the eagle—this again, denoted that the forms and manifestations of creature-life, among whom and for whom God there revealed himself, were not of heaven, but of earth—chiefly indeed, and pre-eminently man, who when the work of redemption is complete, and he is fitted to dwell in the most excellent glory of the divine presence, shall be invested with the glories of what is still to him but an ideal perfection, and be made possessor of a yet higher nature, and stand in yet nearer fellowship with God, than he did in the paradise that was lost. But these new hopes of fallen humanity all centre in the work of reconciliation and love, shadowed forth upon the mercy-seat ; thither, therefore, must the faces of these ideal heirs of salvation ever look, and with outstretched wing hang around the glorious scene, as in wondering expectation of the things now proceeding in connection with it, and hereafter to be revealed. So that God sitting between the cherubim, is God revealing himself as on a throne of grace, in mingled majesty and love, for the recovery of his fallen family on earth, and their final elevation to the highest region of life, and blessedness, and glory.—This explanation applies substantially to the curtains, which formed the whole interior of the tabernacle, and which were throughout inwrought with figures of cherubim. Not the throne merely, but the entire dwelling of God, was in the midst of these representatives (as we conceive them to have chiefly been) of redeemed and glorified humanity.

The articles now described formed properly the whole furniture of the Most Holy Place, being all that was required to give a

suitable representation of the character and purposes of God in relation to his people. But three other things were afterwards added, and placed, as it is said, before the Lord, or before the testimony—the pot of manna, the rod of Aaron, and the entire book of the law. These were all lodged there in the immediate presence of God, as in a safe and appropriate depositary—lodged partly as memorials of the past, and partly as signs and witnesses for the future. The manna testified of God's power and willingness to give food for the life of his people even in the most destitute circumstances—to sustain life in parched lands—and was ready to witness against them in all times coming, if they should distrust his goodness or repair to other sources for life and blessing. The rod of Aaron, which in itself was as dry and lifeless as the rods of the other tribes, but which “brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds,” through the quickening and sovereign agency of God, testified of the appointment of Aaron to the priestly office—of him alone, but not, as some wickedly affirmed, to the detriment and death of the congregation, but rather for their life and fruitfulness in all that is pure and good. It was, therefore, well fitted to serve as a witness in every age against those who might turn aside from God's appointed channel of grace, and choose to themselves other modes of access to him, than such as he had himself chosen and ordained. Finally, the book of the law, which contained all the statutes and ordinances, the precepts and judgments, the threatenings and promises, delivered by the hand of Moses, and which it was the part of the priests and Levites to teach continually, and on the seventh or sabbatical year to read throughout in the audience of the people, this being put beside, or in the ark of the covenant, testified God's care to provide his people with a full revelation of his will, and stood there as a perpetual witness before God against his ministering servants, in case they should prove unfaithful to their charge (Deut. xxxi. 26.)—But these things were rather accessories to the furniture of the Most Holy Place, than essential parts of it. The ark of the covenant, with the tables of testimony within, and the mercy-seat with the cherubim of glory above, upon the testimony, these alone were the sacred things, for the reception of which that interior Sanctuary was properly reserved and set apart. With these only, then, we have here to do.

II. Now, considered in themselves; and without respect to any service connected with them, what a clear and striking representation did they present to the Israelite of the spiritual and holy nature of God ! How much was here to be learned of his perfections and character ! It is true, as certain writers have been at pains to tell us, there was nothing absolutely original in the plan of a sacred building or structure, having an inner sanctuary, with a chest or shrine of the Deity deposited there, in whose honour the house was erected. But what then ? Does this general similarity account for what we have here, or place the one upon a level with the other ? Far from it. For what do we perceive, when we look into those shrines that stood in the innermost recesses, more especially of Egyptian temples ? Some paltry or hideous idol, formed after the similitude of a beast, sacredly preserved and worshipped as a representative of the Deity, and this only as a substitute for the living creatures themselves, which appear to have been kept in the larger temples. " Living animals (says Jablonsky, *Pan. Proll.* p. 86), such as were worshipped for images or statues, and treated with all divine honours, were to be found only in temples solemnly consecrated to the gods, and indeed only in certain of these. But effigies of these animals were to be seen in many other temples through the whole of Egypt, and are still discovered among their ruins." And another says : " Some of the sacred boats or arks contained the emblems of life and stability, which, when the veil was drawn aside, were partially seen ; and others presented the sacred beetle of the sun, overshadowed by the wings of two figures of the goddess Thmei or Truth."¹ But what, on the other hand do we perceive, when we turn from these instruments of a debasing and abominable superstition, to look into the innermost sanctuary of the tabernacle ? No outward similitude of any kind, that might be taken for an emblem or an image of God ; nor any representation of him, but what was to be found in that revelation of law, which unfolds what he is in himself, by disclosing what he requires

¹ Wilkinson, v. p. 265, last ed. We should doubt if in any case emblems of life and stability formed the only, or even the chief figures, since beast-worship was the leading characteristic of Egyptian idolatry. But even in external form, none of the arks referred to, present any proper resemblance of that of God. They always possess the ship or boat form, with something like an altar in the midst ; they have nothing corresponding to the mercy-seat ; and the chief purpose for which they appear to have been used, was to preserve an image of the creature that was worshipped as emblematical of the god.

of moral and religious duty from his people—a law which the more reason is enlightened, the more does it consent to as “holy, just, and good,” and which, therefore, reveals a God infinitely worthy of the adoration and love of his creatures. We here discern an immeasurable gulph between the religion of Moses and that of the nations of heathen antiquity; and also see, how the Israelites were taught, in the most central arrangements of their worship, the necessity of serving God in spirit, and of rendering all their worship subservient to the cultivation of the great principles of holiness and truth.

But considered farther, with reference to the professed object and design of the whole, what correct and elevated views were here presented of the fellowship between God and men? Had God only appeared as represented by the law of perfect holiness, who then could stand before him? Or if without law, as a God of mercy and compassion, stooping to hold converse with sinful men, and receiving them back to his favour, what security should have been taken for guarding the rectitude of his government? But here, with the ark and the mercy-seat together, we behold Him in perfect adaptation to the circumstances of men, appearing at once as the just God and the Saviour—keeping in his innermost sanctuary, nay, placing underneath his throne, as the very foundation on which it rested, the revelation of his pure and holy law, and, at the same time, providing for the transgressions of his people a covering of mercy, that they might still draw near to him and live. It is already in principle the mystery of redemption—the manifestation of a God himself just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly—of a God, whose throne is alike the dwelling-place of righteousness and mercy—righteousness upholding the claims of law, mercy stretching out the sceptre of grace to the penitent: Both, even then, continually exercised, but rising at length to unspeakably their grandest display on the cross of Calvary, where justice is seen pouring out on the Lamb of God the wrath to the uttermost against sin, and mercy providing at an infinite cost a way for sinners into the Holiest of all.

Since the ark of the covenant and the mercy-seat contained such a complete revelation of what God was in himself and toward his people, we can easily understand why the symbol of his presence, the overshadowing cloud of glory, should have been immediately

in connection with that, and why the life and soul of the whole Jewish theocracy should have been contemplated as residing there. *There* peculiarly was "the place of the Lord's throne, and the place of the soles of his feet, where he had his dwelling among the children of Israel," (Ex. xliii. 7). Hence, it was called emphatically, "the glory of the Lord," and on their possession or loss of this sacred treasure, the people of God felt that all, which properly constituted their glory, depended—(Ps. lxxviii. 61 ; 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22.) It was before this, as containing the symbol of a present God, that they came to worship (Josh. vii. 6 ; 2 Chron. v. 6) ; and from a passage in the life of David (2 Sam. xv. 32), where it is said according to the proper rendering : "And it came to pass that when David was come to the top (of the Mount of Olives, where the last look could be obtained of the sacred abode), where it is wont to do homage to God," it would appear, that as soon as they came in sight of the place of the ark, or obtained their last view of it, they were in the habit of prostrating themselves in adoration. Happy, if they had but sufficiently remembered that Jehovah, being in himself, and even there representing himself, as a spiritual and holy God, while he condescended to make the ark his resting-place, and to connect with it the symbol of his glory (Lev. xvi. 2 ; "for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat)," yet could not so indissolubly bind his presence and his glory to it, as if the one might not be separated from the other ! By terrible things in righteousness the Israelites were once and again made to learn this salutary lesson, when rather than appear their patron and guardian in sin, the Lord shewed that he would, in a manner, leave his throne empty, and give up his glory into the enemy's hands. The cloud of glory was still but a symbol, which must disappear when the glorious Being who resided in it could no longer righteously manifest his goodness ; and the ark itself, and the tabernacle that contained it, became but a common thing. Nor is it otherwise now, when men hold the truth of God's salvation in unrighteousness. The partial extent to which they exercise belief in the truth utterly fails to secure for them any real tokens of his regard. Even while they handle the symbols of his presence, he is to them an absent God ; and when the hour of trial comes, they find themselves forsaken and desolate.¹

¹ The tendency above referred to, of regarding God's presence and glory as insepar-

III. But it is only when viewed in connection with the service of the day of atonement—the one day on which the Most Holy Place was entered by the High-priest, that we can fully perceive either the symbolical import or the typical bearing of its sacred furniture. We, therefore, notice this service here, in connection with the place, which it chiefly respected, rather than postpone the consideration of it to the time when it was performed. That not only no Israelite, but that no consecrated priest, that not the High-priest himself, was permitted at all times to enter within the veil, that even he was limited in the exercise of this high privilege to one day in the year, “lest he should die;” this most impressively bespoke the difficulties which stood in the way of a sinner’s approach to the righteous God, and how imperfectly these could be removed by the ministrations of the earthly tabernacle, and the blood of slain beasts. It indicated, that the holiness which reigned in the presence of God, required on the part of men a work of righteousness to lay open the way of access, such as could not then be brought in, and that while the church should gladly avail itself of the temporary and imperfect means of reconciliation then placed within her reach, she should be ever looking forward to a brighter period, when every obstruction being removed, her members would be able to go with freedom into the presence of God, and with open face behold the manifestations of his glory.

1. In considering more closely the service in question, we have first to notice the leading character of the day’s solemnities. The day was to be “a Sabbath of rest” (Lev. xvi. 31), yet, not like other Sabbaths, a day of repose and satisfaction, but a day on which “they should afflict their souls.” This striking peculiarity in the mode of its observance, arose from the nature of the service peculiar to it; it was the day of atonement, or, literally, of atone-

ably and necessarily, instead of only symbolically and morally, connected with the ark and mercy-seat, was a fruit of the carnality of the people, and gave different manifestations of itself according to the circumstances and delusions of particular times. It was partly to shew them the folly of such a mode of thinking, to shew them that there was nothing peculiar to the ark but what might be found anywhere, that the prophet Jeremiah, ch. iii. 16, made promise of a time, when it should no longer be said, “The ark of the covenant of the Lord, neither would it be remembered, &c. for Jerusalem would be the throne of the Lord;” *i. e.* all Jerusalem, the whole city of God, would be as sacred and holy as the ark once was.—Compare Zech. xiv. 20, 21.

ments (Lev. xxiii. 27), not a day so much for one act of atonement, as for atonement in general, for the whole work of propitiation. The main part of the Mosaic worship consisted in the presentation of sacrifice, as the guilt of sin was perpetually calling for new acts of purification ; but on this one day the idea of atonement by sacrifice rose to its highest expression, and became concentrated in one grand comprehensive series of actions. In suitable correspondence to this design, the sense of sin was in like manner to be deepened to its utmost intensity in the national mind, and exhibited in appropriate forms of penitential grief. It was a day of humiliation and godly sorrow working unto repentance. But why all this peculiarly on the day of entrance into the Most Holy Place ? Was it not a good and joyful occasion for men personally, or through their representative, to be admitted into such near fellowship with God ? Doubtless it was ; but that dwelling-place of God is a region of absolute holiness ; the fiery law is there, which reveals the purity of heaven, and is ready to flame forth in indignation and wrath against all unrighteousness of men. And so the day of nearest approach to God, as it is on his part the day of atonement, must be on the part of his people a day for the remembrance of sin, and for the exercise of suitable feelings of sorrow and abasement concerning it. For to the penitent alone is there forgiveness ; not simply to men as sinners, but to men convinced of sin, and humbled on account of it ; to men viewing sin as God views it, and glorifying his justice in its deserved condemnation and doom. " If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive them ;" but without confession there can be no forgiveness, no atonement, as we have not yet entered into God's mind and judgment respecting sin.¹

2. But if the remembrance of iniquity which was made on this day, gave to it a character of depression and gloom, the purpose and design of its services could not fail to render it in the result a season of blessed rest and consolation. For atonement was then

¹ The day itself was the tenth of the seventh month, usually happening toward the middle or end of October, about the close of the busier occupations of the year, and before the commencement of winter. It was not expressly ordered to be kept as a fast (fasting as an ordinance nowhere occurs in the Pentateuch), but it would naturally be so observed for the most part, and indeed latterly, was familiarly named, The Fast.—Acts xxvii. 9.

made for all sin and transgression. It was virtually implied, that the acts of expiation which were ever taking place throughout the year, but imperfectly satisfied for the iniquities of the people, since the people were still kept outwardly at some distance from the immediate dwelling-place of God, and could not even through their consecrated head be allowed to go within the veil. So that when a service was instituted with the view of giving a representation of complete admission to God's presence and fellowship, the mass of sin must again be brought into consideration, that it might be blotted out by a more perfect atonement. And not only so, but as God's dwelling and the instruments of his worship were ever contracting defilement, from "remaining among men in the midst of their uncleanness," so these also required to be annually purified on this day by the more perfect atonement, which was then made in the presence of God. Not that these things were in themselves capable of contracting guilt, but were so viewed in respect to the sins of the people, which were ever proceeding around them, and in a sense, in the very midst of them. For the structure and arrangements of the tabernacle proceeded on the idea, that the people there dwelt (symbolically) with God, as God with them; and consequently the sins of the people in all their families and habitations were viewed as coming in to the sanctuary, and defiling by their pollutions the holy things that were there. No separate offering, therefore, was presented for these holy things, but they were sprinkled with the blood that was shed for the sins of the land, as these properly were what defiled the sanctuary. And that no remnant of guilt, or of its effects, might appear to be left behind, the atonement was to be made and accepted for sin in all its bearings—for the High-priest and his house, and for the people in all their families, for the tabernacle and its sacred utensils.

3. In this service, then, which contained the quintessence of all sacrifice, and gave the most exact representation the ancient worship could afford of the all-perfect atonement of Christ, there was every thing in the manner of accomplishing it to mark its singular importance and solemnity. The High-priest alone had here to transact with God; and as the representative of the entire spiritual community, to go with their sins as well as his own, into the immediate presence of God. After the usual morning oblations, at which, if he had personally officiated, he had to strip himself of

the rich and beautiful garments with which he was wont to be attired, as unsuitable for the services of a day which so peculiarly stained the glory of all flesh ; and after having washed himself, he put on the plain garments, which, from the stuff (linen), and from the colour (white), were denominated “garments of holiness” (v. 4,) and were peculiarly appropriated for the work of this day. Then, when thus prepared, he had first of all to take a bullock for a sin-offering for himself and his house, that is, the whole sacerdotal family, and go with the blood of this offering within the veil. Yet not with this alone, but also it is said with a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord (viz. the altar of incense, though the coals for it must have been got from the altar of burnt-offering), and to this he was to apply handfuls of incense, that there might arise a cloud of fragrant odours as he entered the Most Holy Place—the emblem of acceptable prayer. The meaning was, that with all the pains he had taken to purify himself, and with the blood, too, of atonement in his hand, he must still go as a suppliant into that region of holiness, as one who had no right to demand admittance, but humbly imploring it from the hand of a gracious God. Having thus entered within, he had to sprinkle with the blood upon the mercy-seat, and again before the mercy-seat seven times—seven times the number of the oath or the covenant—and a double act of atonement, the one apparently having respect to the persons interested, and the other to the apartments and furniture of the sanctuary, as defiled by their defilements.

When this more personal act of expiation was completed, that for the sins of the people commenced. Two goats were presented at the door of the tabernacle, which, though two, are still expressly named one victim (v. 5. “two kids of the goats for a sin-offering”), so that the sacrifice consisted of two merely from the natural impossibility of otherwise giving a full representation of what was to be done ; the one being designed more especially to exhibit the means, the other the effect of the atonement. And this circumstance, that the two goats were properly but one sacrifice, and also that they were together presented by the high-priest before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle (v. 7), indisputably stamped the sacrifice as the Lord’s. Nor was the same obscurely intimated in the action which there took place respecting them, viz. the cast-

ing of lots upon them ; for this was wont to be done only with what peculiarly belonged to God, and for the purpose of ascertaining what might be his mind in the matter. The point to be determined respecting the two, was not, which God might claim for himself, and which might belong to another, but simply to what particular destination he appointed the two parts of a sacrifice, which was wholly and exclusively his own. And, indeed, the destination itself of each as thus determined could not be materially different ; it could not have been an entirely diverse or heterogeneous destination, since it appeared in itself an immaterial thing, which should take the one place and which the other, and was only to be determined by the casting of the lot.¹

Of these lots, it is said, that the one was to be for the Lord, and the other for the scape-goat, as in our version, but literally for Azazel. The one on which the Lord's lot fell was forthwith to be slain as a sin-offering for the sins and transgressions of the people ; and with its blood, as with that of the bullock previously, the high-priest again entered the Most Holy Place, and sprinkled, as before, the mercy-seat first, and then before it seven times ; making atonement for the guilt of the congregation, both as regarded their persons and the furniture of the tabernacle. After which, having come out from the Most Holy into the Holy Place, he sprinkled the altar of incense seven times with the blood both of the bullock and of the goat, "to cleanse and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel," (v. 19, comp. with Ex. xxx. 10.)

It was now, after the completion of the atonement by blood, that the high-priest confessed over the live goat still standing at the door of the tabernacle, "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions," and thereafter sent him away, laden with his awful burden, by a fit person into the wilderness, into a land of separation, where no man dwelt. It is expressly said, v. 22, that this was done with the goat that he might bear all their iniquities thither ; but these iniquities, as already atoned by the blood of the other goat—the other half, so to speak, of the sacrifice—for as on the one hand without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin by the law of Moses, so on the other

¹ See Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p. 678.

hand, where blood *was* duly shed, in the way and manner the law required, remission followed as a matter of course. The action with this second goat, therefore, is by no means to be dissevered from the action with the first ; but rather to be regarded as the continuation of the latter, and its proper complement. Hence the second or live goat is represented as standing at the door of the tabernacle, v. 10, while atonement was being made with the blood of the first, as being himself interested in the work that was proceeding, and in a sense the object of it. He was presented there—not to have atonement made with him, as is unhappily expressed in our version—but to be covered upon, atoned for or absolved. And it is only after this process of atonement and absolution is accomplished that the high-priest returns to him, and lays on him the now atoned for iniquities, that he might carry them away into a desert place. So that the part he has to do in the transaction, is simply to bear them off and bury them out of sight, as things concerning which the justice of God had been satisfied, which were no more to be taken into account, fit tenants of a land of separation and forgetfulness.¹

Thus from the circumstances of the transaction, when correctly put together and carefully considered, we can have no difficulty in ascertaining the main object and intent of the action with the live goat—without determining anything as to the exact import of the term Azazel.² We shall give in the Appendix a brief summary of

¹ That the sense here given to the expression in v. 10 respecting the live goat, עָלָיו לִכְפֹּר to cover upon him, or to make atonement for him, is the correct and only well-grounded one, may now be regarded as conclusively established. Bochart, Witsius, and many other eminent divines, did certainly render it as in our version, to make atonement with him. But Cocceius already stated that he could find no case in which the expression was used, “excepting for the persons in whose behalf the expiation was made, or of the sacred utensils,” when spoken of as expurgated. Bähr expressly affirms, that the means of atonement is never marked by עָלָי, but always by כֹּ, and that the former regularly marks the object of the atonement (Symbolik ii. p. 683.) Heugstenberg also concurs in this view, Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 165, who further remarks, that by the live goat being said to be atoned for, “he was thereby identified with the first, and the nature of the dead was transferred to the living ; so that the two goats stand here in a relation entirely similar to that of the two birds in the purification of the leper, of which the one let go was first dipped in the blood of the one slain.”—When all this is duly considered, it will at once be seen how futile are the objections which many, and latterly Bähr, have raised from the case of the live goat against the necessity of death for atonement.

² See Appendix C.

the views which have been entertained regarding it, and state the one which we are inclined to adopt. But for the right interpretation of this part of the service, nothing material, we conceive, depends on it. What took place with the live goat was merely intended to unfold, and render palpably evident to the bodily eye, the effect of the great work of atonement. The atonement itself was made in secret, while the high-priest alone was in the sanctuary, and yet, as all in a manner depended on its success, it was of the utmost importance that there should be a visible transaction, like that of the dismissal of the scape-goat, embodying in a sensible form the results of the service. Nor is it of any moment what became of the goat after being conducted into the wilderness. It was enough that he was led into the region of drought and desolation, where, as a matter of course, he should never more be seen or heard of. With such a destination, he was obviously as much a doomed victim as the one whose life-blood had already been shed and brought within the veil ; he went where “ all death lives and all life dies ;” and so exhibited a most striking image of the everlasting oblivion into which the sins of God’s people are thrown, when once they are covered with the blood of an acceptable atonement.

The remaining parts of the service were as follows : The high-priest put off the plain linen garments in which, as alone appropriate for such a service, the whole of it had been performed, and laid them up in the sanctuary till the next day of atonement should come round. Then having washed himself with water—which he had to do at the beginning and end of every religious service—and having put on his usual garments, he came forth and offered a burnt-offering for himself, and another for the people—by the blood of which, atonement was again made for sin (implying that sin mingled itself even in these holiest services), as by the action with the other parts there was expressed anew the dedication of their persons and services to the Lord. The fat of the sin-offering also—as in cases of sin-offering generally—the high-priest burnt upon the altar ; while the bodies of the victims were—as in the case of sin-offerings generally for the congregation, or the high-priest as its head, Lev. iv. 1–21—carried without the camp into a clean place and burned there. This could not be in consequence of any defilement properly inhering in them—for then it should

not have been provided that the burning was to be done in a *clean* place, and, besides, after the atonement had been made and accepted with the blood, the blood itself became most holy, and as a necessary consequence, the flesh also must have been holy. Hence in ordinary cases of sin-offerings it was to be eaten only by holy persons, by the priests; and that the flesh in this case, and others of a like nature, was to be wholly burnt, and not eaten, arose from the priesthood themselves, and as representatives of the congregation being concerned in the sacrifice; so that it was fit the whole should be consumed by fire. Finally, the person employed in burning them, as also the person who had conducted the scape-goat into the wilderness, were on their return to the congregation to wash themselves—as being relatively impure; not in the strict and proper sense, for if they had really contracted guilt, an atonement would have had to be offered for them; and the relative impurity could only have arisen, from their having been engaged in handling what, though in itself not unclean, but rather the reverse, yet in its meaning and design carried a respect to the sins of the people.¹

IV. It is the less necessary that we should enlarge on the correspondence between this most important service of the Old Testament dispensation, and the work of Christ under the New, since it is the part of the Mosaic ritual, which of all others has received the most explicit application from the pen of inspiration. It is to this that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews most especially and frequently refers when pointing to Christ for the great realities, which were darkly revealed under the ancient shadows. He tells us, that through the flesh of Christ, given unto death for the sins of the world, a new and living way has been provided into the Holiest, as through a veil, no longer concealing and excluding from the presence of God, but opening to receive every penitent transgressor—of which, indeed, the literal rending of the veil at Christ's death (Matth. xxvii. 51) was a matter-of-fact announcement;—that through the blood of Jesus we can enter not only

¹ The full explanation and establishment of what is necessarily stated with much brevity here, both regarding the burnt offerings, and the burning of the sin-offerings, and the washings of men employed, must be reserved till we come to the different kinds of sacrifice.

with safety, but even with boldness into the region of God's manifested presence—that this arises from Christ himself having gone with his own blood into the heavens, that is, presenting himself there as the perfected Redeemer of his people, who had borne for them the curse of sin, and for ever satisfied the justice of God concerning it ;—and that the sacrifice, by which all this has been accomplished, being that of one infinitely precious, is attended with none of the imperfections belonging to the Old Testament service, but is adequate to meet the necessities of a guilty conscience, and to present the sinner, soul and body, with acceptance before God (Heb. ix. x.) This is the substance of the information given us respecting the things of Christ's kingdom, in so far as these were foreshadowed by the services of the day of atonement ; in which, it will be observed, our attention is chiefly drawn to a correspondence in the two cases of essential relations and ideas. We find no countenance given to the merely outward and superficial resemblances, which have so often been arbitrarily, and sometimes even with palpable incorrectness, drawn by Christian writers ; such as that in the high-priest's putting on and again laying aside the white linen garments, was typified Christ's assuming, and then, when his work on earth was finished, renouncing the likeness of *sinful* flesh ; in the two goats, his twofold nature ; in their being taken from the congregation, his being purchased with the public money ; in the slain goat a dying, in the live goat a risen Saviour ; or, in the former Christ, in the latter Barrabbas, or, as the older Cocceians more commonly have it, the Jewish people sent into the desert of the wide world, with God's curse on them. This last notion has been revived by Professor Bush in the *Biblical Repository* for July 1842, and in his notes on Leviticus, who gravely states, that the live goat made an atonement simply by being let go into the desert, and that the Jewish people made propitiation for their sins by being judicially subjected to the wrath of Heaven ! In which case, of course, the region of the lost should be pre-eminently the place for propitiations ; for there certainly in the fullest sense the wrath falls on men to the uttermost !

We inevitably run into such erroneous and puerile conceits, or move at least amid shifting uncertainties, so long as we isolate the

different parts of the outward transaction, and seek a distinct and separate meaning in each of them singly, apart from the grand idea and relations with which they are connected. But rising above this defective and arbitrary mode of interpretation, fixing our view on the real and essential elements in the respective cases, we then find all that is required to satisfy the just conditions of type and antitype, as well as much to confirm and establish the hearts of believers in the faith. For what do we not behold? On the one side, the high-priest, the head and representative of a visible community, all stricken with the sense of sin, going under the felt load of innumerable transgressions into the awful presence of Jehovah, as connected with the outward symbols of an earthly sanctuary; permitted to stand there in peace and safety, because entering with the incense of devout supplication and the blood of an acceptable sacrifice; and in token that all sin was forgiven, and all defilement purged away, sending the mighty mass of atoned guilt into the waste howling wilderness, to remain for ever buried and forgotten. On the other side, corresponding to this, we behold Christ, the head and representative of a spiritual and invisible church, charging himself with all their iniquities, and, having poured out his soul unto death for them, thereafter ascending into the presence of the Father, as with his own life-blood shed in their behalf; so that they also, sprinkled with this blood, or spiritually interested in this work of atonement and intercession, can now personally draw near with boldness to the throne of grace, having their sins blotted out from the book of God's remembrance, and shall in due time be admitted to dwell amid the bright effulgence of his most excellent glory. Does faith stagger, while it contemplates so free an absolution, ventures on so near an approach, or cherishes so elevating a prospect? Or, having once apprehended, is it apt to lose the clearness of its view and the firmness of its grasp, from having to do with things which lie so much within the territory of the unseen and eternal? Let it throw itself back upon the plain and palpable transactions of the type, which on this account also are written for our learning and comfortable assurance. And if truly conscious of the burden of sin, and turning from it with unfeigned sorrow to that Lamb of God, who has been set forth as a propitiation to take away its guilt, then, with what

satisfaction Israel of old beheld the high-priest, when the work of reconciliation was accomplished, send their iniquities away into a land of forgetfulness, and with what joy they then rejoiced, let us assure ourselves that the same also, and on higher grounds, may be ours, and that in those outward transactions of the shadow, we have presented to our view in vivid outline the great and blessed realities of the substance.

SECTION SIXTH.

THE HOLY PLACE—THE ALTAR OF INCENSE—THE TABLE OF
SHEW-BREAD—THE CANDLESTICK.

As the Most Holy Place was peculiarly for God in the Tent of Meeting, so the Holy Place was peculiarly for the people, who occupied it by representation in the priesthood. Into this apartment the priests went every day to accomplish the service of God, having freedom at all times to go in and out. It might, therefore, be justly regarded as their proper habitation ; and the furniture and services belonging to it would with equal propriety express their relation to God, as those of the Most Holy Place expressed the relation of God to them. We shall find this fully borne out by a consideration of the several particulars. The first of these is—

THE ALTAR OF INCENSE.

Its position appears to have been the nearest to the vail, which formed the entrance into the Most Holy Place, and indeed immediately in front of it. “Thou shalt put it before the vail, that is, by the ark of the testimony ; before the mercy-seat, that is over the testimony, where I will meet with thee” (Ex. xxx. 6). The meaning of the direction obviously is, that this altar was to be placed directly before the vail, in close relationship to it, and in the middle of the apartment ; and this for the reason, that being so placed, it might the more readily be viewed as standing in a kind of juxtaposition to the mercy-seat. Hence also in Lev. xvi. 18, it is called “the altar that is before the Lord,” being as near to his throne as the daily service to be performed on it admitted. In regard to its form and structure, it was to be a cubit square, and

two cubits in height; made of shittim-wood overlaid with gold, with jutting points or corners called horns, and a crown, or ornamented edge of gold. That it was an altar, determines it to have been for sacrifice of some sort, or offerings to God; but not offerings of blood, which had to do with sin and atonement. The only altar for these was without the tabernacle, where the worshipper must have been reconciled and purified, before he could obtain admission as a guest into the Lord's house. And when admitted there, as his intercourse with God must now be of a closer kind, being the intercourse of one who had already come into a friendly relation to God, so the kind of sacrifice presented on this altar we naturally expect to form a symbolical expression of the innermost desires and feelings of a devout spirit. On this account, also, it probably was, that of all the articles belonging to the Holy Place, the altar of incense alone was sprinkled with blood on the day of atonement; as being the highest in order of them all, and the one that held a peculiarly intimate relation to the mercy-seat; hence most fitly taken to represent them all.

The incense, for the presentation of which before the Lord this altar was erected, was a composition formed of four kinds of sweet spices, stacte, onycha, galbanum, and pure frankincense—of which the latter alone is known with certainty. The composition was made, we have every reason to think, with the view of yielding the most fragrant and refreshing odour. The people were expressly forbidden to use it on any ordinary occasion, and the priests restricted to it alone for burning on the altar—that there might be associated with it a feeling of the deepest sacredness. It possessed the threefold characteristic of “salted (not tempered together, as first in the LXX., and from that transferred into our version, Ex. xxx. 35; see Ainsworth there, and Bähr, i. p. 424), pure, holy;” that is, having in it a mixture of salt, the symbol of uncorruptness, but otherwise unmixed or unadulterated, and set apart from a common to a sacred use. And the ordinance connected with it was, that when the officiating priest went in to light the lamps in the evening, and again when he dressed the lamps in the morning, he was to place on this golden altar a pot of the prescribed incense with live coals taken from the altar without, that there might be “a perpetual incense” ascending before the Lord in this apartment of his house.

The meaning of the symbol is indicated with sufficient plainness even in Old Testament scripture, and in perfect accordance with what might have been conjectured from the nature and position of the altar. Thus the Psalmist says, "Let my prayer be set before thee, as the incense" (cxli. 2), literally, Let my prayer, incense, be set in order before thee, implying that prayer was in the reality, what incense was in the symbol. The action also in Isaiah vi. 3, 4, where the voice of adoration is immediately followed by the filling of the temple with smoke, proceeds on the same ground; as by the smoke we are doubtless to understand the smoke of the incense, the only thing of that description to be seen there, and which, then, as an appropriate symbol, accompanied the ascription of praise by the seraphim. Passing to New Testament scripture, though still only to that portion which refers to Old Testament times, we find the people without engaged in prayer, while Zacharias was offering incense within (Luke i. 10), doing in word, what he was doing in action. And in the book of Revelation the prayers of saints are once and again identified with the offering of incense on the golden altar before the throne (Rev. v. 8; viii. 3, 4).¹

That the devotional exercises, the prayers of God's believing people, should have been symbolized by this offering of incense, may possibly wear in the view of many a somewhat arbitrary appearance. Yet there is a very natural connection between the two, which persons accustomed to the rites of a symbolical worship could have had no difficulty in apprehending. For what are the odours of plants and flowers, but the sweet breath, in a manner, which they exhale? The outgoing, the efforescence of that fragrant life that is in them? And taking prayer in its largest sense, which we certainly ought to do here, as consisting in the exercise of all devout feeling and spiritual desire toward God—in the due celebration of his adorable perfections—in thanksgiving for the

¹ In the last of these passages the incense is said to have been offered "*with* the prayers of saints," whence some have inferred that the two were different, that the incense symbolized only Christ's intercession, and not the prayers of saints (See, for example, Symington on Atonement and Intercession of Christ, p. 364). But then in ch. v. 8, the incense is expressly called "the prayers of saints." And it is the usual style of the Apocalypse to couple the symbol with the reality, as, besides the instance before us, the golden candlesticks and the churches, the white linen and the righteousness of the saints, &c.

rich and innumerable mercies received from his bountiful hand—in humble supplications for his favour and blessing—if we understand prayer in this wide and comprehensive sense, how can it be more suitably regarded than as the breath of the divine life in the soul? What is it but the pouring out before God, and to God, of the best and holiest affections of the renewed heart? What but the soul's going forth to unite itself in appropriate actings with the great centre of Being, and to devote its own inmost being to him? Of such spiritual sacrifices, it is saying little, that the presentation of them at fitting times is a homage due to God from his redeemed offspring. The permission to offer them is, on their part, a high and ennobling privilege, in the exercise of which they rise to sit in heavenly places with Christ, and occupy the lofty position of princes with God. Nor when done in sincerity and truth, can it ever fail, on God's part, to meet with the warmest reception and most favourable regard. In such breathings of childlike confidence and holy affection, he takes especial delight; and the fragrant odours arising from incense of the sweetest spices, could not be more grateful to the bodily sense, than are the pure and fervent aspirations of a devout spirit to the mind of a gracious God.

But it ought ever to be considered what kind of devotions it is that rise with such acceptance to the sanctuary above. That the altar of incense stood before the Lord, under his immediate eye, intimates that the adorations and prayers he regards, must be no formal service, in which the lip rather than the heart is employed; but a felt approach to the presence of the living God, and a real transaction between the soul and Him. That this altar, from its very position, stood in a close relation to the mercy-seat or propitiatory, on the one hand, and by its character and the live coals that ever burned in its golden vials, stood in an equally close relation to the altar of burnt-offering, on the other, tells us, that all acceptable prayer must have its foundation in the manifested grace of a redeeming God, and draw its breath of life, in a manner, from that blessed work of propitiation, which he has himself provided for the sinful. And since it was ordained that a "perpetual incense before the Lord" should be ever ascending from the altar—since injunctions so strict were given for having the earthly

sanctuary made peculiarly and constantly to bear the character of a house of prayer, most culpably deaf must they be to the voice of instruction that issues from it, if they do not hear enforced on all who belong to the spiritual temple of an elect church, such a lesson as this—Pray without ceasing ; the spirit of devotion is the very element of your being ; your beginning and ending are alike here ; all, from first to last, must be sanctified by prayer ; and if this be neglected, neither can you fitly be named a house of God, nor have you any ground to expect the blessing of Heaven on your means of grace and opportunities of usefulness.

THE TABLE OF SHEW-BREAD.

THIS table was made of the same materials as the other articles in the tabernacle—of the same height as the ark of the covenant, but half a cubit narrower in breadth—and as the table was for a service of food, a provision-board, it had connected with it what, in our version, are called “dishes, spoons, covers, and bowls,” the usual accompaniments of such a table among men. It is proper to notice, however, that these names scarcely suggest what is understood to have been the exact nature and design of the articles in question. What on such a table could be the use of spoons or covers, it is impossible to understand. The rendering, accordingly, of these parts of the description may with good reason be inferred to be erroneous, and in regard to the latter of them, most certainly was so. Of the four subsidiary articles mentioned (Ex. xxv. 29), the first (קַעֲוִיִּים) were probably a sort of platters for carrying the bread to and from the table, on which also it might stand there ; the second (כַּפֵּי from כַּף the hollow of the hand), some sort of hollow cups, or vessels, possibly for the frankincense (the LXX. have expressly *censers*) ; the third and the fourth (קַעֲוִיִּים) and (מִנְקִיִּים), with which the latter in Ex. xxv. 29, and the former, in Numb. iv. 7, have coupled with them the additional expression “to pour withal,” (not “to cover withal,” as in our version), were most likely the vessels appropriated for the wine, and are probably rendered with substantial correctness by the LXX. by words corresponding to “bowls and cups.” That we cannot fix more definitely the form and use of these inferior utensils, is of little moment ; as we can have no doubt, that they

were simply such as were required for the provisions and services connected with the table itself.

Turning, therefore, to the provisions here mentioned, the main part, we find, consisted of twelve cakes, which, when placed on the table, were formed into two rows or piles. The twelve, the signature of the covenant-people, evidently bore respect to the twelve tribes of Israel, and implied, that in the symbolical design of these cakes, the whole covenant-people were equally interested and called to take a part. These cakes, as a whole, were called the "shew-bread," literally "bread of faces or presence." The meaning of the expression may, without difficulty, be gathered from Ex. xxv. 30, where the Lord himself names it "shew-bread before me always;" it was to be continually in his presence, or exhibited before his face, and was hence appropriately designated "shew-bread," or "bread of presence." The table was never to be without it; and on the return of every Sabbath morning, the old materials were to be withdrawn, and a new supply furnished. Why precisely on the Sabbath, will be explained, when we come to speak of the *Moadeem* or stated feast-days.

It has been thought, that something more must have been intended by the peculiar designation "bread of presence," than we have now mentioned, since, if this were all, the altar of incense and the golden candlestick might, with equal propriety, have been called the altar and candlestick of presence—which, however, they never are (*Bähr*). But a special reason can easily be discovered for the peculiar appropriation of this epithet to the bread, viz. to prevent the Israelites from supposing, what they might otherwise, perhaps, in their carnality, have done, that this bread was, like bread in general, simply for being eaten; to instruct them, on the contrary, that it was rather for being seen and looked on with complacency by the holy and ever-watchful eye of God. They would thus more easily rise from the natural to the spiritual use, from the symbol to the reality. The bread, no doubt, *was* eaten by the officiating priests each Sabbath; not on the table, however, but only after having been removed from it, and simply because, being most holy, it might not be turned to a profane use, but must be consumed by God's familiars in his own house. As connected with the table, its design was served by being exhibited and seen, for the well-pleased satisfaction and favourable regard of a right-

eous God ; so that it is not possible to conceive a fitter designation than the one given to it, of shew-bread, or bread of presence.¹

But in what character precisely was this bread laid upon the table ? We are furnished with the answer in Lev. xxiv. 8, where it is described as “an offering from the children of Israel by a perpetual covenant ;” a portion, therefore, of their substance, and consecrated to the honour of God. It was, consequently, a kind of sacrifice ; and, as the altar of God was in a sense his table, so this table of his in turn possessed somewhat of the nature of an altar ;² the provision laid on it had the character of an offering. Hence, also, there was placed upon the top of each of the two rows a vessel with pure frankincense (Lev. xxiv. 7), which was manifestly designed to connect the offering on the table with the offering on the altar of incense, and to shew, that they not only possessed the same general character of offerings presented by the people to the Lord, but also that there existed a near internal relationship between the two : “Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row for the bread, for a memorial (a calling to remembrance, viz. of the covenant-people before the Lord), an offering of fire unto the Lord.” Now, the offering of incense was simply, as we have seen, an embodied prayer ; and the placing of a vessel of incense upon this bread was like sending it up to God on the wings of devotion. It implied, that the spiritual offering symbolized by the bread, was to be ever presented with supplication, and only when so presented could it meet with the favour and blessing of heaven. Thus hallowed and thus presented, the bread became a most sacred thing, and could only be eaten by the priests in the sanctuary : “for it is most holy (a holy of holies) unto him, of the offerings of the Lord, made by fire by a perpetual statute.”

It is also to be borne in mind, with the view of helping us to

¹ We have no intention of entering into any express refutation of Bähr's view—who understands by the shew-bread, that (spiritual) bread by which one comes to see the face of God, the proper food and nourishment of a divine life—as we conceive it to be entirely arbitrary, and utterly at variance with what is said of it, as an offering, and an offering from the people to God. Bush, however, follows closely in the footsteps of Bähr, and might, we think, in this as in some other cases, have given his master a little more specific acknowledgment of his obligations to him. As for Baumgarten's opinion, we scarcely know what he precisely means.

² Sicut enim ara mensa Dei, ita mensa Dei ara quædam erat, araque plane vicem præstabat. —Outram, De Sac. L. I. c. 8, § 7.

understand the symbolical import of the shew-bread, that there was not only frankincense set upon each row, but also a vessel or possibly two vessels of wine placed beside them. This is not, indeed, stated in so many words, but is clearly implied in the mention made of bowls or vessels for "pouring out withal," or making libation with them to God. Wine is well known to have been the kind of drink constantly used for the purpose; and the simple mention of such vessels, for such a purpose, must have been perfectly sufficient to indicate to the priesthood what was meant by this part of the provisions. Still, from the table deriving its name from the bread placed on it, and from the bread alone being expressly noticed, we are certainly entitled to regard it as by much the more important of the two, the main part of the provisions, and the wine only as a kind of accessory, or fitting accompaniment. But these two, bread or corn and wine, were always regarded in the ancient world as the primary and leading articles of bodily nourishment, and were most commonly put as the representatives of the whole means of life (Gen. xxvii. 28, 37; Judges xix. 19; Ps. iv. 7; Hag. ii. 12; Luke vii. 33; xxii. 19, 20, &c.) And from the two being placed together on this table, with precisely such a prominence to the bread as properly belongs to it in the field of nature, it is impossible to doubt, that something must have been symbolized here, which bore a respect to the divine life, similar to what these did in the natural.

But the things presented here, we have already stated, possessed the character of an offering to the Lord: if spiritual food was symbolized, it must have been so in respect to him; and how, it will naturally be asked, could his people present any thing to him that might with propriety be regarded as ministering nourishment or support to the all-sufficient God? Not certainly as if he needed anything from their hands, or could derive actual refreshment from whatever they might be capable of yielding in his service. But we must remember the relation in which Israel stood to God, and he again to Israel—their relation first in respect to what was visible and outward, and then we shall have no difficulty in perceiving, how fitly what was here presented in that lower region, shadowed forth what was due in respect to things spiritual and divine. The children of the covenant were sojourners with God, in that land which was peculiarly his, and on which his blessing, if

they only remained faithful to the covenant, was perpetually to rest. On their part, they were to obtain bread and wine in abundance for the comfortable support of their bodily natures, as the fruit of their labours in the cultivated fields and luxuriant vineyards of Canaan. And even in this point of view, they owed a return of tribute-money to God, as the absolute Lord and sovereign of the land, in token of their holding all in fief of him, and deriving their increase from the riches of his bounty. This they were called to render in their tithes, and first-fruits, and similar offerings. But as the table of shew-bread was part of the furniture of God's house, where all bore a religious and moral character, it is with the spiritual alone we have here to do, and with the outward and natural only as the symbol of that. The children of the covenant had most of all a spiritual relation to fill, as the occupiers of God's territory and the guests of his house ; they had a spiritual work to do for the interests of God's kingdom, and in the doing of which they had also from his hand the promise of fruitfulness and blessing. How was such a result to appear ? What here corresponds to the bread and wine obtained in the province of nature ? What but an increase of righteousness, for which the spiritual mind ever hungers and thirsts, and which, the more it grows in the divine life, the more must it desire to have realized. But as the divine life exists in its perfection with God, he must also supremely desire the same ; he must seek for a becoming return of righteousness from his people, as if it were refreshment to his nature ; and with such a spiritual increase, they must never leave his house unfurnished. Had they been the subjects of an earthly king, it would have been their part to keep his table replenished with provisions of another kind, suited to the wants of a present life. But since God is a Spirit, infinitely exalted above the pressure of outward necessities, and seeking what is good only from his love to the interests of righteousness, it is their fruitful obedience to his commandments, their abounding in whatsoever things are just, honest, pure, lovely, and of good report, on which, as the very end of all the privileges he had conferred, his soul ever was, as it still is, supremely set. These are the provisions which, as labourers in his kingdom, they must be ever serving on his table ; and on these his eye ever rests with holy satisfaction, when sent up with the incense of true devotion from the humble and pious worshipper.

Hence in Ps. l. 13, 14, he repudiates the idea of his requiring such gross materials of refreshment as the blood and flesh of slain victims, while he earnestly desires, v. 14, 23, the spiritual gifts of a pure and holy life. Sacrifices of any kind were acceptable only in so far as they expressed the feelings of a righteous soul.

If the whole community of Israel had entered aright into the mind of God, they would, in the ordinance of the shew-bread, have seen this to be their calling, and laboured with holy diligence to fulfil it. It was in reality done only by the spiritual portion of the seed, who too frequently formed but a small portion of the whole. To such, however, Cornelius is plainly represented as belonging, even though he had not yet been admitted to an outward standing in the community of the faithful, when, in the language of this ordinance, it is said of him, that "his alms-deeds and his prayers came up for a memorial before God"—for a memorial, or bringing to remembrance of the worshipper for his good, the very description given of the object of the shew-bread and its attendant incense. For God never calls his people to serve him for nought. He seeks from them the fruits of righteousness, only that he may send them in return larger recompenses of blessing. And every act of grace, or deed of righteousness that proceeds from their hands, does for them in the upper sanctuary the part of a remembrancer, putting their Heavenly Father, as it were, in mind of his promises of love and kindness. What encouragement to be faithful ! How does God strew the path of obedience with allurements to the practice of every good and pious work ! And in proportion to his anxiety in securing these happy results of righteousness and blessing, so must be his disappointment and indignation, when scenes of an opposite kind present themselves to his view. Of this a striking representation was given by the symbolical action of our Lord, in blasting the fig-tree, on which he went to seek fruit, but found none (Matth. xxi. 19), and in the parables of the barren fig-tree in the vineyard, and of the wicked husbandman to whom a certain householder let out his vineyard (Luke xiii. 6-9 ; Matth. xxi. 33-43 ; comp. also Isa. v. 1-7).

It is scarcely necessary to add, that the lesson taught in the ordinance of the shew-bread speaks with a still louder voice to the Christian, than it could possibly do to the Jewish church ; as the gifts of grace conferred now are much larger than formerly, and

the revenue of glory which God justly expects to accrue from them, should also be proportionally increased. We accordingly find in New Testament Scripture the strongest calls addressed to believers, urging them to fruitfulness in all well-doing; and every doctrine, as well as every privilege of grace, is plied to the purpose of inciting them to run the way of God's commandments. So much is this the characteristic of the Gospel, that its highest demands on the obedience of men come always in connection with its fullest exhibitions of grace to their souls; and nothing can be more certain, than that, according as they become subject to its influence, they are effectually taught to "deny themselves to all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in the world."¹

THE GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.

This is the only remaining article of sacred furniture in the Holy Place of the Tabernacle. Its position was to be on the south side, opposite the table of shew-bread, the altar of incense being in the middle, and somewhat nearer to the veil of separation. It was not so properly a candlestick, as a stand or support for lamps. It was ordered to be made with one erect stem in the centre, and on each side three branches rising out of the main stem in regular gradation, and each having at the top a place fitted for holding a lamp, on the same level and of the same construction with the one in the centre. The material was of solid gold, and of a talent in weight; so that it must have been one of the costliest articles in the tabernacle.

In the description given of the candlestick, nothing is said of its height, or of the proportions of its several parts. Both in the stem, however, and in the branches, there was to be a threefold ornament wrought into the structure, called "bowls, knops, and flowers." The bowls or cups appear to have been fashioned so as to present some resemblance to the almond-tree (Ex. xxv. 33), as, in the passage referred to, they are called "almond-shaped cups."

¹ The provisions of the table of shew-bread were evidently of the same nature, and possessed the same moral import with the meat and drink offerings; and some additional remarks will naturally fall to be made when we treat of these, which may be regarded as supplementary to what has been written here.

The knobs or globes are supposed by some, in particular by Bähr, to have been pomegranates ; but the word used in the original is not that elsewhere employed for pomegranates, and there is no valid ground for holding such to be the meaning of the term here. That they were some sort of rounded figures is all we can certainly know of them. And from the relative position of the three, according to which the flowers come last, it seems out of place to find in the candlestick a representation of a fruit-bearing tree; with a trunk, and on each side three flowering and fruitful branches. We should at least proceed on fanciful ground, did we make anything depend for the interpretation of the symbol on this notion ; and for aught we can see to the contrary, the figures in question may have been designed simply as graceful and appropriate ornaments. Its being of solid gold, denoted the excellency of that which it symbolized ; and the light it diffused being sevenfold (seven being the signature of the holy covenant, hence of sanctification, holiness) denoted that all was of an essentially pure and sacred character.

In the lamps on this candlestick Aaron was ordered to burn pure olive oil ; but only, it would seem, during the night. For in Ex. xxvii. 21, he is commanded to cause the lamps to burn "from evening to morning before the Lord;" and in ch. xxx. 7, 8, his "dressing the lamps in the morning," is set in opposition to his "lighting them in the evening." The same order is again repeated in Lev. xxiv. 3. And in accordance with this, we read in 1 Sam. iii. 3, of the Lord's appearing to Samuel "before the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord"—which can only mean early in the morning, before sunrise. Josephus, indeed, mentions, that the custom was to keep the lamps burning night and day ; but this only shews, that the arrangement in the second temple varied from the original constitution. The candlestick appears to have been designed in its immediate use to form a substitute for the natural light of the sun ; and it must hence have been intended that the outer vail should be drawn up at break of day, as in ordinary tents, so far as to give light sufficient for any ministrations that might require to be performed in the sanctuary.

This symbol has received such repeated illustration in other parts of Scripture, that there is scarcely any room for difference of opinion as to its fundamental import and main idea. In the

first chapter of Revelation, the image occurs in its original form, "the seven golden lamps" (not candlesticks, as in our version, but the seven lamps on the one candlestick), which are explained to mean "the seven churches." These churches, however, not as of themselves, but as replenished by the Spirit of God, and full of holy light and energy; and hence in the 4th chapter of the same book we again meet with seven lamps of fire before the throne of God, which are said to be "the seven spirits of God"—either the One Spirit of God in his varieties of holy and spiritual working, or seven presiding spirits of light fitted by that Spirit for the ministrations referred to in the heavenly vision. Throughout Scripture—as we have already seen in ch. iii. of this part—oil is uniformly taken for a symbol of the Holy Spirit. It is so, not less with respect to its light-giving property, as to its qualities for anointing and refreshment; and hence the prophet Zechariah, ch. iv. represents the exercise of the Spirit's gracious and victorious energy in behalf of the church, under the image of two olive trees pouring oil into the golden candlestick—the church being manifestly imaged in the candlestick, and the Spirit's assisting grace in the perpetual current of oil with which it was supplied. Clearly, therefore, what we see in the candlestick of the tabernacle is the church's relation to God as the possessor and reflector of the holy light that is in him, which she is privileged to receive, and bound to give forth so constantly, that where she is there must be no darkness, though all around may be enveloped in the shades of night. She must ever appear to be dwelling in a region of light, and act under God as the bountiful dispenser of it to others.

But what exactly is meant by darkness and light in this relation? Darkness, in a moral sense, is the element of error, of corruption and sin; the rulers of darkness are the heads and instigators of all malice and wickedness; and the works of darkness are the manifold fruits of unrighteous principle. Light, on the other hand, is the element of moral rectitude, of sound knowledge or truth in the understanding, and holiness in the heart and conduct. The children of light are those who, through the influence of the Spirit of truth, have been brought to love and practise the principles of righteousness; and the deeds of light are such as may stand the examination and receive the approval of God.

When of God himself it is said, that "he is light, and in him is no darkness at all," it implies, not only that he is possessed of all spiritual discernment so as to be able to distinguish with unerring precision between the evil and the good, but also that this good itself, in all its principles of truth, and forms of manifestation, alone bears sway in his character and government. And so, when the Apostle writes to believers (Eph. v. 8), "Ye are light in the Lord, walk as children of the light," he immediately adds, with the view at once of explaining and of enforcing the statement, "for the fruit of the Spirit (or of light, as it is now generally read) is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth;" these are the signs and manifestations of spiritual light, and only in so far as your life is distinguished by these, do you prove and verify your title to the name of children of light.

The ordinance, therefore, of the golden candlestick, with its sevenfold light, told the church of that age, tells the church, indeed, of every age, that she must bear the image of God, by walking in the light of his truth, and shining forth in the garments of righteousness for the instruction and edification of others. Our Lord virtually gives a voice to the ordinance, when he says to his disciples: "Ye are the light of the world; let your light so shine before men, that they seeing your good works may glorify your Father in heaven." Or it may be heard in the stirring address of Isaiah, pointing to Christian times: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord has arisen upon thee." As much as to say, Now, since the true light has come, since He has come who is himself the life and the light of men, it is day with thee; therefore, not a time to slumber and take thy rest, but to be up and doing in thy Master's service. Self-pleasing inaction, or unhallowed enjoyment, is no privilege in God's kingdom. He has brought to thy hand the richest talents of grace, not that they may be wrapt up in a napkin, but faithfully laid out for the glory of him who conferred them. Arise, therefore, and shine; reflect the light which has shone from heaven upon thy soul; give forth true and living manifestations of that glory, which the Spirit of glory has poured around thy spiritual condition: And as that light is all holy light, and that glory peculiarly consists in the revelation of God's pure and blessed character in the face of Jesus Christ, this high calling is fulfilled only in so far as the life and

the power of godliness manifest themselves in thy walk and conduct.

In the preceding discussions regarding the Holy Place, we have avoided referring to the interpretations of the older typologists, or the views of commentators. It would have taken us too long to expose every error, and it seemed better to notice none till we had unfolded what we conceive to be the correct view of the several parts. And this, we trust, has appeared so natural, and is so fully borne out by the language of Scripture, that the contrary opinions may be allowed to remain unnoticed. Indeed, nothing more is needed than to look at them, to see how uncertain and unsatisfactory they commonly are, even to those who propound them. Bähr, indeed, speaks dogmatically enough, although his fundamental error regarding the general design of the tabernacle, formerly referred to, carried him here also for the most part in the wrong direction. But take, for example, what Scott says in his commentary regarding the shew-bread, which may be paralleled by many similar explanations: "They (the cakes) might typify Christ, as the bread of life and the continual food of the souls of his people, having offered himself unto God for them; or they may denote the services of believers, presented before God through him and accepted for his sake; or, the whole may mean the communion betwixt our reconciled Father and his adopted children in Christ Jesus, who, as it were, feast at the same table," &c. What can any one make of this diversity of meaning? When the mind is treated to so many and such different notions under one symbol, it necessarily takes in none distinctly; they become merely so many perhaps's; and instead of multiplying the benefit and instruction of the ordinance, we only deprive it of any certain sound whatever.—The ground of most of the erroneous interpretations on the furniture and services of the Holy Place, lay in understanding all directly and peculiarly of Christ. And this, again, arose from not perceiving that the Tabernacle was intended to symbolise what concerned the people as dwelling with God, not less than what concerned God's dwelling with them. It is not to be forgotten, however, that viewing him as the Head, the Pattern,

and Forerunner of his people, everything that was here shadowed forth concerning them, is true in a higher and pre-eminent sense of him. His prayers, his work of righteousness, and his exhibition of the light of divine truth and holiness, take precedence of all that in a like kind ever has been, or ever may be, presented by the members of his body. But as Christ's whole undertaking is something *sui generis*, and chiefly to be viewed as the means of salvation and access to Heaven, provided by God for his people,—as under this view it was already symbolized in the furniture and services of the Most Holy Place, it is better and more agreeable to the design of the tabernacle, to consider the things belonging to the Holy Place as directly referring only to the works and services of Christ's people.

SECTION SEVENTH.

THE OFFERINGS AND SERVICES CONNECTED WITH THE BRAZEN ALTAR IN THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE—SIN-OFFERINGS—TRESPASS-OFFERINGS—BURNT-OFFERINGS—PEACE OR THANK-OFFERINGS—MEAT-OFFERINGS.

WE found it necessary, before entering on the consideration of the particular apartments and furniture of the tabernacle, to examine the relation in which the whole stood to the altar of burnt-offering in the court, and this we found it impossible properly to explain, without investigating the fundamental idea of sacrifice, as expressed in the more important acts and operations connected with it. What was said there, must here be presupposed and kept in recollection. It was common to all sacrifices of blood that there was in them, on the part of the offerer, a remembrance of sin, and, on the part of God, a provision made for his reconciliation and pardon. The death of the animal represented the desert due to him for sin, the wages of which is death. God's appointing the life-blood of his own guiltless creature to be shed for such a purpose, and afterwards sprinkled on his altar, denoted that he accepted this symbolically as an atonement or substitution for the life of the guilty offerer, and typically implied that he would in due time provide and accept a real atonement or substitution in Christ. In so far as the ancient believer might present the blood of his sacrifice according to the manner prescribed, and in so far as the believer now appropriates by faith the atoning blood of Christ, in each case alike the blessed result is—he is justified from sin, and has peace with God.

But it is evident on a moment's consideration, that while the things now mentioned form what must have been the fundamental and most essential part of every sacrifice, various other things, of

a collateral and supplementary kind, were necessarily required to bring out the whole truth connected with the sinner's reconciliation and restored fellowship with God, as also to give suitable expression to the diversified feelings and affections, which it became him at different times to embody in his acts of worship. If anything like a complete representation was to be given by means of sacrifice of the sinner's relation to God, there must, at least, have been something in the appointed rites to indicate the different degrees of guilt, the sense entertained by the sinner, not only of his own sinfulness, but also of his obligations to the mercy of God for restored peace, his several states of comparative distance from God and nearness to him, and the manifold consequences, both in respect to his condition and his character, growing out of his acceptable approach to God. This could no otherwise be done than by the institution of different kinds of sacrifice, suited to the ever varying circumstances of the worshipper ; or by the different kinds of victims employed in the same sacrifice, the particular actions with their blood, the use made of their several parts, or the supplementary services with which the offering of them was accompanied. In these respects, opportunity was afforded for the symbolical expression of a very considerable variety of states and feelings. And it was, more particularly by its minute prescriptions and diversified arrangements for this purpose, that the Mosaic ritual formed so decided an improvement on the sacrificial worship of the ancient world. Before the time of Moses, this species of worship was comparatively vague and indefinite in its character. There appear to have been at most but two distinct forms of sacrifice, and these probably but slightly varied—the burnt-offering and the peace-offering. That such distinctions did exist, as to constitute two kinds of sacrifice under these respective appellations, seems unquestionable, from mention being made of both at the ratification of the covenant (Ex. xxiv. 5), prior to the introduction of the peculiar distinctions of the Mosaic ritual ; and also from the indications that exist in earlier times of a feast in connection with certain sacrifices, while it was always the characteristic of the burnt-offering, that the whole was consumed by fire. But the line of demarcation between the two was probably restricted to the participation or non-participation on the part of the offerers of a portion of the sacrifice, leaving whatever else might require to be

signified respecting the state or feeling of the worshipper, to be either expressed in words, or to exist only in the silent consciousness of his own mind.

It is apparently on account of this greater antiquity and more general character of the burnt and peace-offerings, that they take precedence in the prescriptions given in Leviticus concerning the sacrifices. The priority in point of order, after the Mosaic ritual was introduced, belonged, however, not to them, but to the sin-offerings; and accordingly on those occasions, when a series of offerings was presented, the sin-offerings invariably came first (Ex. xxix; Lev. v., viii., ix., xvi., &c.) The change introduced by the giving of the law was the cause of this. The law necessarily brought with it the knowledge of sin. It did not, indeed, originate such knowledge; but it imparted much clearer views, and produced a far deeper consciousness of sin, than generally existed before its promulgation. And as consciousness of sin is the foundation and starting-point of all sacrifice, that kind of sacrifice in which the ideas of sin and atonement were brought most prominently out, was fitly regarded as holding the first place in the sacrificial system. It was the kind of offering suitable for those who had either not attained to a covenant-standing, or had by transgression fallen from it. It has, therefore, properly to do with the beginning of all true religion, and may most fitly be taken first.

THE SIN-OFFERING.

This species of sacrifice has so peculiarly to do with sin, that its very name is identified with it (חטאת); in Hebrew, the common term for sin, is also the term for sin-offering. This clearly indicates, that it has specially to do with sin, and aims at atonement, in the most express and definite sense. This, we have already seen, was peculiarly the case with the sin-offerings presented on the day of atonement for the priesthood and the people. And in respect to ordinary occasions, they primarily differed from the other sacrifices, by their being connected with some *special acts* of sin (Lev. iv.—v. 13).¹ But in the description given of these occasions, there are

¹ The whole of this portion treats of the sin-offerings, and only at v. 14, does the law of the trespass-offering begin. The division of the chapters here is particularly unhappy.

two peculiarities, from which the opponents of a vicarious atonement have often sought to invalidate that vital doctrine. The first peculiarity has respect to the prominence given to merely bodily and external defilements: such as touching the carcase of an unclean person, or beast. But that these are far from being alone, or even chiefly intended—that the notice taken of them rather forms a supplementary direction, lest the people should think such comparatively small offences were not included, must be evident to every one who reads attentively the whole section, and compares the portion v. 1–13, where alone such sins are specified, with the preceding chapter, where there is no specification of particular sins, and where the only description given, repeated each time in regard to the priest, the congregation, the ruler, and the private individual, is of sins committed “against *any* of the commandments of God.” In an economy, which had the Decalogue for the root and basis of all its legislation, it is impossible but that, under such a description, transgressions of a religious-moral nature must have been, not only included, but even mainly and primarily intended. And even in regard to the ceremonial institutions, when their symbolical character is correctly understood and taken into account, nothing remains simply ceremonial; there is a moral element embodied in it, and for the sake of that alone was it appointed.

The other peculiarity has respect to the manner in which the sins have been committed, described as “through ignorance,” (בִּשְׂגָגָה, *bishgagah*), unawares, or unwittingly. This has been thought by some to imply, that the sins referred to could scarcely be transgressions in the strictly moral, but only in a kind of accidental or ceremonial sense, and that sin-offerings being appointed only for such, it argues nothing as to the mind of God regarding transgressions of a properly moral nature. But this view proceeds on an entire misapprehension of the proper force of the original expression. It does include sins, indeed, committed in the ordinary sense through ignorance, while the transgressor, as it is said, “wist

That the word *trespass* is sometimes used in the first part of the fifth chapter, arises from these two kinds of offering having much in common, and in particular from the circumstance that every sin for which a sin-offering was to be presented, might be called a trespass, in the sense meant by the original. But of this afterwards, under the trespass-offering.

not" that he was transgressing. But even in such cases, the ignorance for the most part must itself have been culpable, arising from that want of care and watchfulness, which those were strictly bound to exercise, who had God's law revealed to them, that they might avoid all occasions of offence. Hence even the fearful sin of the Jews in crucifying our Lord, is said to have been "done ignorantly" (Acts iii. 17); and the lusts of a corrupt and depraved nature generally are called in I Peter i. 14, "the lusts in ignorance." The expression, therefore, as Archbishop Magee justly infers,¹ "besides sins of ignorance, includes likewise all such as were the consequence of human frailty and inconsideration, whether committed knowingly and wilfully or otherwise. It stands opposed to sins committed 'with a high hand' (Numb. xv. 22-31), that is, deliberately and presumptuously, for which no atonement was admitted. So that the efficacy of the atonement was extended to all sins, which flowed from the infirmities and passions of human nature; and was withheld only from those which sprang from a deliberate and audacious defiance of the divine authority. This view is also abundantly confirmed by the examples given of the particular sins which called for the atonement, and among which fraud, lying, rash swearing or perjury, licentiousness, are to be found." It was expressly on account of such sins being excluded from the province of forgiveness and atonement, that the house of Eli was appointed to excision (1 Sam. iii. 14).

But still, perhaps, it may be thought, that even when the limits are thus extended within which provision was made for the atonement and pardon of sin, the provision was greatly deficient, and gave but a feeble exhibition of the mercy and goodness of God—since all, who had gone in the course of transgression beyond the limits in question, had the fearful doom pronounced against them, "they shall be cut off from their people." But it must be remembered, the whole had respect to a people in covenant with God; the mercies he provided for them in his institutions of grace, were covenanted mercies, such as by the handwriting of God they had a right and privilege to claim. And if the boon had been extended beyond the limits specified—if the deliberate and audacious offender had been included in the provision for pardon, what a

¹ On Atonement, 37th Note, where this point is very ably and satisfactorily argued; see also Hengstenberg on Ps. xix. 13, and Outram, de Sac. L. i. 13, § 4.

license would inevitably have been given to transgression? How would the sinner have encouraged and hardened himself in his ways of iniquity, if he could have reckoned on the forgiveness of God, on presenting what he could so easily procure, a kid of the goats for a sin-offering? Indeed, the grand aim and scope of the whole dispensation, "be ye holy, for I am holy," would speedily have gone into oblivion, unless the covenant had excluded presumptuous sins from the benefit of its provisions of mercy. It is certainly possible, that persons, who had been guilty of such sins, might sometimes actually obtain mercy, and be brought to repentance and peace. But in so far as this might be the experience of any, their case lay without the circle of God's ordinary dealings; the mercy extended to them was not covenanted, but peculiar, extraordinary in its nature, and we may reasonably infer singularly rare also in its exercise; for their state of mind was that which God usually abandons to its own lusts, the state of him, of whom it is written: "He that hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy."

The principle, on which this part of the divine procedure was based, was by no means peculiar to Judaism, but reappears in Christianity, and, indeed, in a still more severe and awful form: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy, of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" "There is a sin unto death, I do not say, that ye shall pray for it"—the sin, namely, of a wilful, obstinate, heaven-daring opposition to the ways of God, and the demands of righteousness, and which, under a dispensation of grace, can usually belong only to such as have grieved the Spirit of God, till he has finally left them:—A sin, therefore, which lies beyond the province of mercy and forgiveness. There are miracles of grace, which God may possibly work even upon such, without giving any account of his matters; but we may rest assured, they are as rare in their occurrence, as they are singular in their character, and it were the height of presumption to expect them.

That there was to be, in this respect, no essential difference in principle between the Old and the New Testament dispensations,

was rendered manifest at the commencement of the latter, by the judgment inflicted on Ananias and Sapphira for their deliberate sin regarding the purchase-money of their possession. This may fairly be considered to parallel the case of the presumptuous Sabbath-breaker, at the commencement of the former dispensation (Numb. xv.),—viewed as an expression of the mind of God respecting the desert of transgression. But with the change of dispensation, a corresponding change was introduced as to the part which the church was to take in dealing with such cases. In Old Testament times, when all was ordered with the view of presenting an outward and symbolical representation of a perfect state—the land, the Lord's inheritance, and all its inhabitants his redeemed, covenant-people—the presumptuous offender could not be suffered to live ; and if he did not himself make his escape from the sacred territory, the congregation must with their own hand make good his excision from their number by the punishment of death. But that punishment, under such a dispensation, was the image of eternal death, which is the full and proper recompense of the presumptuous and impenitent transgressor. And the New Testament church having this future judgment clearly disclosed to it, as ready to be executed by God himself upon such, she is justly withheld from the execution of that outward image of the doom ; in so far as it may still at times fitly come into execution, the bolt of Omnipotence itself must give the stroke. But the church has no longer to wield the carnal sword. Her part is simply to bring sinners into the fold of Christ, and for those who may sin wilfully after having come there and received the knowledge of the truth, she has simply to cast them out from her pale—thus delivering them over, as irrecoverable by the ordinary means of grace, to the region where Satan, not the Spirit of God works, that they may there wait the execution of God's final judgment—unless, by some miracle of grace, he should still awaken them to repentance (Heb. x. 26 ; 1 Cor. v. 2-6, 13 ; 1 Tim. i. 20.) Such, in a few words, is the divine method and order, under both dispensations respectively. But the imperfections connected with their human administration, have in each case alike prevented it from being properly realized. In former times, there would often be a difficulty, even where there was a willingness, to determine exactly whether a transgression was really of the kind for which

no atonement was provided ; and the spirit of unfaithfulness, which so generally characterized the more influential members of the covenant, would naturally manifest itself in an aversion to execute the sentence written, even when it was obviously due. Hence, in the history, we find so many traces of those being suffered to live, and even to hold a leading place in the counsels of the nation, who, by the terms of the law, should have been cut off from the people of the Lord. And in the church of the New Testament, how extensively a similar spirit of defection and unfaithfulness has prevailed in respect to her correlative department of duty, is unhappily a matter of too flagrant notoriety.

If the view, however, now given were properly weighed, there would be no difficulty in perceiving the mistaken and groundless nature of the contrast so often drawn between Judaism and Christianity, as if the one were all severity, and the other all mercy,—as if a spirit of judgment belonged to the one, to which there is nothing corresponding in the other. Judaism could not in that case have formed a fitting preparation for Christianity. And then, what can be made of such declarations in New Testament Scripture itself, as throw the balance entirely on the other side : “ More tolerable for Tyre and Sidon ”—“ if every transgression of disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall *we* escape ? ” “ of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy,” &c. There is a real correspondence between the dispensations : in both alike an excision for the deliberate, presumptuous offender—but that manifesting itself in the one case by the infliction of temporal death, in the other by the delivering up of the offender to the judgment of eternal death.

To return now to the sin-offering appointed to be made for such cases of transgression as admitted of atonement—we are met, in the first instance, with a diversity in the victims—a gradation in value, which was evidently intended to mark the more or less offensive character of the sin to be atoned. When the sin was that of a private member of the congregation, the offering was to be a female kid of the goats (for which in cases of poverty a substitute was allowed of two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, and where the poverty was extreme, a little flour). For a ruler, the offering was to be a male kid ; for the congregation and the high-priest, on ordinary occasions, a young bullock ; but on the great day of

atonement, when the sin-offering of the congregation consisted of two goats, that of the high-priest was a bullock ; because, not only representing the people in his official capacity, but also standing in a relation of peculiar nearness to God, his sins possessed a darker and more aggravated character. There was thus perpetually brought out in connection with the means of atonement, the solemn truth, that while all sin is so offensive in the sight of Heaven, as to deserve the penalty of death, it grows in offensiveness with the rank and number of the transgressors ; and that so far from there being in God's kingdom any such partiality as might infer a privilege of sinning, the higher always one's standing there, the greater is the divine displeasure and judgment against the iniquity committed. Hence also the word by Ezekiel, ix. 6 : "Slay utterly old and young, and *begin* at my sanctuary."

But the chief and most distinctive peculiarity in this species of sacrifice, was the action with the blood, which, though variously employed, was always used so as to give a relatively strong and intense expression to the ideas of sin and atonement. When the offering had respect to a single individual, a ruler or a private member of the congregation, the blood was not simply to be poured round about the altar, but some of it also to be sprinkled upon the horns of the altar—its prominent points, its insignia, as they may be called, of honour and dignity. When the offering was of an inferior kind, and consisted only of doves, as in the case of very poor persons, this latter action was not prescribed (Lev. v. 9). But if it was for the sin of the high-priest, ("the priest that is anointed," Lev. iv. 3, meaning however, the high-priest, because he had the anointing in a pre-eminent sense, comp. Lev. xvi. 32 ; Ps. cxxxiii. 2), or of the congregation at large, besides these actions in the outer court, a portion of the blood was to be carried into the Sanctuary, where the priest was to sprinkle with his finger seven times before the inner veil, and again upon the horns of the altar of incense. It was to be done in the Holy Place, before the veil, because that was the symbolical dwelling-place of the high-priest, or of the congregation as represented by him ; and upon the altar of incense, in particular, because that was the most important article of furniture there, and one also that stood, as already noticed, in a near relation to the altar of

burnt-offering. A still higher expression, and the last, the highest expression which could be given of the ideas in question by means of the blood, was presented when the high-priest, on the day of atonement, went with the blood of his own and the people's sin-offering into the Most Holy Place, and sprinkled the mercy-seat—the very place of Jehovah's throne. In this action the sin appeared, on the one hand, rising to its most dreadful form of a condemning witness in the presence-chamber of God, and, on the other, the atonement assumed the appearance of so perfect and complete a satisfaction, that the sinner could come nigh to the seat of God, and return again, not only unscathed, but with a commission from him to banish the entire mass of guilt into the gulph of utter oblivion.

It is from the peculiar character of the sin-offering as God's special provision for removing the guilt of sin—from what might be called the intensely atoning power of its blood, that the other arrangements arose which were made concerning it. The blood was so sacred, that if any portion of it should by accident have come upon the garments of the persons officiating, the garment "whereon it was sprinkled, was to be washed in the Holy Place" (Lev. vi. 27), it must not be carried out beyond the proper region of consecrated things. The flesh was not consumed upon the altar—the fat alone was burned, as being the most excellent part, the fittest to be set apart immediately for God (Gen. xxvii. 28, xlv. 18; Ps. lxxxii. 16; Numb. xviii. 12, &c.), and though the kidneys and the caul above the liver, or rather, the greater lobe of the liver, which had the caul attached to it, are also mentioned as parts to be burnt, yet it was simply from their being so closely connected with the fat, that they were regarded as in a manner one with it (whence, in Lev. iii. 16, vii. 30, 31, all the parts actually burnt are called simply the *fat*).¹ But while the flesh itself was

¹ This explanation of the fat and adjoining parts, which is now generally adopted, we regard as much more natural and consistent than the one formerly maintained by most Christian divines, and supported by some Jewish authorities, viz. that the fat was the emblem of corruption, and the inward parts of the seat of human depravity. In that case, the whole inwards must always have been burnt, and especially the whole liver and the heart—which was not the case. Why not also the bowels as the seat of feeling and affection? But the interpretation went entirely on a wrong ground—when the animal was killed, the curse was abolished, the relative impurity gone—and not the worst, but the best was fittest to be given to the Lord.

not consumed upon the altar, it was declared to be most holy (literally "a holy of holies"), and could be eaten by none but the officiating priests, and by them only within the sacred precincts of the tabernacle. And if the vessel in which it was prepared was earthen, receiving as it must then have done a portion of the substance, it was required to be broken, as too sacred to be henceforth applied to a common use ; or if of brass, it was ordered to be scoured and rinsed in water, that not even the smallest fragment of flesh so holy might come in contact with common things, or be carried beyond the bounds of the sanctuary (Lev. vi. 25–29, vii. 6.) This eating by the priesthood of the flesh of the sin-offering, however, is said to have been done, not simply because it was most holy, but "also that they might bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord" (Lev. x. 17.) This cannot mean, that the flesh of the sin-offering still had the iniquities of the people, as it were, inhering in it, and that the priests, by devouring the one, made finally away with the other. In that case, the flesh must rather have been regarded as most polluted, instead of being most holy. But the atonement, in the strict and proper sense, was made when, after the imposition of hands, the penalty of death was inflicted on the victim, and its blood sprinkled on the altar of God. This denoted that its life-blood was not only given, but also accepted by God in the room of the sinful. And the eating of the flesh by the priests as at once God's familiars, and the people's representatives, could only be intended to give a symbolical representation of the completeness of the reconciliation—to shew by their incorporation with the sacrifice, how entirely through it the guilt had been removed, and the means of removing it converted even into the sustenance of the holiest life. The "bearing of the iniquity," therefore, was bearing not in reference to guilt, but in reference to expiation, bearing it away as forgiven, and exhibiting the perfected result of the atonement. It was just doing in another form substantially what was done by the action with the live-goat on the day of atonement.¹

¹ The older, and indeed, most also of the recent typologists completely misunderstood this eating of the flesh of the sin-offering, regarding it as a kind of eating of the sin, and so bearing it, or making it their own. See for example, Gill on Lev. x. 17, Bush on ib. and ch. vi. 30 ; also Deyling, Obs. Sac. i. sect. 65, § 2. It was thought in this way to afford the best adumbration of Christ, whom the priests typified, being made a

But it was only in the case of sin-offerings for the private member, or the single ruler in the congregation, that the flesh was to be eaten by the priesthood; in those cases in which the blood was carried within the sanctuary, that is, when the offering had respect to a sin of the high-priest, or of the congregation at large—with whom, as the public representative, he was nearly identified—then the flesh was appointed to be carried without the camp, and burnt in a clean place (ch. iv. 12, 21; vi. 30). These being sacrifices of a higher value, and bearing on them a stamp of still greater sacredness than those whose flesh was eaten by the priesthood, the injunction not to eat of it here, but to carry it without the camp and burn it, could not, as Bähr remarks (ii. p. 397), have arisen from any impurity supposed to reside in the flesh. It is true that all impure things were ordered to be carried out of the camp, but it does not follow from this, that every thing taken without the camp was impure; and in this case it was expressly provided, that the place to which the flesh was brought should be *clean*, implying that it was itself *pure*. The arrangement both as to the not eating, and the burning without the camp, seems to have arisen from the nature and object of the offering. In the cases referred to, the high-priest was himself concerned, directly or indirectly, in the atonement, and could not properly partake of the flesh of the victim, as this would have given it the character of a peace-offering. The flesh, as well as the blood, must therefore be given to the Lord. But it could not be burnt on the altar, for this would have given it the character of a burnt-offering; neither could there in that case have been so clear an expression of the idea which was here to be rendered prominent, viz. the identification, first, of the offering with the sinner's guilt,

sin for his people, or taking their guilt upon his own person and bearing it away. But it proceeds upon a wrong foundation, and utterly confounds the proper relation of things: the flesh as holy, and appointed to be eaten, must have represented the acceptableness or completeness of the sacrifice, not the sinfulness of the sin atoned. Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 182, 183. By this view also the correspondence is best preserved between the sin-offering and Christ. For, as soon as he completed his offering by bearing the penalty of death, the relative impurity was gone; he was immediately treated as the Holy One and the Just; his spirit passed into glory, and even his body was preserved as a sacred thing and treated with honour, providentially kept from violence, sought for and received by the rich among the people, and committed to the tomb with the usages of an honourable burial. Properly, Christ's exaltation began immediately after his death.

then the completeness of the satisfaction, and the entire removal of the iniquity. These ends were best served—as in private cases by the priest eating the flesh—so here, by the carrying of the carcase to a clean place without the camp, and consuming it there as a holy of holies to the Lord ; for as all in the camp had to do with it, it was thus taken apart from them all, and out of sight of all devoted by fire to the Lord.¹

The only additional regulation regarding the sin-offering was, that of no meat or drink-offering accompanying it ; and in those cases of extreme poverty, in which an offering of flour was allowed to be presented, instead of the pigeons or the goat, no oil or frankincense was to be put on it, “for it is a sin-offering” (ch. v.

¹ The same fundamental error here also pervades most of the typical interpretations, which generally proceed on the supposition of the flesh being still charged with sin, and very commonly regard the consuming of it with fire as representing, either the intense suffering of Christ, or the personal sufferings of the lost hereafter. Besides going on a wrong supposition, this notion is still farther objectionable on account of its deriving the idea of suffering from what was absolutely incapable of feeling it. The dead carcase was unconscious alike both of pain and pleasure ; and then, as it was entirely consumed, if referring to Christ, it must have signified his absolutely perishing under the curse,—if to the lost sinner, his annihilation by the sufferings.—The reference made in Heb. xiii. 11, to the burning of the carcase of the sin-offerings without the camp, is in perfect accordance with the explanation given above. “For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high-priest for sin (i. e. the sin-offerings), are burned without the camp ; wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate ; let us, therefore,” &c. It is rather an allusion to the rite than an explicit and proper interpretation of it. The real city, to which God’s people belong, and out of which Christ suffered, is heaven, as the inspired writer, indeed, intimates in v. 14. But the overruling providence of God so ordered matters, that there should be an image of this in the place of Christ’s suffering as compared with the earthly Jerusalem. In his case it was designed to be a mark of infamy, to make him suffer without the gate—a sign that he could not be the Messiah. But viewed in reference to the ancient type, it proved rather the reverse, as in addition to all the proper and essential marks of agreement between the two, it served to provide even a formal and external resemblance. Though the bodies of those sin-offerings were burnt without the camp, they were still a holy of holies to the Lord ; they did not on that account become a polluted thing ; and Christ’s having, in like manner, suffered without the gate, though certainly designed by men to exhibit him as an object of ignominy and shame, did not render him the less the holy child of God, whose blood could fitly be taken into the highest heavens. But if he suffered himself to be cast out, that he might bear our doom, it surely would ill-become us to be unwilling to go out and bear his reproach. This is the general idea ; but the passage is rather of the hortatory than the explanatory kind, and passes so rapidly from one point to another, that to press each particular closely would be to make it yield a false and inconsistent meaning.

11). The meaning of this is correctly given by Kurtz: "Oil and incense symbolized the Spirit of God and the prayer of the faithful; the meat-offering, always good works; but these are then only good works and acceptable to God, when they proceed from the soil of a heart truly sanctified, when they are yielded and matured by the Spirit of God, and when, farther, they are presented to God as his own work in man, accompanied on the part of the latter with the humble and grateful acknowledgment, that the works are the offspring, not of his own goodness, but of the grace of God. The sin-offering, however, was pre-eminently the atonement-offering; the idea of atonement came so prominently out, that no room was left for the others. The consecration of the person, and the presentation of his good works to the Lord, had to be reserved for another stage in the sacrificial institute."¹

[The occasions on which the private and personal sin-offerings were presented, beside those mentioned in Lev. iv. and v., were: when a Nazarite had touched a dead corpse, or when the time of his vow was completed (Numb. vi. 10-14); at the purification of the leper (Lev. xiv. 19-31), and of women after long-continued hæmorrhage or after child-birth (Lev. xii. 6-8; xv. 25-30), pointing to the corruption, not only indicated by the bodily disease, but also strictly connected with the powers and processes of generation—the fountain-head, as they might be called, of human depravity. This also accounts for the case mentioned in Lev. xv. 2, 14, being an occasion for presenting a sin-offering; as it does also for the relative impurity connected in so many ways with the same, even where an atonement was not actually required, but washing only enjoined.]

THE TRESPASS-OFFERING.

That the trespass, or as it should rather be called, the guilt or debt-offering (*עוון asham*), stood in a very near relation to the sin-offering, and to a great extent was identified with it in nature, is evident from the description given of the trespass-offering in Lev. v. 14-vi. 7, and, in particular, from the declaration in ch. vii. 7, "as the sin-offering is, so is the trespass-offering, there is

¹ Mosaische Opfer. p. 192.

one law for them." But great difficulty has been found in drawing precisely the line of demarcation between the two kinds of offerings, and in pointing out, regarding the trespass-offering, what constituted the specific difference between it and the sin-offering. The difficulty, if not altogether caused, has been very much increased, by the mistake adverted to in a preceding note, of supposing the directions regarding the trespass-offering to begin with ch. v., whereas they really commence with the new section at ver. 14, where, as usual, the new subject is introduced with the words: "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying." These words do not occur at the beginning of the chapter itself; the section to the end of the 13th verse was added to the preceding chapter regarding the sin-offering, with the view of specifying certain occasions on which it should be presented, and making provision for a cheaper sort of sacrifice to persons in destitute circumstances. But in each case the sacrifice itself, without exception, is called a sin-offering, v. 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12. In one verse, indeed (the 6th), it is said in our version: "And he shall bring his trespass-offering;" but this is a mere mis-translation, and should have been rendered, as it is in the very next verse, where the expression in the original is the same: "And he shall bring for his trespass." Throughout the section the sin is denominated an *asham*, that is, a matter of guilt or debt; and all sin is such, viewed in reference to the law of God, so that every sin-offering might also be called an *asham*, as well as a *hattah*, or sin-offering. But what were distinctively called by the name of *asham*, were offerings for sins, in which the offence given, or the debt incurred by the misdeed, admitted of some sort of estimation and recompense, so that in addition to the atonement required for the iniquity, in the one point of view, there might also, in the other, be the exaction and the payment of a restitution.

That this is the real import of the *asham*, as distinguished from the *hattah* or sin, is clear from the passage Numb. v. 5-8, where the former is marked as a consequence of the latter, and such a consequence as admitted and demanded a material recompense. "When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit to do a trespass (or deal fraudulently) against the Lord, and that person be guilty (חַטָּא); then they shall confess their sin which they have done, and he shall recompense his *asham* with the prin-

cipal thereof, and add to it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed (literally, to whom he has become guilty). But if the man have no kinsman to recompense the *asham* unto, let the *asham* be recompensed unto the Lord, to the priest, besides the ram of the atonement, whereby an atonement shall be made for him." The Lord in this latter case, as being the original proprietor of the land, stepped into the room of the deceased person who had sustained the injury, and received through his representative, the priest, the earthly restitution, while the sacrifice was also given to the Lord for the offence committed against his authority. The particular cases specified in ch. vi. 1-5, as coming within the law of the trespass-offering, were entirely of this kind; they implied a civil wrong to certain individuals or the commonwealth: False swearing in regard to any pledge or property delivered into one's hands by a neighbour, finding lost property and lying concerning it, violently taking away, or acting with deceit toward a neighbour's goods. Another set of cases are referred to in the preceding chapter, ver. 15, 16, called trespasses in regard to the holy things of the Lord, which, though no specific instances are given, may be inferred to have been offences of a similar nature in the ecclesiastical province: Such as, not paying full tithes, or first-fruits, or withholding in any way from the Lord's representatives some portion of their due gains. In all such cases, a debt was manifestly incurred; and, indeed, a twofold debt: A debt, first of all, to the Lord as the only supreme Head of the commonwealth whose laws had been transgressed, and a debt also to a party on earth whose constitutional rights had been invaded. In both respects alike the priest was to make an estimate of the wrong done: and in the first respect, the debt (whatever might be the valuation) was discharged by the presentation of a ram for the *asham* or trespass-offering, ver. 15; while in the other, the actual sum was to be paid to the party wronged, with an additional fifth.

The same limitations as to the manner of committing the sins in question, were evidently intended to apply here, as in respect to those for which the sin-offering was presented. They were such as had been done in ignorance, unawares, through the influence of passion or temptation; and it is plain, that those most distinctly specified could not possibly have been committed with-

out a consciousness of sin at the very time of their being done. But the precise aspect under which the sins were considered, was taken from a lower point of view, than in the case of the sin-offering. It was a reckoning for and dealing with sin, not precisely in respect to its own nature, but rather in respect to the evils growing out of it ; not in its higher and primary relations, but in such only as were subordinate and earthly, and admitted of a sort of reparation. Hence, also, as an atonement, the trespass-offering appears in quite an inferior place to that of the sin-offering ; the blood was only poured around the altar, not sprinkled on the horns, nor carried within the sanctuary ; and on those more public and solemn occasions, on which a whole series of offerings was to be presented, we never find the trespass-offering taking the place of the sin-offering, or occurring in addition to it (Ex. xxix ; Lev. xvi. ; Numb. vii., xxviii., xxix.) So that the trespass-offering may justly be regarded as a kind of appendage to the sin-offering, designed only for such cases as were peculiarly fitted for enforcing upon the sinner's conscience the moral debt he had incurred by his transgression in the reckoning of God, and the necessity of his at once rendering satisfaction to the divine justice he had offended, and making restitution in regard to the brotherly relations he had violated.¹

There can be little doubt that this more restricted and inferior character of the trespass-offering is the reason why, in New Testament Scripture, the one great sacrifice of Christ is never spoken of with special reference to it, while so often presented under the aspect of a sin-offering. We find there, however, mention frequently enough made of sin as a debt incurred toward God, rendering the sinner liable to the exaction of a suitable recompense to the offended justice of heaven. This satisfaction it is possible for him to pay only in the person of his substitute, the Lamb of God, whose blood is so infinitely precious, that it is amply sufficient to cancel, in behalf of every believer, the guilt of numberless transgressions. But while this one ransom alone can satisfy for man's guilt the injured claims of God's law of holiness ; wherever the sin committed assumes the form of a wrong done to a fellow-

¹This view of the trespass-offering is now generally concurred in, also by Hengstenberg in his last treatise, *Mos. Op.* p. 21, as well as by Bähr, Kurtz, and others.

creature, God justly demands as an indispensable condition of his granting an acquittal in respect to the higher province of righteousness, that the sinner shew his readiness to make reparation in this lower province, which lies within his reach. He who refuses to put himself on right terms with an injured fellow-mortal, can never be received into terms of peace and blessing with an offended God. And if he should even proceed so far as to bring his gift to the altar, while he there remembers that his brother has somewhat against him, he must not presume to offer it, as he should then offer it in vain, but go and render due satisfaction to his brother, and then come and offer the gift.

But while ample materials exist in New Testament Scripture for bringing out the truth of God under these aspects and relations, the predominant and only direct reference, as regards the relation of Christ's work to these closely affiliated sacrifices, is to the sin-offering. And to this most of all, as we have already seen, in connection with the services of the day of atonement, when the leading ideas symbolized by this department of the sacrificial rites, obtained their most solemn and striking representation. Having already in an earlier part unfolded that more peculiar and perfect representation, little of an additional nature remains now to be supplied from the general prescriptions regarding the sin-offering. But as each individual, even the most private member of the congregation, as well as the congregation at large and the high-priest, was obliged, on being convicted by his conscience of any particular sin, to come with a sin-offering, we see there impressively disclosed the need in which every sinner stands of the salvation of Christ, and the necessity of making application to it as often as the guilt of sin renews itself upon his conscience. This resort of faith to the perfect sacrifice of Christ is the one way that lies open for the sinner's attainment of pardon, and restoration to peace.

And then in the sacrifice itself there is the reality of that incomparable worth and preciousness, which was so significantly represented in the sin-offering by the sacredness of its blood, and the hallowed destination of its flesh. With reference to this, the blood of Christ is called emphatically "the precious blood," and "the blood that cleanseth from all sin." "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the right-

eousness of God in him." Holy and without blemish in himself, and infinitely dear to the Father as his only begotten and well-beloved Son, he yet became, when he took upon him the iniquities of us all, in the sight of Heaven—SIN, one grand impersonation of guilt—as the sin-offering was, after the offerer had confessed over it, with imputation of hands, the sin of which he had been guilty, and received the infliction of the penalty that was due. But as soon as this awful penalty was borne by the Redeemer, the moment he could say in regard to what was exacted of him, "It is finished," as the curse was then exhausted, so the guilt that deserved it was finally and for ever borne away; the Lamb of God, formerly charged with a world's guilt, is henceforth in every sense "without sin"—his blood so pure and precious that it can avail to the blotting out of all iniquity, his flesh the root and nourishment in the saved, of an immortal life; so that the participation of his merits by the exercise of a realising faith is fellowship with all that is holiest and best; it is the soul's being engrafted into the very purity and blessedness of Heaven. The true believer is made "the righteousness of God in him."

THE BURNT-OFFERING.

The name commonly given in Scripture to this species of sacrifice is *olah* (עֹלָה) an *ascension*, so called from the whole being consumed and going up in a flame to the Lord. It also received the name *kabil* (כָּבִיל) *the whole*, with reference also to the entire consumption, and possibly not without respect to its general and comprehensive character.

For in this respect it was distinguished from all the other sacrifices, and raised above them. The sin and trespass-offerings were presented with the view of making atonement for particular sins, and had for their object the restoring of the offerer to a state of peace and fellowship with God, which had been interrupted by the commission of iniquity. But the burnt-offering was for those who were already standing within the bonds of the covenant, and without any such sense of guilt lying upon their conscience, as exposed them to excision from the covenant. We are not, however, to suppose on this account, that there was to be no conscience of sin in the offerer when he presented this sacrifice; for he was required

to lay his hands on the head of the victim (with which confession of sin was always accompanied), and it was expressly said "to be accepted for him, to make atonement for him" (Lev. i. 4.) But the guilt for which atonement here required to be made, was not that properly of special and formal acts of transgression, but rather of those shortcomings and imperfections which perpetually cleave to the servant of God, and mingle even with his best services. But along with this sense of unworthiness and sin, which enters as an abiding element into the state of his mind, there is invariably coupled, especially in his exercises of devotion, a surrender and consecration of his person and powers to the service of God. While he is conscious of, and laments the deficiencies of the past, he cannot but desire to manifest a spirit of more complete devotedness in the time to come. And it was to express this complicated state of feeling, to which the whole and every individual of the covenant-people should have been continually exercising themselves, that the service of the burnt-offering was appointed.

Hence this offering, combining in itself to a considerable extent what belonged to the other sacrifices, might be regarded as embodying the general idea of sacrifice, and as in a sense representing the whole sacrificial institute. So it appears in Deut. xxxiii. 10, where the office of the priesthood in the presentation of offerings is described simply with a reference to this species of sacrifice: "They shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt-sacrifice upon thy altar." On the same account, it was the kind of offering which was to be presented morning and evening in behalf of the whole covenant-people, and which, especially during the night, when the altar was required for no other use, was to be so slowly consumed that it might last till the morning (Ex. xxix. 38-46; Numb. xxviii. 3; Lev. vi. 9.) So that it was the daily and nightly, the constant and perpetual sacrifice—the symbolical expression of what Israel needed to be ever receiving from Jehovah, as the God of the covenant, and yielding to him again as his covenant-people. Holding such a position in the sacrificial institute, we can also easily understand why the altar of sacrifice should have received its usual designation from this, and was called "the altar of burnt-offering." And in further accordance with the same general view, we find from sacred history, what the nature of the institution might have led us to expect, that it was the kind of

sacrifice anciently employed for expressing all sorts of devotional feelings, whether of gratitude for past mercies, in supplicating future blessings, or in deprecating apprehended calamities (Gen. viii. 20 ; Job i. 5, xlii. 8 ; Numb. xxiii.)¹

All the more special directions regarding the sacrifice agree with the view now exhibited. In conformity with its general and comprehensive character, or its connection with the abiding and habitual state of the worshipper, much was left to his own discretion, both as to the kind of victim to be presented, and the particular times for presenting it. It might be chosen either from the herd or the flock—but in each case must be a male without blemish, the best and most perfect of its kind—or he might even go to the genus of fowls, and choose a turtle-dove or young pigeon. The blood of the victim was simply poured around the altar, the most general form of the atoning-action ; and with the exception of the skin, which was all that could be given to the priests without detracting from the completeness of the offering, the whole carcase, after being cut into suitable pieces, and the filth that might adhere to any of them washed off, was laid upon the altar and burnt. (In the case of the pigeons the crop was first removed, as but imperfectly belonging to the bird, not properly a part of its flesh and blood.) In that consumption of the whole, after the outpouring of the blood, for his acceptance, the offerer, if he entered into the spirit of the service, saw expressed his own dedication of himself, soul and body, to the service of God—self-dedication following upon, and growing out of pardon and acceptance with God. And as such consecration of the person to God must again appear, and express itself in the fruits of a holy life, the burnt-offering was always accompanied with a meat and drink-offering, through which the worshipper pledged himself to the diligent performance of the deeds of righteousness (Numb. xv. 3–11, xxviii. 7–15.)

That Christ was here also the end of the law, and realized to the full what the burnt-offering thus symbolized, will readily be understood. In so far as it contained the blood of atonement, ever in the course of being presented for the covenant-people, it shadowed forth Christ as the one and all for his people, in regard to deliverance from the guilt of sin—the fountain to which they must daily and hourly repair to be washed from their uncleanness.

¹ Outram, de Sac. i. c. x. § 5.

And in so far as it expressed, through the consumption of the victim and the accompaniment of food, the dedication of the offerer to God for all holy working and fruitfulness in well-doing, the symbol met with unspeakably its highest realization in Him, who came not to do his own will, but the will of the Father that sent him; who sought not his own glory, but the glory of his Father; who said even in the last extremities and in reference to the most appalling trials, "Not my will but thine be done; I have glorified thee on earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do; and now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

But in this the blessed Redeemer did not stand alone; here it could no longer be said, "of the people there was none with him." As bearing the doom and penalty of sin, he is infinitely exalted above the highest and holiest of his brethren. None of them can share with him either in the burden or the glory of the work given him to do. These are exclusively his own, and it is for them simply to receive from his hand, as the debtors of his grace, and enter into the spoils of his dear bought victory. But in the spirit of self-dedication and holy obedience, which animated him from first to last in his high undertaking, he was the forerunner of his people, and the same must breathe and operate in them. As he yielded himself to the Father, so they must yield themselves to him, drawn by the constraint of his love and the mercies of his redemption to present themselves in him as living sacrifices, that they may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. And the more always they realize their interest in his blood for the pardon of sin and acceptance with God, the more are they disposed to yield themselves to the Lord for a ready submission to his righteous will, and to say with the Psalmist, "O Lord, truly I am thy servant; I am thy servant, the son of thine handmaid, thou hast loosed my bonds."

THE PEACE-OFFERING.

The general name for this species of offering is *shelamim* (שלמים) and comes from a root which signifies to make up, to supply what is wanting or deficient, to pay or recompense; and hence it very naturally came to express a state, in which all misunderstandings or disturbances having been removed, there was room for friend-

ship, harmony, peace, and prosperity. And the sacrifice, which went by this name, might be employed in reference to any occasion on which such ideas became strikingly displayed.

The peace-offerings appear under three divisions—the sacrifice of thanksgivings or praise (תודה), of a vow (נדב), and of freewill (נדבה). The last of these is marked as being somewhat inferior, by the circumstance that an animal with something lacking or superfluous in its parts might be offered (Lev. xxii. 23), while in both the other sorts the rule, of being without blemish, was strictly enforced (ver. 21.) And again a difference is marked, a measure of inferiority in both of the two last as compared with the first, in that they are treated conjointly, as coming under the same general laws (Lev. vii. 16–21), while the first has a section for itself (v. 11–15), and also that the flesh of those two might be eaten, either on the first or the second day, while the flesh of the thank or praise-offering must be eaten on the first, or else burnt with fire. These are certainly rather slight distinctions; but they are quite sufficient to indicate degrees of excellence or worth in the respective offerings, in which the sacrifice of praise holds the highest, and that of free-will the lowest place. While also the free-will and the votive peace-offering had much in common, and are made to stand under one general law as to the service connected with them, they are not unfrequently presented as in a kind of contrast to each other (Lev. vii. 16, xxii. 21, 23, &c.) This, however, merely arose from the different circumstances in which they were usually presented. Persons, who received some striking interpositions of Providence at a time when they could not make any suitable outward return—or, more commonly, persons who were involved in danger or distress, and greatly desired the interposition of the divine hand to bring deliverance, were accustomed to vow certain offerings to the Lord in respect to the goodness either actually vouchsafed, or fervently sought. From the moment that the vow was made, they lay under an express obligation to perform what was specified; their sacrifice as to its obligation ceased to be a voluntary service; and if some time elapsed between the promise and the performance, there was considerable danger of the feeling that dictated the vow suffering abatement, and the worshipper either failing to make good his obligation, or doing so under a constraint. Jacob himself, the

father of the covenant-people, formed a memorable example of this; having failed in the strict and proper sense to pay the vow he made at Bethel, after he returned to Canaan, until reprov'd by judgments in his family, and warn'd by God he repaired to the place (Gen. xxxv. 1-7.) Hence, not only the sort of contrast sometimes indicated between the votive and the free-will offerings, but also the pointed allusions to the necessity of fulfilling such vows after they were made, and the care which pious men took to maintain in this respect a good conscience (Ps. xxii. 25, lxvi. 13, lxxvi. 11; Prov. xx. 25; Eccl. v. 4, 5, &c.) When actually presented, such votive offerings must have partaken chiefly of the nature of thanksgivings, as in the mode of their origination they possessed somewhat of the character of a prayer. In ordinary circumstances, however, and when the worshipper was in a condition to give outward and immediate expression to his feelings in an act of worship, it would seem that the free-will peace-offering was the embodied prayer (Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 4; 1 Sam. xiii. 9; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25), as we find peace-offerings presented in circumstances which naturally called for supplication, and which preclude the thought of any other free-will offerings. And the relation of the three kinds to each other, with their respective gradations, may be indicated with probable correctness as follows: The thank or praise-offering was the expression of the worshipper's feelings of adoring gratitude on account of having received some spontaneous tokens of the Lord's goodness—this was the highest form, as here the grace of God alone shone forth. The vow-sacrifice was the expression of like feelings for benefits received from the divine beneficence, but which were partly conferred in consideration of a vow made by the worshipper—this was of a lower grade, having something of man connected with it. And the free-will offering, which was presented without any constraint of necessity, and either without respect to any special acts of mercy experienced, or with a view to the obtaining of such, occupied a still lower ground, as the worshipper here took the initiative, and appeared in the attitude of one seeking after God.¹

¹ Kurtz, *Mosaische Opfer*, p. 138-9. The view given above is substantially the same also with that of Scholl, Hengstenberg, Baumgarten, and in its leading features was already given by Outram, i. 11, § 1. Bähr differs on some points, and is far, indeed, from being a safe guide in any of the sacrifices.

In regard to the offerings themselves, they were all to be accompanied with imposition of hands, and the sprinkling of the blood round about the altar, which implied that they had to some extent to do with sin, and like all the other offerings of blood, brought this to remembrance. The occasion of their presentation being some manifestation of God, of his mercy and goodness, whether desired or obtained, it fitly served to remind the worshipper of his unworthiness of the boon, and his unfitness in himself to stand before God in peace, when God might come near. It was this feeling which gave rise to the maxim, that no one could see God's face and live, and which so often found vent for itself in the ancient worshipper, even when the manifestation actually given of God was of the most gracious kind. This is well brought out by Bähr in reference to the matter now under discussion, however his defective views have led him to misapply the statement, or to overlook the plain inferences deducible from it: "The reference to sin and atonement discovers itself in the most striking and decided manner, precisely in regard to that species of peace-offerings, which was the most important and customary, and which might seem at first sight to have least to do with such a reference, viz. in the praise-offering. The word (זָבַח) comes from a verb, which signifies as well to confess to Jehovah sin, guilt, misconduct, as to ascribe adoration and praise to his name (comp. Ps. xxxii. 4; 1 Kings viii. 33, also Josh. vii. 19.) The confession of sin can only be made in the light of God's holiness; hence, when man confesses his sin before God, he at the same time confesses the holiness of God. But as holiness is the expression of the highest name of Jehovah, the confession of sin with Israel carries along with it the confession of the name of Jehovah; and every confession of this name, as the front and centre of all divine manifestations, is at the same time glory and praise to God. Accordingly, the Hebrews necessarily thought in their praise-offerings of the confession of sin, and with this coupled the idea of an atonement; so that an atoning virtue was properly regarded as essentially belonging to this sacrifice."¹

It was common to peace-offerings with sin and trespass-offerings, that the fat and the parts immediately connected therewith, as the

¹ Symbolik, ii. p. 379-80.

richer and better portion of the animal, were burnt on the altar to Jehovah. But it was peculiar to the peace-offerings that besides this, certain parts of the flesh were, by a special act of consecration, waving and heaving, set apart for the priests, and given them as their portion. These parts were the breast and the right shoulder. Why such, in particular, were chosen, is nowhere stated, but it probably arose from their being somehow considered the more excellent parts. And in regard to the ceremony of consecration, according to Jewish tradition it was performed by laying the parts on the hands of the offerer, and the priest putting his hands again underneath, then moving them in a horizontal direction for the waving, and in a vertical one for the heaving. It would appear that the ceremony was commonly divided, that one part of it alone was usually performed at a time, and that in regard to the peace-offerings, the waving was peculiarly connected with the breast—which is thence called the wave-breast, Lev. vii. 30, 32, 34,—and the heaving with the shoulder, for this reason called the heave-shoulder. There can be little doubt that the rite was intended to be a sort of presentation of the parts to God, as the supreme ruler in all the regions of this lower world and in the higher regions above: the more suitable in connection with the peace-offerings, as these were acknowledgments of the Lord's power and goodness in all the departments of providence, and in the blessings which come down from above. When those parts were thus presented and set apart to the priesthood, the Lord's familiars, the rest of the flesh, it was implied, was given up to the offerer to be partaken of by himself and those he might call to share and rejoice with him. Among these he was instructed to invite, beside his own friends, the Levite, the widow, and the fatherless (Deut. xii. 18, xvi. 11.)

This participation by the offerer and his friends, this family feast upon the sacrifice, may be regarded as the most distinctive characteristic of the peace-offerings. It denoted that the offerer was admitted to a state of near fellowship and enjoyment with God, shared part and part with Jehovah and his priests, had a standing in his house, and a seat at his table. It was, therefore, the symbol of established friendship with God, and near communion with him in the blessings of his kingdom; and was associated in the minds of the worshippers with feelings of peculiar joy and gladness;—but these always of a sacred character. The

feast and the rejoicing were still to be "before the Lord," in the place where he put his name, and in company with those who were ceremonially pure. And with the view of marking how far all impurity and corruption must be put away from such entertainments, the flesh had to be eaten on the first, or at farthest the second day, after which, as being no longer in a fresh state, it became an abomination.

Turning our view to Christian times, we find the ideas symbolized in the peace-offering reappearing, and obtaining their adequate expression, both in Christ himself, and in his people. What it indicated in regard to the presenting of an atonement, could of course find its antitype only in Christ, as all the blood shed in ancient sacrifice, pointed to that blood of his, which alone cleanseth from sin. And inasmuch as all the blessings which Christ obtained for his church were received in answer to intercessory prayer, and when received, formed the occasion also on his part of giving praise and glory to the Father, so here also we see the grand realization of the peace-offering in Him, who in the name and the behalf of his redeemed could say, "My praise shall be of thee in the great congregation, I will pay my vows before them that fear him" (Ps. xxii. 25).

Viewed, however, as a representation of the state and feelings of the worshipper, the service of the peace-offering bears respect, more directly and properly to the people of Christ, than to Christ himself. And so viewed, it exhibits throughout an elevated and faithful pattern of their spiritual condition, and the righteous principles and feelings by which that is pervaded. In the feast upon the sacrifice, the feeding at the Lord's own table, and on the provisions of his house, we see the blessed state of honour and dignity to which the child of God is raised; his nearness to the Father, and freedom of access to the best things in his kingdom; so that he can rejoice in the goodness and mercy, which are made to pass before him, and can say, "I have all and abound." But let it be remembered, that the very place where the feast was held—"before the Lord"—and the careful exclusion of all putrid appearances, give solemn warning, that such a high dignity and blessed satisfaction can be held only by the sanctified mind, and the spiritual delight which is reaped, can by no means consist with the love and practice of sin. Nay, in the prayers, the vows,

the thanksgivings and praises, with which those peace-offerings were accompanied, and of which they were but the outward expression, let it be perceived how much the possessors of this elevated condition should be exercised to the work of communion with Heaven, and especially how sweet should be to them "the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of the lips!" (Heb. xiii. 15). And then, in the way by which the worshipper attained to a fitness for enjoying the privilege referred to, namely, through the life-blood of atonement, how impressive a testimony was borne to the necessity of seeking the road to all dignity and blessing in the kingdom of God through faith in a crucified Redeemer! By him has the provision been made, and the door opened, and the invitation issued to go in and partake. Such only as have been covered upon by his precious blood can be admitted to taste, or be prepared to relish the feast of fat things he sets before them; for through him, as the grand medium of reconciliation and acceptance, must their persons be brought nigh, their devotions presented, and their souls prepared for communion and fellowship with God. The unsanctified by the blood of Christ must of necessity be aliens from God's household, and strangers at his table.

THE MEAT-OFFERING.

The proper and distinctive name for what is called the meat-offering, was *mincha* (מִנְחָה), although the word is sometimes used in a more extended sense, as a general name for offerings or things presented to the Lord. It is not expressly said, that this kind of offering was only to be an addition to the two last species of bloody sacrifices (the burnt-offering and peace-offering), and that it could never be presented as something separate and independent. But the whole character of the Mosaic institutions, and the analogy of particular parts of them, certainly warrants the inference, that it was not the intention of God that the meat-offering should ever be presented alone; as there was here no confession of sin and no expiation of guilt. And accordingly, when the children of Israel were enjoined to bring, on two separate occasions, special offerings of this kind—the sheaf of first-fruits, and the two loaves (Lev. xxiii. 10–12, 17–20), on both occasions alike the offering had to be accompanied with the sacrifice

of slain victims. The ordinary employment of the meat-offering was in connection with the burnt and peace-offerings, which were always to have it as a necessary and proper supplement (Numb. xv. 1-13).

The meat-offering, as to its materials, consisted principally of a certain portion of flour or cakes, with which, it would seem, there was always connected a suitable quantity of wine for a drink-offering. The latter is not mentioned in Lev. ii., which expressly treats of the meat-offering, but is elsewhere spoken of as a usual accompaniment (Ex. xxix. 40 ; Lev. xxiii. 13 ; Numb. xv. 5, 10, &c.), and was probably omitted in the second chapter of Leviticus for the same reason, that it was noticed only by implication with the shew-bread, viz. that it formed quite a subordinate part of the offering, and was merely a sort of accessory. Being of the same nature with the shew-bread, which has already been considered, we need not enter here on any investigation into the design of the offering ; but may simply mention, in respect to this generally, that it was appended to the burnt and peace-offerings, to shew that the object of such offerings was the sanctification of the people by fruitfulness in well-doing, and that without this the end aimed at never could be attained.

This meat-offering was not to be prepared with leaven or honey, but always with salt, oil, and frankincense. Leaven or yeast, is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion ; hence, it very naturally became an image of moral corruption. Plutarch assigns as the reason, why the priest of Jupiter was not allowed to touch leaven, that "it comes out of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mingled."¹ The New Testament usage leaves no room to doubt, that by the leaven was spiritually meant all manner of malice and wickedness, whatever tends to mar the simplicity and corrupts the purity of the people of God—from which, therefore, the symbolical offerings that represented the good works and holy lives of the worshipper must be kept separate (Matt. xvi. 6 ; Luke xii. 1 ; 1 Cor. v. 6-8 ; Gal. v. 9).—The prohibition of honey is variously understood ; and is very commonly regarded as interdicted for the same reason substantially which excluded leaven, as being both in itself, and as an

¹ Bib. Cyclop. art. Leaven.

article of diet, when taken in any quantity, liable to become sour and corrupt. So Winer, Bähr, Baumgarten, and many others. But this seems rather far-fetched, and has little to countenance it in the references made to honey in the Old Testament. There it almost uniformly appears as of all things in nature the most sweet and gratifying to the natural taste—the fitting representative, therefore, of whatever is most pleasing to the flesh. Hence, as Jarchi says, “All sweet fruit was called honey;” and another Jewish authority, connecting the natural with the spiritual here, testifies that “the reason why honey was forbidden, was because evil concupiscence is sweet to a man as honey.” (See Ainsworth on Lev. ii. 11.) As, therefore, the corrupting element of leaven was forbidden, to indicate the contrariety of everything spiritually corrupt to the pure worship and service of God, so here the most luscious production of nature was also prohibited, to indicate that what is most pleasing to the flesh is not pleasing to God, and must be renounced by his faithful servants.¹

In regard to the ingredients with which the meat-offering was to be accompanied, there is scarcely any room for diversity of opinion. Salt is the great preservative of animal nature, opposing the tendency to putrefaction and decay. It was, therefore, well fitted to serve as a symbol of that moral and religious purity, which is essential to the true worship of God, and on which all stability and order ultimately depend. Hence, also, it is called “the salt of the covenant of God,” being an emblem at once of the perpetuity of this, and of the principles of holy rectitude, the true elements of incorruption, for the maintenance of which it was established. When our Lord said to his disciples: “Ye are the salt of the earth,” he wished them to know, that it was their part to exercise throughout society the same sanatory, healthful, purifying, and preservative influence, which salt did in the things of nature. And when again asserting, that every one should have “salt in themselves, and that every sacrifice must be salted with salt” (Mark ix. 49, 50), he intimates, that the pro-

¹ The prohibition of leaven and honey was only for the usual meat-offering, and did not apply to the first-fruits, as the first-fruits of everything had to be presented to the Lord; hence the wave-loaves were leavened, Lev. xxiii. 17, and honey is mentioned among the first-fruits presented in 2 Chron. xxxi. 5. These, however, did not come upon the altar, but were only presented to the Lord, and given to the priests.

perty, which enters into the lives of God's people, and renders them a sort of spiritual salt, must be within, consisting in the possession of a good conscience toward God.—The oil, symbol of the grace of God's Spirit, with which the meat-offering was to be intermingled, implied that every good work, capable of being presented to God, must be inwrought by the Spirit of God. And that frankincense was to be put upon it, bespoke the connection between good works and prayer, and that all righteous action should be presented to God in the spirit of devotion. So that "the good works of the faithful are represented by the oil, as prompted, quickened, and matured by the Holy Spirit—by the frankincense, as made acceptable and borne heavenwards in prayer—and by the salt, as incorruptible, perpetually abiding signs, and fruits of God's covenant of grace."¹

¹ Kurtz, *Mos. Opfer*, p. 102. Compare also what was said above on the show-bread, *Sec. vi.*

SECTION EIGHTH.

SPECIAL RITES AND INSTITUTIONS CHIEFLY CONNECTED WITH SACRIFICE—
 THE RATIFICATION OF THE COVENANT—THE TRIAL AND OFFERING OF
 JEALOUSY—PURGATION FROM AN UNCERTAIN MURDER—ORDINANCE OF
 THE RED HEIFER—THE LEPROSY AND ITS TREATMENT—DEFILEMENTS
 AND PURIFICATIONS CONNECTED WITH CORPOREAL ISSUES AND CHILD-
 BIRTH—THE NAZARITE AND HIS OFFERINGS—DISTINCTIONS OF CLEAN
 AND UNCLEAN FOOD.

THE subjects which we bring together in this section, are of a somewhat peculiar and miscellaneous nature, though they have also certain points in common. We mean to introduce, respecting them, only so much as may be necessary for the explanation of what more particularly belongs to each, as the more general principles they embodied and illustrated have already been fully considered. The remarks to be submitted must, therefore, be taken in connection with what goes before respecting the greater and more important sacrificial institutions, and pre-suppose an acquaintance with it.

THE RATIFICATION OF THE COVENANT.

The account given of this solemn transaction is referred to in the epistle to the Hebrews (ch. ix. 18--22), with an especial respect to the use then made of the sacrificial blood, and for the purpose of proving, that as the inferior and temporary covenant then ratified, required the shedding of animal blood, blood of a far higher and more precious kind must have been required to seal the everlasting covenant brought in by Christ. The whole ceremony stood thus: Moses had on the previous day read the law of the ten commandments, "the words of the Lord," in the

audience of the people, with the few precepts and judgments that had been privately communicated to him after their promulgation ; then, on the following morning, he caused an altar to be built under the hill, and twelve stones erected beside it, to represent the twelve tribes of the congregation ; certain young men, appointed priests for the occasion, were next sent to kill oxen for burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and the blood of these slain victims being received in basins, Moses divided it into two parts—the one of which he sprinkled on the altar, thereby making atonement for their sins, and so rendering them ceremonially fit for being taken into a covenant of peace with God ; and with the other half—after having again read the terms of the covenant, and obtained anew from the people a promise of obedience,—he sprinkled the people themselves and said, “Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.” It is added in the epistle to the Hebrews, that the book of the covenant was also sprinkled ; which, we presume, must have been done with the first half of the blood, and with somewhat of the same meaning and design with which the mercy-seat, that was afterwards placed over the tables of the covenant, was annually sprinkled in the Most Holy Place.

The grand peculiarity in this service was manifestly the division of the blood between Jehovah and the people, and the sprinkling of the latter with the portion appropriated to them. We found something similar in the consecration of Aaron, whose extremities were touched with the blood of the ram of consecration. But the action here differed in various respects from the other, and was directed to the special purpose of giving a palpable exhibition of the oneness that now subsisted between the two parties of the covenant. Naturally they stood quite apart from each other. Sin had formed an awful gulph between them. But God having first accepted in their behalf the blood of atonement, by that portion which was sprinkled on the altar, they were brought into a capacity of union and fellowship with him ; and then, when they had solemnly declared their adherence to the terms on which this agreement was to be maintained, and which simply contained a revelation of God’s purposes of righteousness in regard to them, the agreement was formally cemented by the sprinkling of the other part of the blood upon them. Thus they shared part and

part with God ; the pure and innocent life he provided and accepted in their behalf became (symbolically) theirs ; a vital and hallowed bond united the two into one ; God's life was their life ; God's table their table ; and as a farther sign of this conjunction of feeling and interest, they partook of the meat of the peace-offerings, which formed the second kind of sacrifices presented.

The wonted and necessary imperfections of course marred the completeness of this service ; and in Christ alone and his kingdom is a reality to be found, such as the necessities of the case and the demands of God's righteousness properly required. Here, too, the parties are naturally far asunder, the members of the covenant being all by nature the children of wrath, even as others. And that the covenant of reconciliation and peace might be established on a solid, satisfactory, and permanent basis, there must not only be the shedding of blood, but that blood must be such as both parties have a common interest in—such as might be truly called the blood of reconciliation—blood flowing from the heart of One, who was equally the seed of God and the seed of the woman. Such, in the strictest sense, was the blood of Jesus ; and in it, therefore, we discern the real, the only real bond of peace, and sure foundation of an everlasting covenant between man and God. He, whose conscience is sprinkled with this, is thereby made partaker of a divine nature ; he is received into the participation of the life of God, and is consecrated for evermore to live in the divine communion, and in obedience to the divine will. As the Father is in Christ, so Christ is in him, and he in Christ ; and nothing in privilege is wanting for his being admitted into nearest connection with the Godhead, or to enable him to bring forth such fruits of righteousness, as are required of the possessors of such a dignity.

But a question may here, perhaps, suggest itself in respect to the covenant itself, which was ratified between God and Israel in the manner we have noticed. For if the terms of that covenant were, as we formerly endeavoured to shew, specially and peculiarly the law of the ten commandments, and if this law is equally binding on the church now as a permanent rule of duty, how should it have been taken as the distinctive covenant or bond of agreement with Israel ? Was not this, after all, to place Israel simply on a footing with men universally ? And does it not ap-

pear something like an incongruity, to ratify such a covenant by such symbolical and shadowy services? There would, undoubtedly, be room for such questions, if this covenant were entirely isolated from what went before, or came after—if not taken in connection with the relation out of which properly it grew, and with the ordinances and institutions by which it was necessarily followed up. On the one hand, the covenant was prescribed by God as having redeemed his people from a state of bondage, and conferred on them a title to an inheritance of blessing, thereby pledging himself to give whatever was essentially needed, to aid them in striving after conformity to its requirements of duty. But while these requirements of necessity pointed to the great lines of religious and moral duty binding on the church in every age—for God's own character of holiness being perpetually the same, he could not then take his people bound to live according to other principles of duty than are always obligatory—while, therefore, they necessarily possessed that broad and general character, still, in the peculiar circumstances in which Israel stood, many things, on the other hand, necessarily came along with what properly constituted the terms of the covenant, and which were of a merely national, shadowy, and temporary kind. The redemption they had obtained was itself but a shadow of a greater one to come, and so also was the inheritance to which they were appointed. No adequate provision was yet made for the higher wants of their nature; and though, even in that lower territory, on which God was avowedly acting for them and openly revealing himself to them, he could not but exact from them a faithful endeavour after conformity to his law of holiness, as the condition of their abiding fellowship with him, yet the ostensible provision for securing this was also manifestly inadequate, and could only be regarded as temporary. So that the covenant on every hand stood related to the symbolical and typical, though itself neither the one nor the other. As it grew out of relations having a typical bearing, so it of necessity brought with it ordinances and institutions which had a typical character; “it had (appended to it, or bound up with it) ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary” (Heb. ix. 1.) These could not be dispensed with, during the continuance of that covenant; and the members of the covenant were bound to observe them, so long as the covenant

itself in that temporary form lasted. The new covenant, however, *can* dispense with them, because it brings directly into view the things that belong to salvation in its higher interests, and ultimate realities. The inheritance now held out in prospect is the final portion of the redeemed, and the redemption that provides for their entrance into it is replete with all that their necessities require. It is, therefore, a better covenant, both because established upon better promises, and furnished with ampler resources for carrying its objects to a successful accomplishment. Yet, in respect to fundamental principles and leading aims, both covenants are at one ; a people established in sacred union with God, and bound up to holiness that they may experience the blessedness of such a union—this is the paramount object of the one covenant as well as of the other.

THE TRIAL AND OFFERING OF JEALOUSY.

The prescribed ritual upon this subject, recorded in Numb. v. 11-31, is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable in the Mosaic code ; and we introduce it here because it can only be rightly understood, when it is viewed in relation to the covenant-engagement between God and Israel. The national covenant had its parallel in every family of Israel, in the marriage-tie that bound together man and wife. This relation, so important generally for the welfare of individuals and the prosperity of states, was chosen as an expressive image of that in which the whole people stood to God ; and on the understood connection between the two, Moses represents in another place (Numb. xv. 39), as the later prophets constantly do, the people's unfaithfulness to the covenant as a committing of whoredom toward God. It was, therefore, in accordance with the whole spirit of the Mosaic legislation, that the strongest enactments should be made respecting this domestic relation, that the behaviour of man and wife to each other throughout the families of Israel might present a faithful image of the behaviour Israel should maintain toward God, or if otherwise, that exemplary judgment might be inflicted. This was the more appropriate under the Mosaic dispensation, as it was in connection with the propagation of a pure and holy seed, that the covenant was to reach its great end of blessing the world. So that to bring

corruption and defilement into the marriage-bed, was to pollute the very channel of covenant-blessing ; and in the most offensive manner violate the obligation to purity imposed in the fundamental ordinance of circumcision. Adultery, therefore, if fully ascertained, must be punished with death (Lev. xx. 10), as a practice subversive of the whole design of the theocratic constitution. And not only must ascertained guilt in this respect be so dealt with, but even strong suspicions of guilt must be furnished with an opportunity of bringing the matter by solemn appeal to God, since guilt of this description, more than any other, is apt to escape detection by arts of concealment, and particularly in the case of the woman, has many facilities of doing so. It is also on the woman that most depends for the preservation of the honour and integrity of families, and hence of greater moment that incipient tendencies in the wrong direction should in her case be met by wholesome checks.

It was on this account that the ritual respecting the trial and offering of jealousy was prescribed. The terms of the ritual itself imply, and the understanding of the Jews we know actually was, that the rite was to be put in force only when very strong grounds of suspicion existed in regard to the fidelity of the wife. But when suspicion of such a kind arose, the man was ordained to go with his wife to the sanctuary, and appear before the priest. They were to take with them, as a corban or meat-offering, the tenth part of an ephah of barley-meal, but without the usual accompaniments of oil and frankincense. The priest was then to take holy water—whence derived, it is not said, but most probably water from the laver is meant, and so the Chaldee paraphrast expressly renders it. This water the priest was to put into an earthen vessel, and mingle it with some particles of dust from the floor of the sanctuary. He was then to uncover the woman's head, and administer a solemn oath to her—she meanwhile holding in her hand the corban, and he in his the vessel of water, which is now called “the bitter water that causeth the curse.” The oath was to run thus: “If no man have lain with thee, and if thou has not gone aside unto uncleanness under thy husband (so it should be rendered, meaning, while under the law and authority of thy husband), be thou free from this bitter water that causeth the curse. But if thou hast gone aside under thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some man have lain with thee, while under thy husband, the Lord make thee

a curse and an oath among thy people, by the Lord making thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell ; and this water that causeth the curse, shall go into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell, and thy thigh to rot." To this the woman was to say, Amen, amen ; and the priest proceeding meanwhile on the supposition of the woman's innocence, was then to blot out the words of the curse with the bitter water, and afterwards to wave the offering of barley flour before the Lord, burning a portion of it on the altar ;—which done, he was to close the ceremony by giving the woman the remainder of the water to drink.

The most important part of the rite, undoubtedly, was the oath of purification. The spirit of the whole may be said to concentrate itself there. And, in accordance with the character generally of the Mosaic economy—a character that attached to the little as well as the great, to the individual as well as the general things belonging to it—the oath took the form of the *lex talionis* ; on the one side, announcing exemption from punishment, if there was freedom from guilt ; and on the other, denouncing and imprecating, when guilt had been incurred, a visitation of evil corresponding to the iniquity committed—viz. corruption and unfruitfulness in those parts of the body, which had been prostituted to purposes of impurity. The draught of water was added merely for the purpose of giving increased force and solemnity to the curse, and supplying a kind of representative agency for certifying its execution. It was called bitter, partly because the very subjection to such a humiliating service rendered it a bitter draught, and also, because it was to be regarded as (representatively) the bearer of the Lord's righteous jealousy against sin, and his readiness to be avenged of it ; hence also, the water itself was to be holy water, the more plainly to denote its connection with God ; and to be mingled with dust, the dust of God's sanctuary, in token of its being employed by God with reference to a curse, and to shew, that the person who really deserved it was justly doomed to share in the original curse of the serpent (Gen. iii. 14, comp. Ps. lxxii. 9. Mic. vii. 17.) Of course, the actual infliction of the curse depended upon the will and power of God, whose interference was at the time so solemnly invoked, and the action proceeded on the belief of a particular providence extending to individual cases, such as would truly distinguish between the righteous and the

wicked. But the whole Mosaic economy was founded upon this assumption, and justly—since that God, without whom a sparrow falleth not to the ground, could not fail to make his presence and his power felt among the people, upon whom he more peculiarly put his name; nor refuse to make his appointed ordinances of vital efficacy, when they were employed in the way and for the purposes to which he had destined them. From not being acquainted with the whole of the circumstances, the principle might often appear to men involved in difficulty as regarded its uniform application. But that it was, especially then, and, with certain modifications, is still, a principle in the divine government, no believer in Scripture can reasonably doubt.

The other and subordinate things in the ceremonial—such as the use of an *earthen* vessel to contain the water, the appointment of *barley-meal* for an offering, without oil or incense, and the uncovering of the woman's head—admit of an easy explanation. The two former, being the cheapest things of their respective kinds, were marks of abasement, and were intended to convey the impression, that every woman should regard herself as humbled, on whose account they had to be employed. The impression was deepened by the absence of oil, the symbol of the Spirit, and of incense, the symbol of acceptable prayer. By the uncovering of the head, this was still more strikingly signified, as it deprived the woman of the distinctive sign of her chastity, and reduced her to the condition of one who had either to confess her guilt, or of one on trial to establish her innocence. The only parts of the transaction that are attended with real difficulty, are those which concern the presentation of the corban of barley-meal. Many both defective and erroneous views have been given of what relates to these; but without referring more particularly to them, we simply state our substantial concurrence with the view of Kurtz (*Mosaische Opfer*, p. 326), who has placed the matter, we think, in its proper light. This offering, which in v. 25, is called "the jealousy offering," is also in v. 15, called expressly the woman's offering. And that it is to be identified with her, rather than with the man, is plain also from the circumstance, that she was appointed, during the administration of the oath, to hold this in her hands. Nor can we justly understand more by the direction in v. 15, to the man to bring it, than that, as the whole pro-

perty of the family belonged to him, he should be required to furnish out of his means what was necessary for the occasion. And as the woman was obliged to go with him to the sanctuary for this service, whenever the spirit of jealousy so far took possession of his mind, the offering, though more properly hers, might with perfect propriety be also called the offering of jealousy—being itself the offspring of the spirit of jealousy in the husband. The woman, as was stated, during the more important part of the ceremony, held the offering in her hands, while the priest held in his the water of the curse. The priest, then, appears as the representative and advocate of the man who holds his wife guilty, and, as such, fitly places himself before her with the symbol and pledge of the curse. The woman, on the other hand, maintaining her innocence, as fitly stands before him with the symbol of her innocence, the meat-offering, which was an image of good works, and hence could only be rendered by those who were in a full state of acceptance with God. As soon as the curse was pronounced, and the woman had responded her double Amen, then the articles changed hands. The priest received from the woman her meat-offering, waved and presented it to God, whose it is to try the reins; so that, if he found it a true symbol of her innocence, he might give her to know in her experience, that “the curse causeless should not come.” The woman, on her part, received from the priest the water of the curse, and drank it; so that, if it were a true symbol of her guilt, it might be like the pouring out of the Lord’s indignation in her innermost parts. Thus the matter was left in the hands of Him who is the searcher of hearts. If there was guilt before Him, then the offering was a remembrancer of iniquity; but if not, it would be a memorial of innocence, and a call to defend the just from false accusations of guilt. The whole service, viewed in respect to individuals, was fitted to convey a deep impression of the jealous care with which the holy eye of God watched over even the most secret violations of the marriage-vow, and the certainty with which he would avenge them. And viewed more generally, as an image of things pertaining to the entire commonwealth of Israel, it proclaimed in the ears of all the necessity of an unswerving and faithful adherence to covenant-engagements with God, otherwise the curse of indelible shame, degradation, and misery would inevitably befall them.

PURIFICATION FROM AN UNCERTAIN MURDER.

The rite appointed to be observed in this case so far resembles the preceding one, that they both alike had respect, not to the actual, but only to the possible guilt of the persons concerned. They differed, however, in the probable estimate that was formed of the relation of the parties to the hypothetical charge. The presumption in the last case was against the accused, here it is rather in their favour ; and so the rite in the one seemed more especially framed for bringing home the charge of iniquity, and in the other for purging it away. The rite in this case, however, should not be termed, as it is in the heading of our English bibles, and as it is also very commonly treated by divines, the *expiation* of an uncertain murder ; for there is no proper atonement prescribed. The law is given in Deut. xxi. 1-9, and is shortly this :—When a dead body was found in the field, in circumstances fitted to give rise to the suspicion of the person having come to a violent end, while yet no trace could be discovered of the murderer, it was then to be presumed, that the guilt attached to the nearest city, either by the murderer having come from it, or from his having found concealment in it. That city, therefore, had a certain indefinite charge of guilt lying upon it—indefinite as to the parties really concerned in the charge, but most definite and particular as regards the greatness of the crime involved in it, and the treatment due to the perpetrator. For deliberate murder the law provided no expiation. Even for the infliction of death, not deliberately, but by some fortuitous and unintentional stroke, it did not appoint any rite of expiation, but only a way of escape, by means of a partial exile. Here, therefore, where the question is respecting a murder, the prescribed ritual cannot contemplate a work of expiation. Nor is the language employed fitted to convey that idea. The elders of the city were enjoined to go down into a valley with a stream in it, bringing with them a heifer which had never been yoked, and there strike off its head by the neck. Then in presence of the priests, the representatives and ministers of God, they were to wash their hands over the carcase of the slain heifer in token of their innocence, and to say, “ Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O Lord, unto thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto

thy people of Israel's charge. And (it is added) the blood shall be forgiven them."

The forgiveness here meant was evidently forgiveness in the more general sense—the guilt in question would not be laid to the charge of the elders of the city, and the punishment due on account of it not inflicted upon them. They were personally cleared from the guilt, but the guilt itself was not atoned; there was a purgation, but not an expiation. And, accordingly, none of the usual sacrificial terms are applied to the transaction with the heifer. It is not called an oblation, a sacrifice, a sin or trespass-offering; nor was there any sprinkling of its blood upon the altar; and even the mode of killing it was different from that followed in all the proper sacrifices, not by the shedding of the blood, but by the lopping off of the head. Indeed, the process was merely a symbolical action of judgment and acquittal before the priests, not as ministers of worship, but as officers of justice. The heifer, young and unaccustomed to the yoke, therefore chargeable with no blame, was yet subjected to a violent death—a palpable representative of the case of the person whose life had been wantonly and murderously taken away. The carcase of this slain heifer is placed before the elders, and over it, as if it were the very carcase of the slain man, they wash their hands, and solemnly declare their innocence respecting the violent death that had been inflicted on him. The priests, sitting as judges, receive the declaration as satisfactory, and hold the city absolved of guilt. The washing of the hands in water was merely to give additional solemnity to this declaration, and exhibited symbolically what was presently afterwards announced in words. Hence, among other allusions to this part of the rite, the declaration of the Psalmist, "*I will wash mine hands in innocence*" (Ps. xxvi. 6); and the action of Pilate, when wishing to establish his innocence respecting the death of Jesus, though it cannot be considered as done with any allusion to the part here performed by the elders over the body of the heifer, yet serves to show how natural it was in the circumstances, according to the customs of antiquity. The leading object of the rite was to impress upon the people a sense of God's hatred of deeds of violence and blood, and make known the certainty with which he would make inquisition concerning such deeds, if they were allowed to proceed in the land. It was one of the fences thrown around the

second table of the law ; and if performed on all suitable occasions, must have powerfully tended to cherish sentiments of humanity in the minds of the covenant-people, and promote feelings of love between man and man.

ORDINANCE OF THE RED HEIFER.

The ordinance regarding the Red Heifer (described in Numb. xix.), had respect to actual defilements, though only of a particular kind, and to the means of purification from them. The defilements in question were such as arose from personal contact with the dead, such as the touching of a dead body, or dwelling in a tent where death had entered, or lighting on the bone of a dead man, or having to do with a grave in which a corpse had been deposited. In such cases a bodily uncleanness was contracted, which lasted seven days, and even then could not be removed but by a very peculiar element of cleansing, viz. the application of the ashes, mixed with water, of the body of a heifer, red-coloured, without blemish, unaccustomed to the yoke, burnt without the camp, and with cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet cast into the midst of the burning.

In regard, first, to the occasion of this very peculiar service, it will readily be understood, that, in accordance with the general nature of the symbolical institutions, the body stands as the representative and image of the soul, and its defilement and cleansing for actual guilt and spiritual purification. This, indeed, was clearly indicated in the ordinance being called "a purification for sin" (ver. 9). But it is the soul, not the body, which is properly chargeable with sin ; and the whole, therefore, of what is here described, was evidently intended to serve merely as the shell and outward representation of inward and spiritual realities. Divine truths and lessons were embodied in it for all times and ages. For, what according to the uniform language of scripture, is death ? It is the direful wages of sin—the visible, earthly recompense, with which God visits transgression ; and being in itself the end and consummation of all natural evils, the state from which flesh naturally and most of all shrinks with instinctive abhorrence, it is the proper image of sin, both as regards its universal prevalence and its inherent loathsomeness. This may be said of death only

in the aspect it carries to men's natural state and feelings ; and much more may the same be affirmed of it when viewed in connection with the Most High. It stands in utter contrariety to his blessed and glorious nature. For, it is his to have life in himself, and to be even so inseparably connected with the powers and elements of life, that no corruption can dwell in his presence. But death is the very essence of corruption ; it is therefore most abhorrent to his nature, and has been appointed as the proper doom of sin, the sign and evidence of sin's exceeding sinfulness.

This is the painful truth which lies at the foundation of the whole of this rite about the Red Heifer. It is a rite which presents in bold relief what was one grand design of the law's observances, the bringing of sin to remembrance, and teaching the necessity of men's being purified from its pollution. It is true there was no actual sin in simply touching a dead body, or being in the place where such a body lay. In the case of ordinary persons it was even a matter of duty to defile one's self in connection with the death of near relatives. But as the corporeal relations were here made the signs and interpreters of the spiritual, there was, in such cases, the coming, on the part of the living body, into contact with what bore on it the awful mark and impress of sin—a breathing of the polluted atmosphere of corruption, most alien to the region, full of incorruptible and blessed life, where Jehovah has his peculiar dwelling. Therefore, in a symbolical religion like the Mosaic, the neighbourhood or touch of a dead body, was most fitly regarded as forming an interruption to the intercourse between God and his people—as placing them in a condition of external unfitness for approaching the sanctuary of his presence and glory, or even for having freedom to go out and in among the living in Jerusalem. That sin, which is the bitter well-spring of death, is utterly at variance with the soul's peace and fellowship with God—that it should, therefore, be most carefully watched against and shunned—that on finding his conscience defiled with its pollution, the sinner should regard himself as incapacitated for holding intercourse with heaven, or performing any work of righteousness, and should betake himself without delay to the appointed means of purification,—these are the important and salutary truths which the Lord sought continually to impress upon the

people by means of the bodily defilements in question, and the channel provided for obtaining purification.

In regard now to the purifying apparatus, there are certainly some points connected with it, which it is scarcely possible to explain quite satisfactorily, and which probably refer to customs or notions too familiar and prevalent in the age of Moses to have then appeared at all strange or arbitrary. But the leading features of the ordinance would present, we conceive, little difficulty, were it not that the whole has been viewed in a somewhat mistaken light. Recent, as well as former, writers have generally gone on the supposition that the ideas concerning sin, and atonement or cleansing, are here represented in a peculiarly intense form, and that from this point of view everything must be explained. We regard the occasion as pointing rather in the opposite direction. It was not an ordinance strictly speaking for sin, but for a sort of incidental, corporeal connection with the effect and fruit of sin—the means of purification not from personal transgression, but from a merely external contact with the consequence of transgression—a symbolical ordinance of cleansing for what, in itself, was only a symbolical defilement. Directly, therefore, and properly it is the flesh and not the spirit that is concerned ; and we might certainly expect a marked inferiority in various respects between this ordinance, and such ordinances as were for deliverance from personal transgression. This is precisely what we find. The victim appointed was a female, while in all the proper sin-offerings for the congregation, a male, an ox, was required. And of this victim no part came upon the altar ; even the blood was only sprinkled before the tabernacle of the congregation, and that, not by the high-priest, but only by the son of the high-priest ; and while the carcase was burnt entire without the camp, not even the skin or the dung was removed from it. From the respect the offering had to bodily defilements, the priest and the other persons engaged in the work, contracted a similar defilement, and had to wash their clothes, and bathe themselves in water. That the ashes were regarded as in themselves clean, is obvious from a clean person being required to gather them up and put them in a clean place ; as also from their being the appointed means of purification. For this it was necessary that living or running water should be poured upon them ; and then during the seven days that the de-

filament from contact with the dead lasted, the persons or articles requiring it were twice sprinkled, first on the third, then on the seventh day ; after which the restraint was taken off, as to fellowship with the camp. The mixture of the ashes strengthened the cleansing property of the water, not, however (as Bähr thinks), by rendering it a sort of wash,—if that had been all, common ashes might have served the purpose—but rather from their connection with the sin-offering, through which the curse of death was taken away. And the bearing of the whole on Christian times, with respect to the higher work of Christ, is so plainly and distinctly intimated in the epistle to the Hebrews, that there is no need for any further comment : “ If the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God !” Whoever looks with this view to the ordinance, will see in it the perfect purity and completeness of Christ’s character, the corrupt and loathsome nature of that for which he died, the efficacy, and alone efficacy of his blood, so that he who has not this applied to his conscience must inevitably perish.

[We have taken little or no notice of some of the peculiarities connected with this ordinance, which have given rise to much discussion, but have, as yet, ended in no satisfactory result. The female sex of the victim (sufficiently accounted for, we trust, above), has been thought by Bähr to point to Eve, or the female sex generally, as the mother of life among men, and others have produced equally fanciful reasons. The colour was by the Jewish doctors accounted of such difficult interpretation, that they conceived the wisdom of Solomon to have been inadequate to the discovery of it. With Bähr it is the colour of blood, life : with Hengstenberg of sin, &c. And the latter recently, as well as many others in former times, have found an allusion in it to the Egyptian notion, that the evil god Typhon was of red colour, and the practice prevalent in Egypt of sacrificing red bullocks to him. Only, that the rite here might savour somewhat less of heathenism, not a bullock, but an heifer, was required, to discountenance the idolatrous veneration paid in Egypt to the cow. We deem it quite unnecessary to enter upon any exposure of such fanciful

notions. It was more likely, we conceive, that the colour should bear a respect to the body or flesh of man, for which immediately the offering was presented. Man's body having been taken from the ground, he was called *Adam* (אָדָם), and it is the same word, only differently pointed, so as to make it sound *edom*, which signified red—probably because the kind of redness denoted was a sort of ground or earth-colour. Without searching for any more recondite reasons, one can easily perceive a propriety in this particular victim being of such a colour, as it had more especially to represent and stand for the bodies of the people. However, no particular stress should be laid upon the circumstance. The burning along with the victim of cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool, has also given rise to a great variety of suppositions. The cedar from its loftiness, and the hyssop from its smallness, have been regarded by Hengstenberg (*Egypt and Books of Moses*, and again in *Commen. on Ps. li. 7*) as emblems, the one of the divine majesty, and the other of the divine condescension. But the supposition is quite arbitrary, and has nothing properly to support it in Scripture. Besides, it could scarcely be the lofty cedar, which was meant to be used in the ordinance, for such were not to be found in the desert; it must rather have been some species of juniper. (See *Bib. Cyclop. art. Eres*.) The hyssop, it would appear, was anciently thought to possess some sort of medicinal or abstergent properties, and on that account probably was so much used in purifications. It appears to have been generally used among the Hebrews in sprinklings, along with some portion of scarlet wool. (Comp. *Ex. xii. 22*; *Lev. xiv. 6, 7*; *Ps. li. 7*; *Heb. ix. 19*.) It is quite possible that notions and customs regarding these articles, of which now no certain information is to be had, may have led to their use on such occasions as the present. It would seem, however, from what is said in the case of the leper (*Lev. xiv. 6, 7*), that their use was merely to apply the cleansing or purifying element—the scarlet and hyssop being probably attached to a stick of cedar. On this account a portion of each was here burnt along with the carcase of the heifer, as the whole together were to furnish the means of purification. But it is needless to pursue the matter farther, as certainty is unattainable, and little comparatively depends on it for a general understanding of the purport and design of the ordinance.]

THE LEPROSY AND ITS PURIFICATION.

The case of the leper, with its appointed means of purification, stood in a very close relation to the one just considered, and the lessons taught in each are to a considerable extent the same. As disease generally is the fruit and evidence of sin, every form of disease might have been held to be polluting, and to have required separate purifications. This, however, would have rendered the ceremonial observances an intolerable burden. One disease, therefore, was chosen in particular, and that such an one as might fitly be regarded at the head of all diseases, the most affecting symbol of sin. This disease, that of leprosy, is described with much minuteness by Moses (Lev. xiii., xiv.), and various marks are given to distinguish it from others, which, though somewhat resembling it, yet did not possess its inveterate and virulent character. It began in the formation of certain spots upon the skin, small at first, but gradually increasing in dimensions ; at their first appearance of a reddish colour, but by and by presenting a white, scaly shining aspect, attended by little pain, but incapable of being healed by any known remedy. Slowly, yet regularly, the spots continued to increase, till the whole body came to be overspread with them, and assumed the appearance of a white, dry, diseased, unwholesome scurf. But the corruption extended inwardly while it spread outwardly, and affected even the bones and marrow ; the joints became first relaxed, then dislocated ; fingers, toes, and even limbs dropt off ; and the body at length fell to pieces, a loathsome mass of dissolution and decay. Such is the description of the disease given in Scripture, taken in connection with what is known of certain bodily disorders which still go by the name of leprosy. It was disease manifesting itself peculiarly in the form of corruption—a sort of living death.

Persons on whom any apparent symptoms were found of this disease, were ordered to go to the priests for inspection ; and if it was ascertained to be real leprosy, then the diseased was removed into a separate apartment, and shut out of the camp, or the city, as a person politically dead. So rigidly was this regulation enforced, that even Miriam, the sister of Moses, could not obtain exemption from it ; nor at a later period king Azariah,

since we are told, that from the time he was smitten with leprosy to the day of his death, "he dwelt in a several house" (2 Kings xv. 5)—literally, a house of emancipation, as one discharged from the ordinary service and occupations of the Lord's people. Even in the kingdom of Samaria, where the divine laws were by no means so strictly observed, the history presents to our view lepers dwelling in a separate house before the gate, which they were not permitted to leave even during the straitness of a siege. (2 Kings vii. xiii.) And that there was a place or hill set apart for such in Jerusalem, and called by their name, may be inferred from Jer. xxxi. 38, where mention is made of the hill Gareb, which means, the hill of the leprous.

Besides this careful separation of the leper, he was to carry about with him every mark of sorrow and distress, going with rent clothes, with bare and uncovered head, with a bandage on the chin or lip, and when he saw any one approaching, was to give timely warning of his condition by crying out, "Unclean, unclean!" Why, we naturally ask, all this in the case only of leprosy? It could not be simply because it was a severe and dangerous disease, for no other disease was ordered to have such signs of grief attached to it, nor did they give occasion to uncleanness, excepting the disorders connected with generation and birth—presently to be noticed. Neither could such singular precautions and painful treatment have been employed here on account of the infectious character of the disease, as if the great object were to prevent it spreading around. For, had that been all, several of the things prescribed would have been needless aggravations of the distress, such as the rent clothes, bare head, and covered chin; and, besides, the diseases which go by the name of leprosy, and which are understood to possess the same general character, though hereditary, are now known not to be infectious; while the really infectious diseases, such as fevers, or the plague, have no place whatever in the law, either as regards uncleanness or purification.

The only adequate reason that can be assigned for the manner in which leprosy was thus viewed and treated, was its fitness to serve as a symbol of sin, and of the treatment those who indulge in sin might expect at the hand of God. It was the visible sign and expression upon the living, of what God thought and felt upon the subject. Hence, when he manifested his righteous

severity toward particular persons, and testified his displeasure against their sins by the infliction of a bodily disease, it was in the visitation of leprosy that the judgment commonly took effect, as in the case of Miriam, Uzziah, and Gehazi. Hence, also, Moses warned the people against incurring such a plague (Deut. xxiv. 9); and when David besought the infliction of God's judgment upon the house of Joab, leprosy was one of the forms in which he wished it might appear. (2 Sam. iii. 29). So general was the feeling in this respect, that the leprosy were proverbially called *the smitten*, *i. e.* the smitten of God, and from the Messiah being described in Isaiah as so smitten, certain Jewish interpreters inferred that he would be afflicted with leprosy. (Hengst., *Christol.* on Isaiah liii. 4). Now, viewing the disease thus, as a kind of visible copy or image of sin, judicially inflicted by the immediate hand of God on the living body of the sinner, it is not difficult to understand how the leper especially should have been regarded as an object of defilement, as theocratically dead, until he was recovered and purified. He bore upon him the impress and mark of iniquity, the begun and spreading corruption of death, the appalling seal of Heaven's condemnation. He was a sort of death in life, a walking sepulchre (Spencer, "*sepulchrum ambulans*"), unfit while in such a state to draw near to the local habitation of God, or to have a place among the living in Jerusalem. And his exiled and separate condition, his disfigured dress, and lamentable appearance, while they proclaimed the sadness of his case, bore striking testimony at the same time to the holiness of God, and solemnly warned all who saw him to beware how they should offend against Him. But these things are written also for our learning, and the malady with its attendant evils, though no longer visible to the bodily eye, speaks still to the ear of faith. It tells us of the insidious and growing nature of sin, spreading, if not arrested by the merciful interposition of God, from small beginnings to an universal corruption—of the inevitable exclusion which it brings when indulged in, from the fellowship of God, and the society of the blessed—of the deplorable and unhappy condition of those who are still subject to its sway—and of the competency of divine grace alone to bring deliverance from the evil.

The purification of the leper had three distinctly marked stages. The first of these bore respect to his reception into the visible com-

munity of Israel, the next to his participation in their sacred character, and the last to his full re-establishment in the favour and fellowship of God. When God was pleased to recover him from the leprosy, and the priest pronounced him whole, before he was permitted to leave his isolated position outside the camp or city, two living clean birds were to be taken for him ; the one of which was then to be killed over a vessel of living or fresh water, so that the blood might intermingle with the water, and the other, after being dipt in this blood-water, was let loose into the open field. That the two birds were properly only one offering, like the two goats on the day of atonement, and that they represented the leper in his two different states, is clear as day. The death of the one imaged the doom that lay upon him on account of his impurity, and which was only prevented from taking full effect upon him by the special intervention of divine goodness. The dipping of the other bird in the blood of the former one, mingled with water, accompanied with the sprinkling of its blood on the leper himself, this represented his participation in the life that had been accepted for him—a life, as imaged in the other bird, of enlargement and freedom. As partaker in this new life, he saw in that bird's dismissal, to fly wherever it pleased among the other fowls of heaven, his own liberty to enter into the society of living men, and move freely up and down among them. But in token of his actual participation in the whole, and his being now separated from his uncleanness, he must wash his clothes and his flesh also, even shave his hair, that every remnant of his impurity might appear to be removed, and nothing be left to mar the freedom of his intercourse with his fellow-men.

In all this, however, there was no proper atonement, and though the ban was so far removed that the leper was now regarded as a living man, and could enter into the society of other living men, he was by no means admitted to the privileges of a member of God's covenant. He had to remain for an entire week out of his own dwelling. Then for his restoration to the full standing of an Israelite, he had to bring a lamb for a trespass-offering, another for a sin-offering, and another still for a burnt-offering, with the usual meat-offering, and a log of oil. The lamb for the trespass-offering and the log of oil were for his consecration—the second stage of the process ; and for this purpose they were first waved

before the Lord. Then with a portion of the blood of the trespass-offering, the priest sprinkled his right ear, the thumb of his right hand, the great toe of his right foot, repeating the same action afterwards with the oil, and pouring also some upon his head. This action with the blood and oil was much the same with that observed in the consecration of the priesthood ; but differed, in that the blood used on this occasion was that of a trespass-offering, whereas the blood used on the other was that of a peace-offering. The service still further differed, in that here the consecration came first, whereas as in the case of Aaron the sin and burnt-offering preceded it. The differences, however, are such as naturally arose out of the peculiar situation of the restored leper. As a man under the ban of God and the doom of death, he had lost his place in the kingdom of priests—the Lord's consecrated family. By a special act of consecration he must be received again into the number of this family, before he can be admitted to take any part in the usual services of the congregation. And the blood by which this was chiefly done, was most appropriately taken from the blood of a trespass or guilt-offering, because having forfeited his life to God, there was here, according to the general nature of such an offering, the payment of the required ransom, the (symbolical) discharge of the debt ; so that he was at one and the same time installed as the Lord's freeman, and consecrated for his service. The consecration of Aaron, on the other hand, was that of one who already belonged to the kingdom of priests, and only required an immediate sanctification for the peculiar and distinguished office to which he was to be raised. It, therefore, came last, and the blood used was fitly taken of the peace-offering. But when the recovered leper had been thus far restored—his feet standing within the sacred community of God's people, his head and members anointed with the holy oil of divine refreshment and gladness, he was now permitted and required to consummate the process by bringing a sin-offering, a burnt-offering, and a meat-offering, that his access to God's sanctuary, and his fellowship with God himself, might be properly established. What could more impressively bespeak the arduous and solemn nature of the work, by which the outcast, polluted and doomed sinner regains an interest in the kingdom and blessing of God ! The blood and Spirit of Christ, appropriated by a sincere repent-

ance and a living faith, this, but this, alone can accomplish the restoration. Till that is done, there is only exclusion from the family of God, and alienation from the life that is in him. But that truly done, the child of death lives again, he that was lost is again found.¹

DEFILEMENTS AND PURIFICATIONS CONNECTED WITH CORPOREAL,
ISSUES AND THE PROPAGATION OF SEED.

A considerable variety of prescriptions exist in the books of Leviticus and Numbers, relating to these defilements and purifications; but, for obvious reasons, we refrain from going into particulars, and content ourselves with giving their general scope and design. The laws upon the subject are to be found chiefly in the 12th and the 15th ch. of Leviticus, the one relating to the uncleanness arising from the giving birth to children, and the other to that arising from issues in the organs therewith connected. The impurities of this class were all more or less directly connected with the production of life. And it may seem strange, at first sight, that production and birth, as well as disease and death, should have been marked in the law as the occasions of defilement. It would be not only strange, but inexplicable, were it not for the doctrine of the fall, and the inherent depravity of nature growing out of it. By reason of this the powers of human life are tainted with corruption, and all that pertains to the production of life, as well as to its cessation, appears enveloped in the garments of impurity. That the whole was viewed in this strictly moral light, and not in relation to natural health or cleanliness, is evident—not only from the predominantly ethical character of the whole legislation of Moses, but also from the kind of purifications prescribed, in which *atonement* is spoken of as being made in behalf of the

¹ We have said nothing of what is called the leprosy of clothes and houses, for nothing certain is known of the thing itself—although Michaelis speaks dogmatically enough about both. The whole of what he says upon the leprosy is a good specimen of the thoroughly earthly tone of the author's mind; and if Moses had looked no higher than he represents him to have done, he would certainly have been little entitled to be regarded as a messenger of Heaven. The leprosy in garments and houses was evidently considered and treated as an image of that in man; and on that account alone was purification or destruction ordered. See Hengstenberg's *Christol.* on Jer. xxxi. 38; Baumgarten on Lev. xii. xiii.

parties concerned (Lev. xii. 6, xv. 30) ; and also from the references made to the cases under consideration in other parts of Scripture—as in Ezek. xxxvi. 17, Lam. i. 17—which point to them as defilements in a moral respect. There is no possibility of obtaining a satisfactory view of the subject, or accounting for the place assigned such things in the symbolical ritual of Moses, excepting on the ground of that moral taint, which was believed to pervade all the powers and productions of human nature, and thus regarding them as an external embodiment of the truth uttered by the Psalmist, “Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me” (Ps. ii. 5.) Some of the Hebrew doctors themselves have virtually expressed this idea, as in the following quotation produced from one of them by Ainsworth on Lev. xii. 4, “No sin-offering is brought but only for sin ; and it seemeth unto me, that there is a mystery in this matter, concerning the sin of the old serpent”—the sin, namely, introduced by the temptation of the old serpent, and in immediate connection with the moral weakness of the woman.

Indeed, it is by a reference to that original act of transgression that we can most easily explain, both the general nature of the legal prescriptions respecting defilements and purifications of this sort, and some of the more striking peculiarities belonging to them. In what took place in that fundamental transaction an image was presented of what was to be ever afterwards occurring. The woman having taken the leading part in the transaction, she was made to reap in her natural destiny most largely of its bitter fruits ; and that especially in respect to child-bearing : “Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception, and in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children.” No doubt, the evil originating in the fall was to cleave to the nature, and appear in the condition of each portion of the human family ; but in the female portion the signs of it were to be most apparent, and particularly in connection with the bearing of children. This one fact, prominently written in God’s word, and perpetually exemplified in history, sufficiently accounts for the peculiar stress laid on the case of the female in the regulations of the law. The occasions that called for purification on the other side, were comparatively rare ; but in hers they were of constant recurrence. And hence also, partly at least, is to be explained the difference in regard to the

continuance of the period of her uncleanness, when the birth was a female child, as compared with what it was at the birth of a male. In the one case a term of seven days only of total separation from the usual business and intercourse of life, and three and thirty more from the sanctuary ; but in the other a term of fourteen days of total separation, and sixty-six more from the sanctuary. It was not from any physical diversity in the cases, as regards the mother herself, that the two periods in the latter case were exactly the double of those in the former ; but because it was the birth of one of that sex, with which the signs of corruption in this respect were more peculiarly connected. Partly, we say, on this account, not wholly ; for the express mention of circumcision in the case of the male child (ch. xii. v. 3), seems plainly intended to ascribe to that circumstance a portion of the difference. The first stage of the mother's cleansing terminated with the circumcision of her son. On the eighth day he had the corruption of his fleshly nature (symbolically) removed, and stood, as it were, by himself, as the mother also by herself. The terms of separation, therefore, were fitly shortened, so as to make the one only a full week, and the other a full month. But in the case of a female child there was no ordinance to distinguish so precisely between the mother and her offspring ; and as if there were a prolonged connection in what occasioned the defilement, so there was for her a prolonged period of separation from social life, and access to the sanctuary. Together with the other circumstances referred to, this is enough to account for the seeming anomaly ; and serves also to render more obviously and conclusively certain the reference in the whole matter to moral considerations.

There is no necessity for enlarging on the prescribed means of purification. They were such, both in the case of men and women, as to bear distinct reference to guilt, and to renewed surrender to the Lord's service. A sin-offering, as well as a burnt-offering was necessary. But to render the way of pardon and acceptance open to all, turtle-doves or pigeons were allowed to be substituted for the more expensive offerings.

THE NAZARITE AND HIS OFFERINGS.

The institution of the Nazarite vow is introduced without any

explanation (Numb. vi.), either as to the manner or the reason of its original appointment; and some have hence inferred that its origin is to be sought in Egypt, and only its proper regulation to be ascribed to Moses. But no traces of it have been found among the antiquities of Egypt, nor could it properly exist there. The Nazarite was to be a living type and image of holiness, he was to be in his person and habits a symbol of sincere consecration and devotedness to the Lord. It was no mere ascetical institution, as if the outward bonds and restraints, the self-denials in meat and drink, were in themselves well-pleasing to the Lord. Such a spirit was as foreign to Judaism as it is to Christianity. The Nazarite was an acted, symbolical lesson in a religious and moral respect; and the outward observances to which he was bound, were merely intended to exhibit to the bodily eye the separation from every thing sinful and impure required of the Lord's servants.

The import of the name, Nazarite, is simply *the separate one*, and the vow he took—in all ordinary cases, voluntarily took—upon him, is said to have been (v. 2.) “for separating to the Lord.” What was implied in this separation? There must have been, unquestionably, a withdrawing from one class of things as unbefitting, that there might be the more free and devoted application to another class, as proper and becoming. And we shall best understand what both were by glancing at the requirements of the vow.

The first was an entire abstinence from all strong drink; from whatever was made of grapes—from grapes themselves, whether moist or dried, from everything belonging to the vine. There can be no doubt that it was the intoxicating property of the fruit of the vine, which formed the ground of this prohibition; for special stress is laid upon the strength of the drink; and as the vine in Eastern countries was the chief source of such drink (although other ingredients, it would seem, were sometimes added to increase the strength) not only wine itself, but the fruit of the vine in every shape, even in forms without any intoxicating tendency, was interdicted—that the separation might be the more marked and complete. A like abstinence was imposed upon the priests when engaged in sacred ministrations (Lev. x. 8). Like the ministering priest, the Nazarite was peculiarly separated to the Lord, and in his drink, not less than other things, he was to be an embodied

lesson, regarding the manner in which the divine service was to be performed. This service—such was the import of that part of the Nazarite institution—requires a withdrawal and separation from whatever unfits for active spiritual employment—from everything which stupifies and benumbs the powers of a divine life, and disposes the heart for carnal pleasure and excitement, rather than for sacred duty. There must, indeed, be a careful and becoming reserve in regard to the means and occasions of a literal intoxication; but not in respect to these alone. The more inward and engrossing love of money—the eager pursuit after worldly aggrandizement—or the delights of a soft and luxurious ease, may as thoroughly intoxicate the brain, and incapacitate the soul for spiritual employment as the more grovelling vice of indulgence to excess in liquor. From all such, therefore, the true servant of God is here warned to abstain, and admonished to keep his vessel, in soul and body, as holiness to the Lord.

The next thing exacted of the Nazarite was to leave his hair unshorn. And this was so different from the prevailing custom, yet so strictly enjoined upon him, that it might be regarded as the peculiar badge of his condition. Hence, if by accidentally coming into contact with any unclean object, his vow was broken, he had to shave his head and enter anew on his course of service. So also, when the period of the vow was expired, his hair was cropt and burned as a sacred thing upon the altar. Thus he was said to bear “the consecration (literally the separation, the distinctive mark, the crown) of his God upon his head.” The words readily suggest to us those of the apostle Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 10, and the appointment itself is best illustrated by a reference to the idea there expressed. Speaking of the propriety of the woman wearing long hair, as given to her by nature for a modest covering, and a token of subjection to her husband, the Apostle adds, that “for this reason she must have power upon her head;” *i. e.* (taking the sign for the thing signified, as circumcision for the covenant, Gen. xvii. 10), she must wear long hair, covering her head, as a symbol of the power under which she stands, a sign of her subjection to the authority of the man. For the same reason, because the hair did not cover the face, a veil was added, to complete the sign of subjection. But the man, on the other hand, having no earthly superior, and being in his manly freedom and dignity the

image of the glory of God, should have his face unveiled, and his hair cropt ; hence, it was counted even a shame, a renouncing of the proper standing of a man, a mark of effeminate weakness and degeneracy for men, like Absalom, to cultivate long tresses. But the Nazarite, who gave himself up by a solemn vow of consecration to God, and who should therefore ever feel the authority and the power of his God upon him, most fitly wore his hair long, as the badge of his entire and willing subjection to the law of his God. By the wearing of this badge he taught the church then, and the church, indeed, of all times, that the natural power and authority of man, which in nature is so apt to run out into self-will, stubbornness, and pride, must in grace yield itself up to the direction and supremacy of Jehovah. The true child of God has renounced all claim to the control and mastery of his own condition. He feels he is not his own, but bought with a price, and, therefore, bound to glorify God with his body and spirit, which are his.¹

The only other restriction laid upon the Nazarite, of a special kind, was in regard to contracting defilement from the dead ; for, like the priest, he was discharged from entering into the chamber of death and mourning for his nearest relatives. Separated for God, in whose presence death and corruption can have no place, the Nazarite must ever be found in the habitations and the society of the living. He must have no fellowship with what bore so distinctly impressed on it the curse and wages of sin. But this sin itself is, in the sphere of the spiritual life, what death is in the natural. It is the corruption and death of the soul. And as the Nazarite was here also an embodied lesson re-

¹ We deem this by much the most natural and appropriate view of the Nazarite's long hair. It is not a new one, but may be found (though only, indeed, as one among other reasons), in Ainsworth, and later commentators ; last and best in Baumgarten Comm. on Numb. vi. It also renders the best explanation of the loss of power in Samson, flowing from his allowing his hair to be shorn—for this, viewed in the light presented above, betokened the breaking of his allegiance to his God, ceasing to make God's arm his dependence, and God's will his rule.—The idea of Hengstenberg, Egypt, and Books of Moses, p. 190, that the long hair was a sign of the Nazarite's withdrawing from the world to give himself to the Lord, separating from the world's habits and business, is not sufficiently grounded ; more especially, as it does not appear that the Nazarite vow bound men actually to cease from worldly employments. The idea of Bähr, that the hair of men corresponds to the grass of the earth, the blossoms and leaves of trees, and thus imaged the spiritual blossoms and productions of men, the fruits of holiness—is too fanciful and far-fetched to commend itself to any one.

garding things spiritual and divine, he was a living epistle, that might be known and read of all men, warning them to resist temptation, and flee from sin—teaching them that, if they would live to God, they must walk circumspectly, and strive to keep themselves unspotted from the world.

Such persons in Israel must have been eminently useful, if raised up in sufficient number, and going with fidelity and zeal through the fulfilment of their vow, in keeping alive upon men's consciences the holy character of God's service, and stimulating them to engage in it. The Nazarites are hence mentioned by Amos along with prophets, as among the chosen instruments whom God provided for the good of his people, in proof of his covenant-faithfulness and love: "And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites" (ii. 11). They were a kind of inferior priesthood in the land—by their manner of life, as the priests, by the duties of their office, acting the part of symbolical lights and teachers to Israel. And the institution was farther honoured by being connected with three of the most eminent servants of God—Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist—on whom the vow was imposed from their very birth, to shew that they were destined to some special and important work of God. This destination to a high and peculiar service, in connection with the Nazarite vow, still more clearly indicated its symbolical character; the more so, as the end of the institution appears to be always the more fully realized, the higher the individual's calling, and the more entirely he consecrated himself to its fulfilment. Of the three Nazarites referred to, Samson was unquestionably the least, because in him the spiritual separation and surrender to the Lord was most imperfect; he did not resist the temptation to which his singular gift of corporeal strength exposed him, of trusting too much to self; and the gift, when exercised, led him to act chiefly on the lower and merely physical territory. Though in one respect a remarkable witness of the wonderful things which God could do even on that territory by a single instrument of working, he yet proved in another a sad monument of the inefficacy of such instruments to regenerate and save Israel. A far higher manifestation of divine power and goodness developed itself in Samuel, by whom, more than all the other judges, the cause of God was revived; and a higher yet

again in John the Baptist. But highest and greatest of all was Jesus of Nazareth, in whom the idea of the Nazarite rises to its grand and consummate realization—although in this, as in other things, the outward symbol was dropt, as no longer needed. In him alone has one been found who was “holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners,” light of light, perfect even as the Father is perfect, so that, without the least flaw of sin or failing of weakness, he executed immeasurably the mightiest undertaking that ever was committed to the charge of a messenger of Heaven.

The offerings prescribed for the Nazarite, refer to two points in his history—to his contracting defilement, whereby the vow was broken, and to the period of its fulfilment. In the first case he had to bring a lamb for a trespass-offering, having, like the leper, contracted a debt in the reckoning of God, by which he became liable to judgment, and so requiring to be discharged from this bond, before anything could be accepted at his hands. One pigeon, or turtle-dove, for a sin-offering, and another for a burnt-offering, had also to be brought, that he might enter anew on his vow, as from the starting-point of full peace and fellowship with God; and the time past being all lost, his hair had to be cut or shaved, to mark the entirely new commencement. Then, when his period of consecration was finished, he had to bring a whole round of offerings—a sin-offering, in token that, however carefully he might have kept himself for the Lord, sin had still mingled itself with his service, and that he was far from having anything to boast of before God—a burnt-offering, to indicate his desire that not only the sins of the past might be blotted out, but that the imperfection of his obedience to the will of God might be supplemented by a more full, an entire surrender; lastly, a peace-offering, with various kinds of bread and drink-offerings (including wine, of which he also now partook), to manifest that he ceased from his peculiar state of consecration, and entered upon the more ordinary path of dutiful obedience, in settled friendship and near communion with God.

DISTINCTIONS OF CLEAN AND UNCLEAN IN FOOD.

The distinctions made in the Mosiac law, regarding food, are

quite analogous in their nature to some of the prescriptions already noticed under the preceding heads, and stand also in several respects very closely related to the sacrificial institutions. From this latter respect, certain portions of all animals were forbidden to be used as food—the blood, the fat that covered the inwards, probably also these inwards themselves, and the tail of the sheep, which, in the Syrian sheep is a mass of fat. These were the parts which were set apart in sacrifice for the altar of the Lord, and were hence regarded as too sacred for common use (Lev. iii. 17, xvii. 11). Why such parts in particular were devoted to the altar, has already been considered.—With the exception of the parts just mentioned, the bodies of all creatures, that could be used in sacrifice, were considered as clean and given for food. More, indeed, than these ; for the permission extended to all animals that at once chew the cud and divide the hoof, comprising chiefly the ox, sheep, goat, and deer species—to such fish as have both fins and scales—and in regard to fowls, though no general rule is given, but only individuals are mentioned, yet it would appear that such as feed on grain or grass were allowed. All others, such as birds of prey, feeding on other birds or carrion, or fish, or insects, serpents, and creeping things, fishes without scales or fins, and animals that do not both divide the hoof and chew the cud, were accounted unclean, and expressly forbidden.¹

Now, in thinking of what was thus prohibited and allowed in respect to food, we can see at a glance, that the restrictions could not have been issued for the purpose properly of forming a check upon the gratification of the palate. The articles permitted, include, with very few exceptions, all that the most refined and civilized nations still choose for their food. And whether from a certain natural correspondence between the bodily taste, and the kinds of meat in question, or from these possessing the qualities best adapted for food and nourishment, or perhaps from both together, it is at least manifest, that the restrictions under which the Israelites were here laid, imposed upon them no heavy burden ;

¹ There is very considerable difficulty in making out the precise species of birds interdicted. Several of the modern names given to them, are given merely on the authority of the rabbinical writers, which is not greatly to be depended on. There are twenty in all named ; and even as given in our English Bibles, they are, with scarcely an exception, such as are in modern times thought unfit as articles of diet.

and that practically they were allowed to eat nearly all that it was desirable or proper for them to consume.¹

Some commentators have rested the whole matter upon this ground ; and have thought that the prohibition to use other kinds of flesh was sufficiently accounted for, by those allowed being the most easy of digestion, the fullest of nourishment, the best adapted to prevent disease, and promote a healthful state of body. In these respects the kinds permitted were certainly of the highest order ; but this is the whole that can be said, as some of those prohibited were not absolutely either distasteful or unhealthy. And it was a proof of the divine wisdom and goodness in this part of the legal arrangements, that the articles appointed for food were among the best which the earth affords. But higher grounds than this must have entered into the distinction ; otherwise, the line of demarcation would not have been drawn as between clean and unclean, but rather as between wholesome and unwholesome. That the different species permitted were pronounced clean, this evidently brought them within the territory of religion—defilement, excision, death was the consequence of trespassing the appointed landmarks (Lev. xi. 43-47). The law respecting the two classes is made to rest, in the passage referred to, upon the same footing with all the rights and institutions of Judaism, viz., the holiness of God, demanding a corresponding holiness on the part of his people. So that the outward distinctions could only have been intended to be observed as symbolical of something inward and spiritual. Of what, then, symbolical ?

If we look to the Jewish doctors for the answer, we shall certainly find, that they understood by the unclean animals different

¹ The kind of flesh that seems principally to form an exception is pork, which is now in common use, and yet was forbidden food to the Israelites. Indeed, it was regarded as so peculiarly forbidden, that it was sometimes put as the representative of whatever is most foul and abominable (Isa. lxxv. 4, lxxvi. 3, 17.) But though in common use now, it is still esteemed an inferior sort of butcher-meat, and chiefly consumed by persons in humble life. And the special dislike to it among the Israelites probably arose in part from their connection with Egypt, where, though once a year every house sacrificed a pig to Osiris, yet the animal itself was accounted unclean, and the swineherds formed an inferior race, with whom the other tribes would not intermarry, and who were not permitted even to enter the temples of the gods ; see Heeren, Afr. ii. p. 148 ; Wilkinson, i. 239, iii. 34, iv. 46. The filthy habits of the sow also rendered it a very natural and fitting image of what is impure. Reference to this is expressly made in Prov. xxvi. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 22.

sorts of people, with whom the Jews were to have no communion, as between brethren—such as the Babylonians, Medes, Persians, Romans, &c. And we can readily perceive how the restrictions in question would, in point of fact, operate to prevent any free and friendly intercourse at meals ; for at the table of a heathen, not only might the eye of a Jew be offended by seeing articles served up for food, which his law taught him to regard as abominations, but he would scarcely feel at liberty to taste of others, lest in the preparation the flesh had not been carefully separated from the blood and fat. Practically, there can be no doubt, the distinctions as to clean and unclean, lawful and unlawful in food, did, to a great degree, cut off the Jews from social intercourse in meat and drink from the rest of the world. But if we ask, why the forbidden articles of diet should have represented idolatrous nations, rather than any other sources of defilement within the land of Israel itself ? or what fitness there was in the particular things prohibited for food, to stand as images of the persons or things to be shunned in the daily intercourse of life ? We shall look in vain for any satisfaction to the Jewish doctors, nor is it possible to find this by treading in their footsteps.

We must look somewhat deeper ; and if we do, the leading principles, at least, of the distinction, will be found intelligible enough, and in perfect accordance with the general spirit of the Mosaic economy. The body requires food ; and as in all its relations, the body was made to image relations of a higher and more important nature, so, in particular, the manner it was dealt with in respect to food, must be of a kind fitted to represent what concerned the proper sustenance and enjoyment of the soul. The food, therefore, could not be everything that might come in the way, capable of being turned into an article of diet ; for in a fallen world the soul that would be in health and prosper, must continually exercise itself to a choosing between the evil and the good. Hence, to present a shadow of this in the lower province of the bodily life, there must here also be an evil and a good—a permitted and a forbidden—a class of things to be taken as lawful and proper, and another class to be rejected as abominable. It must also be God's own word, which should regulate the distinction, which should single out and sanctify certain kinds of food from the animal creation (within which alone the distinction

could properly be drawn), for the comfortable support of the body. But in doing this, the word of God did not act capriciously or without regard to the natural constitution or fitting order of things ; and while it prescribed with an absolute authority what should or should not be eaten, it selected in each department for man's use the highest of its kind—whatever it was best and most agreeable to its nature to partake of. But in choosing out such things, in the sphere of the bodily life, putting on them a stamp of sacredness, that they might be adapted to the use of a consecrated people, and commanding them to look upon all that lay beyond as common and unclean, what was it but to make the things of that lower sphere speak as a kind of elbow monitor in regard to the higher ? to bring perpetually to the remembrance of the covenant-people, that they must restrain and regulate the dispositions of their nature, and that, surrounded as they were on every hand with the means and occasions of evil, they must be ever directed by a spiritual taste, formed after the pattern of the law of God ? It said—it says still, for though the outward ordinance is gone, its spiritual meaning remains—Child of God, thou must put a bridle in thy mouth, and a rein upon the neck of thy lust ; thy path must be chosen with the most careful discrimination, and a holy reserve maintained in thy intercourse with the objects and beings around thee. For the world has a thousand channels through which to pour in upon thee its pollution, and separate between thy soul and God. Let his word, therefore, in all things be thy directory ; make the precepts of his mouth thy choice ; and since “evil communications corrupt good manners,” set a watch upon thy companionships as well as thy doings—go not in the way of sinners, nor be desirous to eat of their dainties, for righteousness has no part with unrighteousness, and the companion of fools shall be destroyed.

Taking this view of the ordinance, we get at once at the root of the matter, and have no need to search for recondite and fanciful reasons in the scales and fins, or the chewing of the cud, and the dividing of the hoof. Neither do we need to stop at the merely external, and, in part, arbitrary distinction between one nation and another ; for we have here a principle which comprehends that and much more within its bosom. We see also how completely the Jews of our Lord's time erred regarding this ordinance,

from their carnal sense and want of spiritual insight. They erred here, as in other things, by resting in the mere outward distinction—as if God cared with what sort of flesh the body was sustained ! or as if the holiness he was mainly in quest of, depended upon the things which ministered to men's corporeal necessities ! Gross and carnal in their ideas, they knew not that God is a spirit, who, in all his ordinances, deals with men as spiritual beings, and seeks to form them to the love and practice of what is morally good. Christ, therefore, sharply rebuked their folly, and declared with the utmost plainness, that defilement in the eye of God is a disease and corruption of the heart, and that not the kind of food which enters into the body, but the kind of thoughts and affections which come out of the soul, is what properly renders men clean or unclean. This obviously implied that the outward distinction was from the first appointed only for the sake of the spiritual instruction it was fitted to convey. It implied, further, that the outward, as no longer needed, and as now rather tending to mislead, was about to vanish away, that the spiritual and eternal alone might remain. And the vision shortly after unfolded to St Peter, with the direction immediately following, to go and open the door of faith to the Gentiles, as in God's sight on a footing with those who had eaten nothing common or unclean, made it manifest to all, that as at first the outward symbol had been established for the sake of the spiritual reality, so again for the sake of that reality, which could now be better secured otherwise, the symbol was finally and for ever abolished.

By looking back upon this ancient ordinance, the follower of Christ may be taught to remember : 1. That he is constantly in danger of contracting spiritual defilement, through the love of improper objects, or entering into unhallowed alliances. 2. That he is therefore bound to exercise himself to watchfulness, and to practise self-denial, apart from which the graces of religion can never grow and flourish in the world. 3. But that still, so far from losing by this restraint and discipline of his nature, he is a gainer in everything essential to his real happiness and well-being. The Lord withholds nothing that is good ; and the enjoyments he does interdict are only such dangerous and hurtful gratifications, as never fail to bring with them a painful recompense of evil.

SECTION NINTH.

THE STATED SOLEMNITIES AND FEASTS—THE WEEKLY SABBATH—THE
 FEAST OF THE PASSOVER—OF PENTECOST—OF TRUMPETS (NEW MOONS)
 —THE DAY OF ATONEMENT—THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES—THE SAB-
 BATIONAL YEAR, AND YEAR OF JUBILEE.

THE name of Feasts, which in modern times is generally applied to the sacred seasons and religious meetings of the people of Israel, is far from conveying a correct idea of their nature and design. The most general designation applied to them in Scripture itself is *moadeem* (מוֹעֵדִים), which properly signifies *assemblies*. And the reason why they were so called is given both at the beginning, and again at the close of the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus, which professedly treats of the sacred festivals; they were so called, because they were the occasions on which assemblies were to be held for religious purposes: "The *moadeem* of Jehovah, on which ye shall call holy convocations, these are the *moadeem*" (v. 2, 4, 37). In this most general view, therefore, they should rather be called the stated solemnities of the Israelites, or their seasons for social and public worship, than feasts. It is under that aspect, principally, that they are considered in the chapter of Leviticus referred to; and hence, the weekly Sabbath there takes precedence of all, because it was the primeval day of sacred rest, of spiritual enjoyment, and divine blessing, "a Sabbath of sabbatism, a convocation of holiness." This being the primary and leading character of the stated solemnities of the Mosaic religion, the notion is as groundless as it is derogatory to the character of the Mosaic institutions, which has been so zealously espoused and propagated by many divines on the continent. viz. that the Jewish festivals were chiefly of a political and economic character, and that people met together upon them, not for such grave and ungenial work as hearing sermons and taking

part in strictly religious exercises, but rather for good cheer, neighbourly intercourse, and purposes of commerce.¹ It was, no doubt, one of the designs of the greater solemnities, which required the attendance of the people at the sacred tent, that the oneness of the nation might be maintained and cemented together, by statedly congregating in one place, and with one soul taking part in the same religious services. "But that oneness was primarily and chiefly a religious, and not merely a political one; the people were not simply to meet as among themselves, but with Jehovah, and to present themselves before him as one body; the meeting was in its own nature a binding of themselves in fellowship with Jehovah; so that it was not politics and commerce that had here to do, but the soul of the Mosaic dispensation, the foundation of the religious and political existence of Israel, the covenant with Jehovah. To keep the people's consciousness alive to this, to revive, strengthen, and perpetuate it, nothing could be so well adapted as meetings of the kind referred to."²

That there might be time and opportunity for these holy convocations or religious assemblies, there was of necessity connected with all of them, a cessation of ordinary labour, a season of sacred rest. Besides the seventh day Sabbath, there were of such seasons connected with the stated solemnities, two days at the feast of the Passover (the first and the last,) one at Pentecost, one at the feast of Trumpets, the day of annual atonement, and two at the feast of Tabernacles (the first and last). As these days plainly took their character from the weekly Sabbath, the rest belonging to them is undoubtedly to be regarded as of the same nature, and carrying the same import with it. Now the rest of the Sabbath, as formerly observed, was throughout *sacred* rest, given to be enjoyed, and commanded to be observed by the people, because "Jehovah was He that sanctified them." It must, therefore, have been designed to be not of a negative kind merely, but also positive; not a simple withdrawal from ordinary employment, but this

¹ See, for example, Herder, *Ebr. Poesie*, i. p. 116, Michaelis, *Comm. on Laws of Moses*, art. 194, who with great redundancy tells us how jovially such seasons were spent, how the time was sported away in social enjoyment, feasting, dancing, marketing, &c., and who can think of no better excuse for modern sermonizing on Sundays, than that the Bible is an old book, and needs some explanation. Also de Wette, *Archæologie*, § 217.

² Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p. 543.

only that employment of another and higher kind might proceed. The resting in such a case must be no carnal repose or idleness, far less any letting out of the desires on sensual and worldly enjoyments, but a return of the heart to Him, who is the one great centre of its being, and its only proper resting-place. Hence, all true blessedness has from the first presented itself as an entering into the rest of God. But the cares, the labours, and the comforts of life, however in themselves lawful, or even necessary, all tend to carry the soul out of itself, and away from God. When occupied with these, it has to do with things which are of an inferior nature, and in themselves uncertain and changeable—things which are utterly incapable of bringing it to a state of heavenly repose and satisfaction, but are rather calculated to retain it in a state of *unrest*, because withdrawing its regard from the one absolute and supreme Good, and scattering its desires on things comparatively vain and worthless. The holy rest, therefore, enjoyed in God's Sabbath, and other seasons consecrated to a sacred use, was not so much a relief from toil, as a return to God himself, to blessed communion and intercourse with Him, as the only centre of created being, and the source of all excellence and bliss.

But for this high end the holy convocations or assemblies were an important and essential means ; through these, as one main channel, would the soul seek to attain to its proper rest. Such religious meetings and employments, so far from standing in any sort of antagonism to the true repose of the Sabbath, were most strictly connected with it, and necessary to it. Mainly by such meetings and employments, promoting the soul's fellowship with God, and interest in His blessing, the external rest was converted into a holy Sabbath. Nor is it anything against this view, that both the weekly Sabbath and the holy-days are spoken of as days of refreshment and delight (Numb. x. 10 ; Isa. lviii. 13, 14). For, though they would certainly be quite otherwise, if spent as we suppose, to those whose hearts were alienated from the life of God, yet to the true members of the covenant, who knew how to regard God as their Father and their portion, the religious exercises of the day would not only consist with, but most materially contribute to their real satisfaction and spiritual comfort. Like David, they would account these among their highest privileges

and happiest moments ; and would deplore nothing more than their exclusion, by any untoward event in providence, from the fellowship of those who kept holy-day before the Lord. Accordingly, at the first great celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles in the days of Ezra, we are expressly told, "there was very great gladness;" while yet we learn that, from the first day to the last, they read out of the book of the law of God (Neh. viii. 17, 18). It is true, we find no prescription in the law, as to the way in which these holy assemblies, either on the weekly Sabbath or at the annual feasts, were to be conducted. But neither do we find any express legislation regarding such meetings in New Testament times, while yet nothing can be more certain than that they were intended to be held, and negligence in attending them is even marked as a piece of disorderly behaviour (Heb. x. 25). Under both dispensations alike it was left to the Church herself, through her constituted authorities, to make suitable arrangements for the due celebration in public of divine worship, as also to her members generally for the proper employment of the remaining portions of sacred time, so as to secure the general design of their appointment. That the days of holy rest were actually so kept by the pious members of the covenant, is manifest from various incidental allusions occurring in Old Testament Scripture ; such as the familiar references made to "the congregations," "the calling of assemblies," "the solemn meetings," and the custom in later times of going even considerable distances to wait on the ministrations of the prophets on Sabbath days and new moons (2 Kings iv. 23 ; Isa. i. 13 ; Ps. lxxxii. 3). And if we read of no places, like the synagogues of a later age, being appropriated to such meetings, it must be remembered how long it was, even in the Christian Church, before buildings were erected and set apart for worshipping assemblies, how long upper chambers, schools, and other private apartments were used for such purposes. Besides, if we think of the immense numbers of priests and Levites scattered through the land, which might easily have afforded one to every twenty or thirty of the population, capable of attending any meeting for worship, and the character of the religion itself, which admitted of comparatively little of direct instruction, we shall readily perceive that the sacred assemblies, held at a distance from the tabernacle, must have been of a more conver-

sational character, and consisted more of outward and social exercises of devotion, than can be fitly introduced now into the worship of Christian congregations. But that it was the design of the Lawgiver they should be held, we conceive he has put beyond all reasonable doubt, by marking every weekly and extraordinary Sabbath as a day for holy convocations; while the avowed reason and design of appointing such days clearly inferred the obligation of spending the time generally in such employments and exercises, whether public or private, as were fitted to promote the soul's establishment and growth in holiness.¹

¹ We hold it, therefore, to be an entire error in Bähr to speak of the "weekly Sabbath as simply a day of rest," distinguished from other days merely by the cessation from bodily labour, and the doubling of the daily burnt-offering at the tabernacle (ii. p. 566, 578). How such a day could promote, and be one of the most important means of promoting the real sanctification of the people, the learned author has not told us. He leaves the practical bearing of this part of his views, as of most others, a fearful blank; and with all his contendings for a high religious sense, gives no doubtful indications that he would be satisfied with a very low religious practice. It is striking in this connection that, while he strongly repudiates the low and more broadly marked neological views of George, regarding the Feasts and the Books of Moses, this latter author maintains practically a much higher standard upon the proper observance of the sacred times.—See especially p. 161 and 202 of his work, *Die alten Jüd. Feste*. The right view, as we judge, is defended at considerable length by Meyer, *De Temp. Sac. et Festis diebus Heb. P. II. c. 9*, where also strong arguments are produced against Vitringa, for holding that even synagogues existed before the captivity; at least, that places for religious meetings were common. More recently, the correct view on this branch of the subject is also set forth and at considerable length vindicated by Hengstenberg, in his treatise, *Ueber den Tag des Herrn*, p. 20, sq. He holds, from what is written in the Law itself, that the Sabbath was never meant to be restricted to bodily rest; and that persons might be guilty of Sabbath-breaking who preserved the outward rest most scrupulously.—Profesor Stuart of Andover, in a work otherwise full of useful matter, on the Old Testament Canon, seems even to make a merit of depreciating the Mosaic institutions as to their fitness for instructing the people and training them to religious habits, p. 66, ss. He says it lies on the face of the whole Jewish history that, before the Babylonish exile, "they had not only no synagogues, but no public, social, devotional worship;" that priests and Levites had no charge to instruct the people; and that "there is not a word in all the Pentateuch of command to the Hebrews to keep the Sabbath by attendance on public worship." What, then, can possibly be meant by its being called a day "for holy convocations?" For what were holy convocations to meet, but for worship? And if God had never given such holy assemblies, how could he again in his anger threaten to take them away? See Hos. ii. 13, and Hengs. Christol. there. Certainly, if Moses delivered so many laws connected with the worship and service of God, and suspended the very existence of the people on their fidelity in keeping them, while yet he provided no teachers, no stated times of worship, no adequate means of instruction whatever, even though he had forty long years to think of it, he must have had no great measure of human sagacity,

The weekly Sabbath, beside being set apart as consecrated time, to be occupied as much as possible in holy convocations, spiritual exercises, and domestic instruction, was distinguished by the offering up of two lambs for a burnt-offering, instead of one, with a proportionally increased meat-offering. This farther marked it out as a day which the Lord set apart for himself, and appropriated for honourable and spiritual employment. A still farther note of distinction was the weekly renewal of the shew-bread on the Sabbath. And as the shew-bread symbolized good works, the perpetual renewal of it on that day pointed to the connection between well-spent Sabbaths and the proper cultivation of righteousness throughout the week. It was by observing that day as one of holy consecration to the Lord, that the church was to become periodically refreshed and invigorated for the active service of God. And in that respect the ordinance teaches an important lesson still ; and shews how little we may expect lives of piety and worth apart from the due observance of the Lord's day.—But we proceed now to what are more properly understood by the name of feasts, and which, as we have seen, were all called *moadeem*, from having one day, if not more, of holy convocations connected with them.

THE FEAST OF THE PASSOVER.

This, in point of order, was the first of all the feasts. It could be held only in the place where the altar and house of God were stationed, and all the males—with such females, of course, as could conveniently accompany them—were ordered to repair thither at the appointed time for its celebration. This time was the month Abib (literally the ear-month, when the corn was in the ear), the first month in the Jewish calendar, and usually commencing somewhere between the beginning and middle of our April. The actual commencement, as in all the other Jewish months, was determined by the moon. On the tenth day of that month, each head of a household was required to separate a kid, or a lamb, commonly the latter, without blemish, and on the four-

to say nothing of divine wisdom. With Professor Stuart's views, we should tremble for our own belief in the divine mission of the Jewish Lawgiver.

teenth to kill it toward the evening (literally between the evenings, *i. e.* late in the afternoon, at the very close of the fourteenth day, but as it would be some time before it could be prepared for being eaten, and as the Jewish day terminated with sunset, while the lamb was sacrificed on the fourteenth, the feast on the sacrifice did not take place till the fifteenth.)¹ The blood was given to the priests to sprinkle upon the altar, which determined it to be a sacrifice; and, indeed, the Lord emphatically calls it in two places *my sacrifice* (Ex. xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25, see Ainsworth, Rivet, in loc., and Hengstenberg, Authen. ii. p. 372). It was that sacrifice, in consideration of which the Lord saved Israel as a people, and gave them a national existence. The body of the lamb was immediately roasted entire, none of its bones being allowed to be broken, nor its flesh to be boiled; if any portion should remain uneaten, to prevent it from seeing corruption, or being put to a common use, it was to be consumed with fire.

At the original institution the Israelites were commanded to eat the passover with their loins girt, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand; but this appears to have been enjoined only in consideration of the circumstances in which they were then placed, as ready to take their departure from Egypt, and, like the sprinkling of the blood on the door-posts, seems afterwards to have been discontinued. The only permanent accompaniments of the feast appear to have been the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs, with which the lamb was to be eaten. So strict was the prohibition regarding leaven, that they were ordered to make the most careful search for it in their several dwellings before the slaying of the paschal lamb; so that it might not be killed *upon* leaven (as the expression literally is, in the passage last referred to), that there might be nothing of this about them at the time of the sacrifice. And the prohibition extended throughout the whole of the seven days, during which the feast lasted; whence it was so frequently called the feast of unleavened bread. Finally, in addition to the daily offerings for the congregation, there was presented on each of the seven days a goat for a sin-offering, and

¹ Bib. Cyclopædia, art. Passover, errs in saying that the feast of unleavened bread did not commence till next morning. It began with the eating of the lamb on the preceding evening when the fifteenth day of the month began.

two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs for a burnt-offering, with meat and drink-offerings.

The feast was, in the first instance, of a commemorative character, being intended to keep in everlasting remembrance the execution of judgment upon Egypt by the slaying of the first-born, and the consequent liberation of Israel from the house of bondage. But why so especially commemorate that event? Because it formed the birth, in a manner, of their existence as a people. It was the stretching out of Jehovah's arm to save them from destruction, and vindicate them to himself as a peculiar treasure above all the nations of the earth. The Lord then did what he afterwards declared by the prophet he had done, "I have formed thee, O Jacob, I have redeemed thee, O Israel, thou art mine." Above all others, then, this event deserved to be embalmed in the hearts of the people, and held in everlasting remembrance.

But while thus instituted to commemorate the past, the ordinance of the Passover at the same time pointed to the future. It did this partly in common with all other judgments upon the adversary, and deliverances to God's people. For what Bacon said of history in general—"All history is prophecy"—holds with special application to these portions of it. They are the manifestations of God's character in his relation to his covenant-people; and that character being unchangeably the same, he cannot but be inclined substantially to repeat for them in the future what he has done in the past. Hence we find the inspired writers, in the Psalms and elsewhere, when feeling their need of God's interposition in their behalf, constantly throwing themselves back upon what he had formerly done in avenging the enemies of his church, and delivering her from trouble; assured that He who had so acted once, had in that given them a sure warrant to look for a like procedure again. But another and still higher element of prophetic import mixed with the singular work of God, which gave rise to the institution of the passover. For the earthly relations then existing, and the operations of God in connection with them, were framed on purpose to represent and foreshadow corresponding, but immensely superior ones, connected with the work and kingdom of Christ. And as all adverse power, though rising here to its most desperate and malignant working, was destined to be put down by Christ, that the salvation of his church might be finally and for

ever accomplished, so the redemption from the land of Egypt, with its ever recurring memorial, necessarily contained the germ and promise of this ; the lamb perpetually offered to commemorate the past, pointed the expecting eye of faith to the Lamb of God, one day to be slain for the yet unatoned sins of the world ; and only when it could be said " Christ our passover has been sacrificed for us," did the purpose of God, which lay enclosed as an embryo in the paschal institution, become fully developed.

This twofold bearing runs also through the subordinate and accompanying arrangements. The lamb had to be prepared for food to those in whose behalf its blood was accepted, that the sacrifice, by which they were ransomed from destruction, might become to them the food of a new and better life.¹ And for this purpose the lamb must be preserved entire, and roasted, so that it might not be served up to them in a mutilated form, nor have part of its substance wasted by being boiled in water. Itself whole and undivided, it was to be partaken of at one and the same time by entire households, and by an entire community, that all might realize their divine calling to the same life, and the oneness, as well as completeness of the means, by which it was procured and sustained. So also, in the higher things of Christ's work and kingdom, while he gave himself unto death for sinners, and suffered the doom he voluntarily took upon him amid the furious assaults of men and devils, yet a special providence secured that his body, after it had received the stroke of death, should be dealt with as a sacred thing, and be preserved free from mutilation or violence—the sign and token of its preciousness in the sight of the Father, and of the completeness of the redemption it had been given to provide. But this Saviour, even in death whole and undivided, must also be received as such by his people. No more in their experience, than in his own person, can he be divided. He is in the fulness of his perfected redemption, the one bread of life ; and

¹ It was in this personal eating of the flesh by each household, rather than the killing of the victim, that the people exercised a priestly dignity at the annual celebration of the Passover. At the original celebration, a separate priesthood had not yet been appointed, and so each head of a household did the whole. But afterwards, the priests alone could sprinkle the blood, though the households still ate the flesh of the sacrifice. We mention this in qualification of the opinion of Philo, formerly quoted, which erroneously makes the mere killing a priestly act.

by partaking of this in a simple and confiding faith, thus, but no otherwise, do sinners become in him one bread and one body—possessors of his life, and fellow-heirs of his glory (1 Cor. x. 17 ; John vi. 43–57).

The bitter herbs, with which the lamb was to be eaten, may possibly have borne some respect to the affliction and bondage, which the Israelites had endured in Egypt. So most of the Jewish, and many also of the Christian commentators, appear to have understood them. But we should rather regard them as pointing, at least chiefly, to that intermingling of sorrow and grief, amid which the soul enters into the fellowship of the life out of death. The life itself, when fairly rooted and grounded in the soul, is one of serene peace and elevated joy ; but as it can only be entered on by the working upon the conscience of a sense of sin, and the crucifixion of nature's feelings and desires, there must be bitter experiences in the way that leads to its possession. The Israelites were made conscious of this in that lower and outward territory on which God dealt with them in Egypt, when at the very time that they were brought to the participation of the grace and life of God, the judgment of Heaven was all around thundering in their ears, and they were obliged to flee in haste and for ever from a land in which they had found many natural delights. And in the higher territory of Christ's everlasting kingdom, the same thing in principle is experienced by all, who through the godly sorrow that worketh repentance unto salvation, take up their cross and follow Jesus.

The putting away of the leaven, that there might be the use only of unleavened bread, may also be regarded as carrying some respect to the circumstances of the people at the first institution of the feast. And on this account it seems to be called "the bread of affliction" (Deut. xvi. 3), because of the trembling haste and much tribulation, amid which their departure was taken from Egypt. But there can be no doubt that it mainly pointed, as already shewn in connection with the meat-offering, to holiness in heart and conduct, which became the ransomed people of the Lord—the uncorrupt sincerity and truth, that should appear in all their behaviour. Hence, while the bitter herbs were only to be eaten at the first with the lamb itself, the unleavened bread was to be used through the whole seven days of the feast—through

one complete revolution of time, the primary sabbatical circle, as a sign that the religious and moral purity, which it imaged, was to be their abiding and settled character. Even as now, the very end for which Christ died is, that he might redeem to himself a people, who must be zealous of good works, sincere and without offence, filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are to the glory and the praise of God.

The only remaining part of the solemnity was the presentation to the Lord of a sheaf of barley, which took place on the second day of the feast, and was done by waving it before the Lord, accompanied by a burnt-offering, with its meat-offering (Lev. xxiii. 12), in acknowledgment of sin, and dedication of the people's persons and lives to God. It was not accidental, but of set purpose, that the time for the annual celebration of this feast, which commemorated God's act in vindicating for himself the first fruits of Israel as a people, should have been also the season, when they could annually gather the first fruits of the land's increase. The natural thus fitly corresponded with the spiritual. The religious presentation of the first ripe grain of the season, was like presenting the whole crop to God, acknowledging it to be his property, and receiving it as under the signature of his hand. It thereby acquired throughout a sacred character, for if the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy. The service bore respect to the consecration of the first-born at the original institution of the passover, and was therefore most appropriately connected with this ordinance. Those first-born, as previously noticed, represented the whole people of Israel, and in their personal deliverance and future consecration, all Israel were saved and sanctified to the Lord. So now, when they had reached the inheritance, for which all was done, there was the yearly presentation of the first of their increase to the Lord, in token of all being derived and held of him; and as the eating of the Passover was like a perpetual renewal of their birth to the Lord, so the waving of the first sheaf was a sort of perpetual consecration of their substance to his glory. Whence, also, being thus connected with the very existence of the people in their redeemed condition, and with the first of their annual increase, the month on which the Passover was celebrated, was fitly made to stand at the commencement of the Jewish calendar. So in the history of the New Testament church, every thing may be

said to date from the work of Christ in the flesh ; and in the history of the believer, from his new birth in Christ unto God. Till then he was dead, but henceforth he begins to live in truth. And living in Christ—the whole harvest of a redeemed church springing out of his root, all must be like him, holiness to the Lord. In soul and body, in their condition here and their destiny hereafter, they must be conformed to his image, so that he may be the first-born among many brethren.

THE FEAST OF WEEKS, PENTECOST.

This feast was appointed to be held at the distance of seven weeks complete, a week of weeks, from the second day of the Passover, when the first ripe barley sheaf was presented, therefore, on the fiftieth day after the former. The males were then again to repair to the house of God. And from the Greek word for fifty being *Pentecoste*, the feast itself in the New Testament, and in later times generally, came to be designated Pentecost. But its Bible name is rather that of Weeks, being determined by the complete cycle of weeks, that followed the waving of the barley sheaf at the time of the Passover, and forming the close of that period, which stretched from the one solemnity to the other ; whence it was frequently called by the ancient Jews *Atzeret* (Josephus, iii. 10, 6, *Asartha*), *i. e.* the closing or shutting up.

There are, however, two other names applied to it in the Pentateuch. In Ex. xxiii. 16, it is called “the Feast of Harvest,” because it was kept at the close of the whole harvest, wheat as well as barley—the intervening weeks between it and the Passover, forming the season of harvest. And in the same passage, as again in Numb. xxviii. 26, it is also called, “the Feast of the First-fruits,” because it was the occasion on which the Israelites were to present to God the first-fruits of their crop, as now actually realized and laid up for use. This was done by the high-priest waving two loaves in the name of the whole congregation. But, besides this, as they were enjoined to give “the first of all the fruit of the earth to the Lord,” to whom it all properly belonged, it was ordered that at this feast they should bring these first-fruits along with them. The precise amount to be rendered of such was not fixed, but was left, as a free-will offering, to the piety of the

individual. The offering itself, however, was a matter of strict obligation ; whence the precept of the wise man : " Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of thine increase." The form of confession and thanksgiving recorded in Deut. xxvi. was commonly used on such occasions.

In later times the feast is understood to have been held for an entire week like the Passover ; and is often described as having been originally appointed to be continued for the same period. But no time is specified in Scripture for its continuance, and as a holy solemnity it appears to have been limited to one day, when the same number and kind of offerings were presented, as on each day of the Paschal Feast (Numb. xxviii. 26-30). But as the people were specially required at this feast to extend their liberality to their poorer brethren, and invite not only their servants, but also the widow, the orphan, the stranger, and the Levite, to share with them in the goodness which the Lord had conferred upon them (Deut. xvi. 10), it is obvious that a succession of days must have been required for its due celebration.

This feast has been very commonly viewed as, at least, partly intended to commemorate the giving of the law, which certainly took place within a very little of fifty days after the slaying of the Passover—although the time cannot be determined to a day. But not a hint occurs of this in Scripture, nor is any trace to be found of it either in Philo or in Josephus. It was maintained by Maimonides and one class of Rabbinical writers, but denied by Abarbanel and another class ; and it seems somewhat strange, that the opinion should so readily have found its way into so many Christian authors. The points of ascertained and real moment in connection with the feast are (1.) Its reference to the second day of the Passover, when the first barley sheaf was presented—the former being the commencement, the latter the completion of the harvest period. Hence all being now finished, and the year's provision ready to be used, the special offering here was, not of ripe corn, but of loaves, baked as usual with leaven—representing the whole staff of bread. In this case the fermenting property of leaven was not taken into account. But the loaves were not placed upon the altar, to which the prohibition about leaven strictly referred ; they were simply waved before the Lord, and given to the priests. (2.) Then, secondly, there was the refer-

ence it bore to the week of weeks—the complete revolution of time, shut in on each hand by a stated solemnity, and thus marked off as a time peculiarly connected with God, a select season of divine working. Why should this season in particular have been so distinguished? Simply because it was the reaping time of the year. Canaan was in a peculiar sense God's land; the people were guests and sojourners with him upon it; he was bound by the relation in which he stood to them (so long as they continued faithful in their allegiance to him) to provide for their wants, and satisfy them with good things. The harvest was the season more especially for his doing this; it was his peculiar time of working in their behalf, when he crowned the year with his goodness, and laid up, as it were, in his storehouses what was required to furnish them with supplies, till the return of another season. Hence it was fitting that he should be acknowledged both at the beginning and ending of the period—that as the first of the ripening ears of corn, so the first of the baked loaves of bread should be presented to him—and that as guests well cared for, and plentifully furnished with the comforts of life, they should at the close come before the Lord to praise him for his mercies, and give substantial expression to their gratitude, by presenting to his representatives a portion of their increase, and causing the poor and needy to sing for joy.

There are, doubtless, important lessons of instruction here for every age of the Church, in respect even to the sphere of the natural life. But looking to the higher things of grace and salvation, which alone form the antitype to the other, there is here also a time of laying up the provision that is needed for our immortal natures, and a time for the actual participation and enjoyment of it. The provision is for the redeemed, who alone have the new life that is capable of using it; and, therefore, the rite that commemorated the typical redemption, had to take precedence of any thing belonging to the coming harvest, even of the presentation of its first ripening sheaf. But the work of redemption being finished, and the feast of fat things so long in preparation being ready, then the freest welcome is given to come and be satisfied with the loving-kindness of the Lord. And after Christ had suffered and been glorified, what day could be so fitly chosen for the descent of the Holy Spirit as the day of

Pentecost? That Spirit was expressly promised and given for the purpose of taking of the things of Christ, and shewing them to Christ's people; in other words, to turn the riches of his purchased redemption from being a treasure laid up among the precious things of God, into a treasure received and possessed by his people, so that they might be able to rejoice, and call others to rejoice with them, in the goodness of his house. Now the work of God is finished, henceforth the fruitful experience of it among his people proceeds; and the first fruits of the Spirit having assuredly been given, he can never withdraw his hand till the whole inheritance of blessing is enjoyed.

THE FEAST OF TRUMPETS AND THE NEW MOONS.

We couple these together, for, to a certain extent, they were of the same description. Strictly speaking, the New Moons were not feasts, and have no place among the *moadeem* in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus. They were not days of sacred rest, nor of holy convocations. But being the commencement of a new portion of time, they were so far distinguished from other days, that the same special offerings were presented on them which were presented on the *moadeem* (Numb. xxviii. 11-15). And they were further distinguished by the blowing of trumpets over the burnt-offerings (Numb. x. 10; Ps. lxxxi. 3). This latter service brought them into a close connection with the Feast of Trumpets, which *was* a day of rest and holy convocation, and had its peculiar and distinctive characteristic from the blowing of the trumpets, on which account we may suppose the blowing would then be continued longer, and probably also made to give forth a louder sound than on other days. The feast so characterised took place on the first day of the seventh month, which fell somewhere about our October; and though the people were not required to appear at the tent of meeting, yet, in token of the importance of the day, an additional series of offerings was presented, beside those appointed for the new moons in general.

There can be no doubt that the sacred use of the trumpet had its reason in the loud and stirring noise it emits. Hence, it is described as a *cry* in Lev. xxv. 9 (the English word *sound* there is too feeble), which was to be heard throughout the whole land.

The references to it in Scripture generally suggest the same idea (Zeph. i. 16 ; Isa. lviii. 1 ; Hos. viii. 1., &c.). On this account the sound of the trumpet is very commonly employed in Scripture as an image of the voice or word of God. The voice of God, and the voice of the trumpet on Mount Sinai, were heard together (Ex. xix. 5, 18, 19), first the trumpet-sound as the symbol, then the reality. So also St John heard the voice of the Lord as that of a trumpet (Rev. i. 10 ; iv. 1), and the sound of the trumpet is once and again spoken of as the harbinger of the Son of Man, when coming in power and great glory, to utter the almighty word which shall quicken the dead to life, and make all things new (Matth. xxiv. 31 ; 1 Cor. xv. 52 ; 1 Thess. iv. 16). The sound of the trumpet, then, was a symbol of the majestic, omnipotent voice or word of God ; but of course only in those things in which it was employed in respect to what God had to say to men. It might be used also as from man to God, or by the people, as from one to another. In this case, it would be a call to a greater than the usual degree of alacrity and excitement in regard to the work and service of God. And such probably was the more peculiar design of the blowing of trumpets at the festivals generally, and especially at the festival of trumpets on the first day of the seventh month. That month was distinguished above all the other months of the year, for the sacred services to be performed in it—it was emphatically the sacred month. Being the *seventh* month—bearing on its name the symbol of the covenant, and of covenant holiness—it was hallowed in its course by solemnities, which peculiarly displayed both God's goodness to his people and their delight in God. For, not only was its first day consecrated to sacred rest and spiritual employment, but the tenth was the great day of yearly atonement, when the high-priest was permitted to sprinkle the mercy-seat with the blood of sacrifice, and the liveliest exhibition was given which the materials of the earthly sanctuary could afford of the salvation of Christ. And then on the fifteenth of the same month commenced the Feast of Tabernacles, which was intended to present a striking image of the glory that should follow, as the former of the humiliation and sufferings by which the salvation was accomplished. In perfect accordance with all this, not only is the feast named the Feast of Trumpets, but "a memorial of blowing

of trumpets," a bringing to remembrance, or putting God, as it were, in mind of the great things by which (symbolically) he was to distinguish the month that was thus introduced ; precisely as when they went to war against an enemy that oppressed them, they were to blow the trumpet, and, it is added, "ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies." (Numb. x. 9).¹

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

This day formed the most distinguishing solemnity of the seventh month, and indeed of the whole Mosaic ritual. But we have already treated of it in Section Fifth, and refer to what is said here.

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

This had all the marks of a great and solemn feast. The males were to repair for its celebration to the place where God might put his name ; it was to be begun and ended by a day of holy convocation, and the last the eighth, an additional day, so that the whole reached a day beyond the feast of unleavened bread. It is sometimes called "the Feast of Ingathering in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labours out of the field" (Ex. xxiii. 16 ; Deut. xvi. 13) ; for it took place immediately before the winter months, and after the labours, not only of the harvest, but also of the vintage and the fruit season generally were passed. The year might, therefore, with an agricultural population like the Israelites, be then considered as tending towards its close ; and the comparative leisure of the winter months being before them, they would have ample time for the celebration of the feast. But we remark in passing, that this feast, which began on the fifteenth of the seventh month, being spoken of as falling about the close of the year, is a clear enough proof how little in

¹ Most commonly by the Jews, and generally also by Christian writers, the Feast of Trumpets is called that of the New Year, viz. of the civil year, as distinguished from the sacred. But Bähr justly remarks, there is nothing in Old Testament Scripture of this twofold year, nor does any record of it exist till after the Babylonish captivity. It is, therefore, quite arbitrary to regard this feast as pointing at all in such a direction.

the mind of the lawgiver, the Feast of Trumpets at the beginning of it had to do with a New Year.

The more distinctive appellation, however, of this feast was that of Tabernacles, or, as it should rather be, of *booths* (תב האכורת), because during the continuance of the feast the people were to dwell in booths. A booth is not precisely the same as a tent or tabernacle, though the names are frequently interchanged. It properly means a slight, temporary dwelling, easily run up, and as easily taken down again, a house or shed for a day or two ; such as Jacob made for his cattle in the place, which on that account was called Succoth (booth, Gen. xxxiii. 17), and Jonah for himself, which was so slim and insufficient, that he was glad of the foliage of a gourd to cover him. Tents might also be called booths, because of a very imperfect description as dwelling-places, light and moveable, speedily pitched and easily transported, the proper domiciles of a yet unsettled and wandering population. In this respect they form a contrast to solid, fixed, and comfortable houses ; as with the Rechabites, whose father commanded them not to build houses, but to dwell in tents ; and with the Israelites at large before, as compared with their condition after, they entered the promised land. Hence, may be remarked, the propriety and force of the Apostle's language in the beautiful passage, 2 Cor. v. 1, " We know that if our earthly house of this *tabernacle* were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens"—our present bodily frame-work, a frail, slender, temporary dwelling ; what awaits us hereafter, a house in the proper sense, a permanent, settled, eternal habitation.

That the feast was of a commemorative character, admits of no question ; for it is expressly given as the reason for the people then dwelling in booths, " that their generations might know, that the Lord made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt" (Lev. xxiii. 43). In this respect it was designed, in the first instance, to serve what may always be regarded as the immediate end of all commemorative religious institutions, that, namely, of keeping properly alive the remembrance of the historical fact they refer to. In all cases of this nature, it is of course understood, that the fact itself be one of a primary and fundamental character, containing the germ of spiritual ideas vitally important for every age of the church. Such

certainly was the character of the period of Israelitish history, when the people were made to dwell in tents or booths after they had left the land of Egypt. It was, in a manner, the connecting link between their house of bondage, on the one hand, and their inheritance of blessing, on the other. Then especially did the Lord come near and reveal himself to them, pitching his own tabernacle in the midst of theirs, communicating to them his law and testimony, and setting up the entire polity which was to continue unimpaired through succeeding ages. Hence, the annual celebration of the feast of tabernacles was like a perpetual renewing of their religious youth; it was keeping in fresh recollection the time of their espousals; and re-enforcing upon their minds the views and feelings proper to that early and formative period of their history.—On this account, we have no doubt it was, that the Feast of Tabernacles was the time chosen, every seventh year, for reading the whole law to the people (Deut. xxxi. 10–13), and not as Bähr thinks, because it was the greatest feast, and the one most largely frequented. The law was given them in the wilderness on their way to the land of Canaan, as the law by which all their doings were to be regulated, when they were settled in the land, and on the faithful observance of which their continued possession of it depended. So that nothing could be more appropriate, when commemorating the period, and reviving the thoughts and feelings of their religious youth, than to have the law read in their hearing. But this shews, at the same time, that the feast of Pentecost could not have been intended to commemorate the giving of the law; as in that case, unquestionably, the time of its celebration would rather have been chosen for the purpose.

Even in this point of view, there was a much closer connection between the wilderness-life, the booth-dwelling portion of Israel's history, than if it had formed the mere passage from Egypt to Canaan. But the same will appear still more, if we look to the bearing it had upon the personal preparation of Israel for the coming inheritance. It was not simply the time of God's manifesting his shepherd care and watchfulness toward them, guiding them through great and terrific dangers, and giving them such astonishing proofs of his goodness in the midst of these, as were sufficient to assure them in all time coming of his faithfulness and love. It was this, doubtless; but, at the same time, much more

than this. While the whole period was strewed with such tokens of goodness from the hand of God, by which he sought to draw and allure the people to himself ; it was also the period emphatically of temptation and trial, by which the Lord sought to winnow and sift their hearts into a state of meetness for the inheritance. Hence the words of Moses, Deut. viii. 2-5 : "Thou shalt remember all the way by which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldst keep his commandments or not. And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know, that he might make thee know that man liveth not by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord," &c. This alternating process of want and supply, of great and appalling danger, ever ready to be met by sudden and extraordinary relief, was the grand testing process in their history, by which the latent evil in their bosoms was brought fully to light, that it might be condemned and purged away, and by which they were formed to that humble reliance on God's arm, and single-hearted devotedness to his fear, which alone could prepare them for taking possession of, and permanently occupying the promised land. It proved in the issue too severe for by far the greater portion of the original congregation ; or, in other words, the evil in their natures was too deeply rooted to be effectually purged out, even by such well-adjusted and skilfully applied means of purification ; so that they could not be allowed to enter the promised land. But for those who did enter, and their posterity to latest generations, it was of the greatest moment to have kept perpetually alive upon their minds the peculiar dealing of God during that transition-period of their history, in order to their clearly and distinctly realizing the connection between their continued enjoyment of the land, and the refined and elevated state, the lively faith, the binding love, the firm and devoted purpose, to which the training in the wilderness conducted. They must in this respect be perpetually connecting the present with the past, with the close of every season renewing their religious youth ; as it was only by their entering into the spirit of that period, and making its moral results their own, that they had any warrant to look forward to another season of joy and plenty. For this high

purpose, therefore, the feast was more especially instituted. And while the fulness of supply and comfort, amid which it was held, as contrasted with their formerly poor and unsettled condition, called them to rejoice, the solemn respect it bore to the desert-life, taught them to rejoice with trembling; reminded them that their delights were all connected with a state of nearness to God, and fitness for his service and glory; and warned them, that if they forsook the arm of God, or looked to mere fleshly ease and carnal gratifications, they would inevitably forfeit all title to the goodly inheritance they possessed. Hence, also, when this actually came to be the case, when the design of this feast had utterly failed of its accomplishment, when Israel "knew not that it was the Lord who gave her corn and wine and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold," he resolved to send her again through the rough and sifting process of her youth: "Therefore will I return, and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my wine in the season thereof; I will also cause all her mirth to cease, and I will destroy her vines and her fig-trees; and I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and will speak comfortably unto her; and I will give her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope," &c. (Hos. ii. 8-15; comp. Ez. xx.) Not that the literal scenes were to be enacted over again; but that a like process of humiliation, trial, and improvement had to be undergone—the severe training first, and then the holy, earnest spirit of the past revived, that they might be fitted for being partakers of the goodness of the Lord.

This view of the nature and design of the feast, which we take to be the only scriptural one, sufficiently discovers the fallacy of those representations, which would make the celebration of this feast to have been an occasion merely for carnal merriment, dancing, feasting, and revelry. When the people themselves became carnal, it would, no doubt, partake too much of that character; but such was by no means the manner in which God designed it to be kept. They were, indeed, to rejoice over all the goodness and mercy which the Lord had given them to experience; but their joy was still to be the joy of saints, and nothing was to be done or tasted, which might have the effect of weakening the graces of a divine life, or disturbing their fellowship with God. It is, no doubt, in connection with the joy that was to

characterize the feast, and as symbolical of it, that branches of palms and other trees were to be taken (whether in their hands, or on their booths, is not said, Lev. xxiii. 40). Having taken these, they were to "rejoice before the Lord"—the joy having respect more immediately to the gathered produce of the year, and more remotely to the abundance of Canaan, as contrasted with the barrenness of the desert. The palm tree was particularly named merely from having the richest foliage, and thus presenting the best symbol of joy. The history of our Lord shews how naturally the people associated the palm leaf with joy (John xii. 12).

In regard to the mode of celebrating the feast, beside the dwelling in booths, there was a great peculiarity in the offerings to be presented. The sin-offering was the same as on the other feast-days, a single goat; but for the burnt-offering the rams and lambs were double the usual number, two and fourteen instead of one and seven; while in place of the two young bullocks of other days, there were to be in all during the seven days of the feast seventy, and these so divided, that on the last day there were to be seven, eight on the day preceding, and so on, up to thirteen, the number offered on the first day of the feast. The eighth day did not properly belong to the feast, but was rather a solemn winding up of the whole feast-season; the offerings for it, therefore, were much of the usual description. But for those peculiarities in the offerings properly connected with this feast—the double number of one kind, and the constant and regular decrease in another, till they reached the number of seven, we are still without any very satisfactory reason. The greater number may possibly be accounted for by the occasion of the feast, as intended to mark the grateful sense of the people for the Lord's goodness after having reached not only Canaan, but the close of another year of its plentiful increase in all natural delights. We make no account of its being called in a passage often quoted from Plutarch (*Sympos. i. 4, 5*), "the greatest of the Jewish feasts," as also by Philo, Josephus, and most of the Rabbins; for there is no ground in Scripture for making it in itself greater than the Passover, and in vital importance both of them fell below the day of atonement. The other point is more obscure. That some stress was intended to be laid on the whole number 70, ten times seven,

the two most sacred and complete numbers, is probable. But the gradual diminution till seven is reached, we confess lies beyond our discernment. The views of the Rabbins are mere conjectures, most of them frivolous and nonsensical. To see in it, with Bähr, a reference to the waning moon, is quite unsatisfactory ; nor is it less so to understand it, with the greater part of the older typologists, of the gradual ceasing of animal sacrifice, for there should then have been none on the last day, or at most one, whereas there were still seven—the very symbol of the covenant. We might rather regard it as intending to point to this covenant, as designed to impress upon the people the conviction, that however their blessings might increase, and however many their grateful oblations might be, yet they must still settle and rest in the covenant, as that with which all their privileges and hopes were bound up. But we can scarcely venture to present this as a satisfactory explanation. We only mention farther regarding the observance of the feast, that several things were added in later times, and, in particular, the practice of drawing water from the fountain of Siloam, and pouring it on the sacrifice, together with wine, amid shouts of joy, and every manifestation of exuberant delight. This was done, however, only during the seven days of the feast, not on the eighth or last, as is commonly represented. (See Winer's *Real-wört.* on the feast, also *Bib. Cyclopaedia*). And if our Lord, in John vii. 37, when he said, on the last, the great day of the feast, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink"—if he made any reference to the libations connected with the feast, it must have been to the cessation on that day, rather than to the performance of the wonted ceremonies. He took advantage of the want, and intimated, that in him the reality was to be found of what on the other days had been exhibited, but which had now ceased.

The Israelites in their outward history were a grand type of the real children of God ; and, therefore, in this feast, which brought the beginnings and the endings of their history together, we naturally look for a condensed representation of a spiritual life, whether in individuals or in the church at large. We see its antitype first of all, and without its imperfections, in the man Christ Jesus—who also was led up, after an obscure and troubled youth, into a literal wilderness, to be tempted forty days, a day

for a year, that the people might the more readily identify him with the true Israel ; and when Satan could find nothing in him, so that he was proved to be fitted for accomplishing the work of God, and casting out the wicked one from his usurped dominion, he came forth to enter on the great conflict of man's and the world's redemption. In this great work, too, the beginning and the end meet together, and are united by a bond of closest intimacy. The sufferings necessarily go before and lay the foundation for the glory. Jesus must personally triumph over sin and death before he can receive the kingdom from the Father, or be prepared to wield the sceptre of its government, and enjoy with his people the riches of its fulness. And, therefore, even now when he has entered on his glory, to shew the bond of connection between the one and the other, he still presents himself as "the Lamb that was slain," and receives the adorations of his people, as having by his obedience unto death redeemed them from sin, and made them kings and priests unto God.

With a still closer resemblance to the type, because with a greater similarity of condition in the persons respectively concerned, is the spiritual import of the feast to be realized in the case of all genuine believers. And on this account the prophet Zechariah, when speaking of what is to take place after the final overthrow of the church's enemies, represents all her members as going up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles (xiv. 16). She shall then rejoice in the fulness of her purchased and redeemed inheritance, and have her experiences of heavenly enjoyment heightened and enhanced by the remembrance of the past tribulation and conflict. Now she is passing through the wilderness ; it is her period of trial and probation ; she must be sifted and prepared for her final destiny by constant alternations of fear and hope, of danger and deliverance, of difficulties and conquests. By these she must be reminded of her own weakness and insufficiency, her proneness to be overcome of evil, and the dependence necessary to be maintained on the word and promises of God ; the dross must be gradually purged out, and the carcase of the old man at last thrown off and left to perish in the desert, that with the new man, all purified and refined into a glorious image of God, she may take possession of the heavenly Canaan. Then shall she ever hold with her Divine Head a feast of taber-

nacles ; living and reigning in his kingdom, satisfied with his fulness, even as with marrow and with fatness ; and so far from grudging at the trials and difficulties of the way, rather rejoicing the more on account of them, because seeing in them a course of discipline absolutely needed for the enjoyment of Heaven's fulness of life and blessing, and feeling assured that if there had been no wilderness to pass through on earth, there should have been for her no inheritance with God in glory. The glorious company in Rev. vii., clothed in white robes, and with palms in their hands, representatives of a redeemed and triumphant church, are the final antitypes of the Israelites keeping the Feast of Tabernacles.

THE SABBATICAL YEAR.

The appointment of a Sabbatical year does not strictly belong to the stated festivals, nor is it included among these in the 23d chapter of Leviticus, but it was very closely related to them, and in some respects had the same purposes to serve. It is hence called by the name *moed*, festival, in Deut. xxxi. 10. The principal law on the subject is given in Lev. xxv. 1-7. There it is enjoined, that after the children of Israel came into possession of the land of Canaan, they were to allow it every seventh year an entire season of rest. The land was to be untilled—a promise being also given of such plenty on the sixth year as would render the people independent of a harvest on the seventh. They might enjoy a year's respite from their toils, and yet be no losers in their worldly condition. But, as there would still be a certain return yielded from the fruit-trees and the ground, so whatever grew spontaneously was to be used, partly indeed by the owner, but by him in common with the poor and the stranger that might sojourn among them. And along with this freedom to the humbler classes of the community, there was also ordained, by a subsequent law (Deut. xv.), a release from all personal bondage and a cancelling of debts. The name given to this year, “a Sabbath of rest,” and “a Sabbath to the Lord,” alone denotes its close connection with the weekly Sabbath ; and this was farther confirmed by the promise of a larger increase than usual on the sixth year, corresponding to the double portion of manna that fell on the

sixth day in the wilderness. On account of this connection and resemblance, Calvin has assigned it (in his Commentary) as one of the reasons of the appointment, that "God wished the observance of the Sabbath to be inscribed upon all the creatures, so that wherever the Jews turned their eyes, they might have it forced on their notice."

The sacredness of the rest during this year was more especially indicated by the prescription, that the whole law should be read that year at the feast of tabernacles. Such a prescription could not simply mean, that the time at the feast was to be so spent; for that might have been done, so far as the necessary time was concerned, any year. It must rather have been designed to teach the Israelites, that the year, as a whole, should be much devoted to the meditation of the law, and engaging in exercises of devotion. If they entered, as they should have done, into the divine appointment, the release from ordinary work would be gladly taken as an opportunity to direct the mind more to divine things, to be more frequent in conversing with each other upon the history of God's dealings in the past and future, and giving a fuller attendance upon the stated solemnities of worship. How much, too, would the periodical return of such a season be fitted to impress upon all ranks and classes of the people the solemn fact, that the land, with every plant and creature in it, was the Lord's! Nor, could it be less fitted to impress upon the richer members of the community the image of God's beneficence and tender consideration of the poor and needy. Such an institution was utterly opposed to the niggardly and selfish spirit which would mind only its own things, and would grind the face of the poor with hard exactions or oppressive toil, in order to gratify some worldly desires. No one could imbibe the spirit of the institution without being as distinguished for his humanity and justice toward his fellow-men, as for his piety toward God.

It may possibly be thought, that the encouragement given to idleness by such a long cessation from the ordinary labours of the field, would be apt to counterbalance the advantages arising from the institution. The cessation, however, could only be comparative, not absolute; and each day would still present certain calls for labour in the management of household affairs, the superintendence or care of the cattle, the husbanding of the provisions

laid up from preceding years, and the execution, perhaps, of improvements and repairs. The ordinance was abused, if it was turned to an occasion for begetting habits of idleness. But the solemn pause which it created in the common occupations and business of life—the arrest it laid on men's selfish and worldly dispositions—and the call it addressed to them to cultivate the graces of a pious, charitable, and beneficent life,—these things conveyed to the Israelites, and they convey still to the church of God (though the outward ordinance has ceased) salutary lessons, which in some form or another must ever be listened to, if the interest of God is to prosper in the world.

THE YEAR OF JUBILEE.

This institution stood in the closest relation to the Sabbatical year, and may be regarded as the higher form of the same. It was appointed that when seven weeks of years had run their course, this great Sabbath-year, the year of jubilee, should come ; when, not only as in the ordinary Sabbatical year, the land should be allowed to rest, the fruit-trees to grow unpruned, and debts to be cancelled, but also every personal bond should be broken, every alienated possession restored to its proper owner, and a general restitution should take place. The sabbatical idea, as involving a participation in the perfect order and peaceful rest of God, rose here, so far as social arrangements were concerned, to its proper consummation ; it could ascend no higher in the present imperfect state of things, nor accomplish any more. Its object was one of deliverance—deliverance from trouble, grievance, and oppression—a restitution to order and repose, so that the face of nature and the aspect of society might reflect somewhat of the equable, brotherly, well-ordered condition of the heavenly world. As such it fitly began, not at the usual commencement of the year, but on the day after the yearly atonement in the seventh month—when the sins of the people in all their transgressions were (symbolically) atoned for and forgiven by God—when all, in a manner, being set right between them and God, it became them to see that every thing was also set right between one person and another. It implied, however, that Canaan was not the region

of bliss, in which the desire of the righteous was to find its proper satisfaction, but only an imperfect type and shadow of what should actually be so. It implied, that every thing there was constantly tending, through human infirmity and corruption, to change and deteriorate what God had settled; so that times of restoration must perpetually come round to check the downward tendency of things, to rectify the disorders which were ever springing into existence, and especially to maintain and exhibit the principle, that every one entitled to dwell with God was also entitled to share in his inheritance of blessing (v. 23).

Happy had it been for Israel if he had heartily fallen in with these restorative Sabbatical institutions. But they struck too powerfully against the current of human depravity, and drew too largely upon the faith of the people, to be properly observed. Considered in respect to the people generally, there is but too much reason to believe, that the breach of the law here was greatly more common than the observance; since the seventy years' desolation of the Babylonish exile is represented as a paying of the long arrears due to the land for the want of its Sabbatical repose—"until the land had fulfilled her Sabbaths" (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). The promise, however, contained in this year of jubilee for the church and people of God, cannot ultimately fail. A presage and earnest of its complete fulfilment was given in the work of Christ, when at the very outset he declared that he was anointed to preach good tidings to the poor, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound—to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. But it is from his finished work of reconciliation on the cross, from the great day of atonement, that the commencement of the proclamation properly dates, respecting the world's coming jubilee. Sin still causes innumerable troubles and sorrows. Even in the best governed states, the true order of absolute righteousness and peace is to be found only in scattered fragments, or occasional examples. Darkness and corruption are everywhere contending for the mastery. But the truth shall certainly prevail. The prince of this world shall be finally cast out; and amid the manifested power and glory of God all evil shall be quelled, and sorrow and sighing shall for ever flee away. Then

shall the joyful anthem be sung, "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof; let the field be joyful, and all that is therein; then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord, for he cometh to judge the earth; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and his people with his truth."

CHAPTER FOURTH.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPEMENTS.

IN the course of the preceding discussions, we have so often had occasion to refer to the greater events in Israelitish history, that it would be alike needless and unprofitable, as regards our present object, to go at any length into the consideration of its particular parts. It will be enough to take a brief survey of the more prominent points connected with the state of the covenant-people, while under the law and the promises. And in doing so, it shall be our chief object to mark the successive stages, by which either some peculiar developement was given in respect to their typical relationships, or these relationships themselves were loosened in order to make way for the larger grace and higher realities of the Gospel.

SECTION FIRST.

THE CONQUEST OF CANAAN.

The conquest and actual possession of Canaan by the children of Israel, both in point of time and importance, deserves the first place. The possession of that land formed one of the things most distinctly promised in the Abrahamic covenant; and as matters actually stood, when the fulfilment came to be accomplished, the possession could be made good only by the overthrow and destruction of the original inhabitants. This mode of entrance on the possession has been often denounced by infidel writers as cruel

and unjust ; and has not unfrequently met with a lame defence from the advocates of a divine revelation. Even heathen morality is said to have been offended at it ; and we learn from Augustine and Epiphanius, that the ancient sect of the Manicheans, who were more Pagan than Christian in their sentiments, placed it among “ the many cruel things which Moses did and commanded,” and which went to prove, according to their view, that the God of the Old Testament could not be the God of the New. All the leading abettors of infidelity in this country—Tindal, Morgan, Chubb, Bolingbroke, Paine—have decried it as the highest enormity ; and Bolingbroke, in his usual style, did not scruple to denounce the man “ as worse even than an Atheist, who would impute it to the Supreme Being.” Voltaire, and the other infidels, with their allies the theologians on the continent, have not been behind their brethren here in the severity of their condemnation, and the plentifulness of their abuse. And it would even seem as if the more learned portion of the Jews themselves had been averse to undertake the defence of the transaction in its naked and scriptural form, as we find their older Rabbinical writers attempting to soften down the rugged features of the narrative, by affirming that “ Joshua sent three letters to the land of the Canaanites before the Israelites invaded it ; or rather, he proposed three things to them by letters : that those who preferred flight, might escape ; that those who wished for peace, might enter into covenant ; and that such as were for war, might take up arms.”²

This apparently more humane and agreeable view of the transaction has been substantially adopted by many Christian writers—among others, by Selden, Patrick, Graves—who conceive that the execution of judgment upon the Canaanites was only designed to take effect in case of their refusal to surrender, and their obstinate adherence to idolatry ; but that in every case peace was to be offered to them, on the ground of their acknowledging the God of Israel, and submitting to the sway of their conquerors. The sacred narrative, however, contains nothing to warrant such a supposition. Indeed, the supposition is made in despite of an express line of demarcation on that very point, drawn between the Canaanites and the surrounding nations. To the latter only were the Israelites

² Nachman, as quoted by Selden *de Jure Nat. etc.* L. vi. c. 13.

allowed to offer terms of peace: "But of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth, but thou shalt utterly destroy them" (Deut. xx. 16, 17). And as they were not permitted to propose terms of peace, so neither were they at liberty to accept of articles of agreement: "Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land;" "they shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me" (Ex. xxiii. 33, xxxiv. 12). Such explicit commands manifestly did not contemplate any plans of reconciliation, and left no alternative to the Israelites but to destroy. According to the view of Scripture, the inhabitants of Canaan were in the condition of persons placed under the *cherem* or ban of heaven, that is, devoted to God by a solemn appointment to destruction as no otherwise capable of being rendered subservient to the divine glory. The part assigned to the Israelites was simply to execute the final sentence as now irrevocably passed against them; and in so far as they failed to do so, it is charged upon them as their sin, and their failure was converted into a judgment on themselves—a judgment that involved them in many troubles and calamities during the earlier period of their residence in Canaan (Judg. ii. 1–5).

Another series of attempts has been made to soften the alleged harshness and severity of the divine command in reference to the Canaanites, by asserting for the Israelites some kind of prior right to the possession of the country. A Jewish tradition, espoused with this view by many of the Fathers, claims the land of Canaan for the seed of Abraham, as their destined share of the allotted earth in the distribution made by Noah of its different regions among his descendants. Michaelis, justly rejecting this distribution as a fable, holds, notwithstanding, that Canaan was originally a tract of country that belonged to Hebrew herdsmen; that other tribes gradually encroached upon and usurped their possessions, taking advantage of the temporary descent of Israel into Egypt to appropriate the whole; and that the seed of Abraham were hence perfectly justified in vindicating their right anew, when they had the power, and expelling the intruders sword in hand. This opinion has found many abettors in Germany, and quite recently has been supported by Ewald and Jahn; though the original right of the Israelites is now commonly held to have reached only to the pas-

toral portions of the territory. A more baseless theory, however, never was constructed. Scripture is entirely silent respecting such a claim on the part of the Israelites. But there is more than its silence to condemn the theory ; for at the very first appearance of the chosen family on the ground of Palestine, it is expressly stated that " the Canaanite was then in the land " (Gen. xii. 6) ; and in it, not merely as a wandering shepherd or temporary occupant, but as its settled and rightful possessor, to whom Abraham and his immediate descendants stood in the relation of sojourners. Hence the promise given to Abraham was, that he and his seed should get for an everlasting possession " the land wherein he was a stranger." The testimony of Scripture is quite uniform on the two points—that Canaan, as an inheritance, was bestowed as the free gift of God on the seed of Abraham, and that the gift was to be made good by a forcible dispossession of the original occupants of the land.

It is plain, therefore, that according to the representations of Scripture, the family of Abraham had no natural right to the inheritance of Canaan. Nor would it be hard to prove, that such false attempts to smooth down the inspired narrative, and adapt it to the refinement of modern taste, instead of diminishing, really aggravate, the difficulties attending it ; that if, in one respect, they seem to bring the transaction into closer agreement with Christian principle, they place it, in another, at a much greater, and absolutely irreconcilable distance. For, on the supposition that the posterity of Abraham were the original possessors, why should God have kept them, for an entire succession of generations, at a distance from the region, making their right—if they ever had any—virtually to expire, and rendering it capable of vindication no otherwise than by force of arms ? Surely, on any ground of righteous principle, a right at best so questionable in its origin, and so long suffered to fall into abeyance, ought rather to have been altogether abandoned, than pressed at the expense of so much blood and desolation. And if the situation of the Canaanites had been such as to admit of terms of peace being proposed to them, then the decree of their extermination must have been in contrariety with the great principles of truth and righteousness.

It will never be by such methods of defence that the objections of the infidel to this part of the divine procedure can be success-

fully met, or what is more important—that the God of the Old Testament can be shewn to be the same in character and working with the God of the New. There will still be room for the sneer of Gibbon, that the accounts of the wars commanded by Joshua “are read with more awe than satisfaction by the pious Christians of the present age.”¹ On the contrary, we affirm, that if contemplated in the broad and comprehensive light in which Scripture itself presents them to our view, they may be read with the most perfect satisfaction ; that there is not an essential element belonging to them, which does not equally enter into the principles of the Gospel dispensation ; and that any difference which may here present itself between the Old and the New is, as in all other cases, a difference merely in form, and that coupled with an essential agreement. This will appear, whether it is viewed in respect to the Canaanites, to the Israelites, or to the times of the Gospel dispensation.

1. Viewed, first of all, in respect to the Canaanites, as the execution of deserved judgment on their sins (in which light Scripture uniformly represents it, so far as *they* are concerned), there is nothing in it to offend the feelings of any well-constituted Christian mind. From the beginning to the end of the Bible, God appears as the righteous judge and avenger of sin, and does so not unfrequently by the infliction of fearful things in righteousness. If we can contemplate Him bringing on the cities of the Plain the vengeance of eternal fire, because their sins had waxed great, and were come up to heaven ; or, at a later period, even in gospel-times, can reflect how the wrath was made to fall on the Jewish nation to the uttermost ; or, finally, can think of impenitent sinners being appointed, in the world to come, to the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone for ever and ever—if we can contemplate such things entering into the administration of God, without any disturbance to our convictions that the Judge of all the earth does only what is right, it were surely unreasonable to complain of the severities exercised on the foul inhabitants of Canaan. Their abominations were of a kind that might be said emphatically to cry to heaven—such idolatrous rites as tended to defile their very consciences, and the habitual practice of pollutions which were

¹ History, c. 50.

a disgrace to humanity. The land is represented as incapable of bearing any longer the mass of defilements which overspread it, as even "vomiting out its inhabitants," and "therefore," it is added, "the Lord visited their iniquity upon them" (Lev. xxiv.) Nor was this vengeance taken on them summarily; the time of judgment was preceded by a long season of forbearance, during which they were plied with many calls to repentance. So early as the age of Abraham, the Lord manifested himself toward them both in the way of judgment and of mercy—of judgment, by the awful destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, cutting off the most infected portion, that the rest might fear and turn from their evil ways—of mercy, by raising up in the midst of them such eminent saints as Abraham and Melchizedec. That period, and the one immediately succeeding, was peculiarly the day of their merciful visitation. But they knew it not; and so, according to God's usual method of dealing, he gradually removed the candlestick out of its place—withdrew his witnesses to another region, in consequence of which the darkness continually deepened, and the iniquity of the people at last became full. Then only was it that the cloud of divine wrath began to threaten them with overwhelming destruction—not, however, even then, without giving awful indications of its approach by the wonders wrought in Egypt and at the Red Sea,—and again hanging long in suspense during the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, as if waiting till a little further space was given for repentance. But as all proved in vain, mercy at length gave place to judgment, according to the principle common alike to all dispensations, "he, that being often reprov'd, hardeneth his neck, shall be suddenly destroyed, and that without remedy"—and, "where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" in plain terms, whenever iniquity has reached its last stage, the judgment of Heaven is at hand. This principle was as strikingly exemplified in the case of the Jews after our Lord's appearing, as in the case of these Canaanites before. In the parables of the barren fig-tree and the wicked husbandmen in the vineyard, the same place is assigned it in the Christian dispensation which it formerly held in the Jewish. And in the experience of all, who, despite of merciful invitations and solemn threatenings, perish from the way of life, it must find an attestation so much more appalling than the one now referred to, as a lost eter-

nity exceeds in evil the direst calamities of time. In fine, the very same may be said of the objections brought against the destruction of the Canaanites, which was said by Richard Baxter of many of the controversies started in his day, "The true root of all the difference is, whether there be a God and a life to come." Grant only a moral government and a time of retribution, and such cases as those under consideration become not only just, but necessary.

2. Again, let the judgment executed upon the Canaanites be viewed in respect to the instruments employed in enforcing it—the Israelites—and in this aspect also nothing will be found in it at variance with the great principles of truth and righteousness. The Canaanites, it is to be understood, in this view of the matter, deserved destruction, and were actually doomed to it by a divine sentence. But to execute such a sentence by the hand of the Israelites, must it not have tended to produce a hardening effect upon the minds of the conquerors? Was it not fitted to lead them to regard themselves as the appointed executors of Heaven's vengeance, wherever they themselves might deem this to be due, and to render their example a most dangerous precedent for every wild enthusiast, who might choose to allege a commission from Heaven to pillage and destroy his fellow-men? So it has sometimes been alleged, but without any just foundation. Such charges evidently proceed on the tacit assumption, that there was in reality no doom of Heaven pronounced against the Canaanites, and no special commission given to the Israelites to execute it—thus ignoring one part of the sacred narrative for the purpose of throwing discredit on another. Or, it is implied that God must be debarred from carrying on his administration in such a way as may best suit the ends of divine wisdom, because human fraud or folly may take encouragement from thence to practise an unwarranted and improper imitation. Thoughts of this description carry their own refutation along with them. The commission given to the Israelites was limited to the one task of sweeping the land of Canaan of its original occupants. But this manifestly conferred on them no right to deal out the same measure of severity to others; and so far from creating a thirst for human blood in cases where they had no authority to shed it, they even fainted in fulfilling their commission to extirpate the people of Canaan. This, however, is only the negative side of the question; and viewed in another and more positive aspect, the

employment of the Israelites to execute this work of judgment was eminently calculated to produce a salutary impression upon their minds, and to promote the ends for which the judgment was appointed. For, what could be conceived so thoroughly fitted to implant in their hearts an abiding conviction of the evil of idolatry and its foul abominations—to convert their abhorrence of these into a national, permanent characteristic, as their being obliged to enter on their settled inheritance by a terrible infliction of judgment upon its former occupants for polluting it with such enormities? Thus the very foundations of their national existence raised a solemn warning against defection from the pure worship of God; and the visitation of divine wrath against the ungodliness of men accomplished by their own hands, and interwoven with the records of their history at its most eventful period, stood as a perpetual witness against them, if they should ever turn aside to folly. Happy had it been for them, if they had been as careful to remember the lesson, as God was to have it suitably impressed upon their minds.

3. But the propriety and even moral necessity of the course pursued become manifest, when we view the proceeding in its typical bearing—the respect it had to gospel-times. There were reasons, as we have seen, connected with the Canaanites themselves and the surrounding nations, sufficient to justify the whole that was done; but we cannot see the entire design of it, or even perceive its leading object, without looking farther, and connecting it with the higher purposes of God respecting his kingdom among men. What he sought in Canaan was an inheritance—a place of rest and blessing for his people—but still only a temporary inheritance, and as such a type and pledge of that final rest which remains for the people of God. All, therefore, had to be arranged concerning the one, so as fitly to represent and image the higher and more important things, which belong to the other—that the past and the temporary might serve as a mirror in which to foreshadow the future and abiding, and that the principles of God's dealing toward his church might be seen to be essentially the same, whether displayed on the theatre of present or of eternal realities. It was partly, at least, on this account, that the place chosen for the inheritance of Israel was allowed, in the first instance, to become in a peculiar sense the region of pollution

—a region that required to be sanctified by an act of divine judgment upon its corrupt possessors, and thereby fitted for becoming the home and heritage of saints. In this way alone could the things done concerning it shadow forth and prepare for the final possession of a glorified world—an inheritance which also needs to be redeemed from the powers of darkness, that meanwhile overspread it with their corruptions, and which must be sanctified by terrible acts of judgment upon their ungodliness, before it can become the meet abode of final bliss. The spirit of Antichrist must be judged and cast out ; Babylon, the mother of abominations, which has made the earth drunk with the wine of her fornications, must come in remembrance before God, and receive the due reward of her sins ; so that woes of judgment and executions of vengeance must precede the church's occupation of her purchased inheritance, similar in kind to those which put Israel in possession of the land of Canaan. What, indeed, are the scenes presented to our view in the concluding chapters of revelation, but an expansion to the affairs of a world, and the destinies of a coming eternity, of those which we find depicted in the wars of Joshua ? In these awful scenes we behold, on the one hand, the Captain of Salvation, of whom Joshua was but an imperfect type, going forth to victory with the company of a redeemed and elect church, supported by the word of God, and the resistless artillery of heaven ; while, on the other hand, we see the doomed enemies of God and the church, long borne with, but now at last delivered to judgment—the wrath falling on them to the uttermost, and, when the world has been finally relieved of their abominations, the new heavens and the new earth rising into view, where righteousness, pure and undefiled, is to have its perennial habitation.

We have said, that the work of judgment in the one case was similar in kind to what shall be executed in the other ; but we should couple with this the intimation, that it may be very different in form. It both may and should be expected to possess less of an external or compulsory character, according to the general change that has taken place in the spirit of the divine economy. Outward visitations of evil may, no doubt, still be looked for, upon such as act a hostile part toward the kingdom of Christ ; yet not by any means to the same extent as in former times. Christ's own personal conquest over evil has struck in this respect a higher

key for future conflicts with the adversary—a conquest effected, not by external violence, but by the exhibition of truth and righteousness putting to shame the adherents of falsehood and corruption. Conquests of this kind should now be regarded as the proper counterpart to those of the earlier dispensation. And while the church has still, as she had in the days of Joshua, a two-edged sword in her hand to execute vengeance on the heathen (Ps. cxlix. 6), the noblest vengeance she can execute, and the only vengeance she should seek to execute, is that of destroying their condition as heathen by the sword of the Spirit, and turning their antagonistic into a friendly position.

If such views of Israel's conquest and occupation of the land of Canaan are just, the more striking and peculiar facts connected with it admit of an easy and natural explanation. The administration, for example, of the rite of circumcision to the whole adult population, was most fitly done before they formally entered on the work; as it is never more necessary for the Lord's people to be in the full enjoyment of the privileges of a saved condition, and in a state of greater nearness to himself, than when they are proceeding in his name to rebuke and punish iniquity. The work given Israel to do in this respect was emphatically a work of God, bearing on it the impress alike of his greatness and his holiness. And both a living faith, and a sanctified heart, were needed on the part of Israel to fulfil what was required of them. On this account special supports were given to faith in the miracles wrought by God at the commencement of the work, in the separation of the waters of the river, and the falling of the walls of Jericho, as afterwards in the extraordinary prolongation of the day at the request of Joshua; shewing it was God's work rather than their own they were accomplishing, and that his power was singularly exerted in their behalf. And not only in the charges given to Joshua regarding his careful meditation of the law of God, and punctual observance of all that was commanded in it, but also, and more particularly, in the discomfiture appointed on account of the sin of Achan, was the necessity forcibly impressed upon the people of the maintenance of holiness; they were made to feel the inseparable connection between the preservation of holiness and the possession of power. It served also impressively to teach them their unity as a people, and how

the holiness which they were bound collectively to maintain, must be individual, in order that it might be national. Nor was the instruction disregarded by the immediate agents in the work of judgment. They cast out from among them the sin that was discovered in Achan ; and, at a later period, their jealousy regarding the tribes on the other side of Jordan, lest they would separate themselves from the one altar and commonwealth of Israel, and the protestations of allegiance to God, which Joshua made before his death, and they again to him, clearly shewed, that much of the spirit of faith and holiness rested upon that generation. In them the covenant found, in no small degree, a faithful representation, as well in regard to its requirements of duty, as to its promises of grace and blessing.

SECTION SECOND.

THE PERIOD OF THE JUDGES.

THE period, which is known as that of the Judges, in its character, not less than its position, stands intermediate between the leadership of Moses and Joshua, on the one hand, and the institution of the kingly government on the other. On the people's part it continually gave evidence of evils springing up in their condition, originating in their own unfaithfulness to covenant-engagements; and on God's part it equally gave evidence of his readiness to interpose in their behalf, and provide saviours for the ever-recurring times of danger and trouble. These temporary saviours, or judges, are undoubtedly to be regarded as standing in a typical relationship to the Messiah, presenting, as they severally did, certain personal manifestations of the power and goodness of God to rescue his people from evil, and maintain inviolate the provisions of the covenant. The typical element, however, is certainly of a somewhat vague and indefinite character—though occasionally, as in the cases of Gideon and Samson, the modes of the divine manifestation present more marked and striking resemblances to those which appear in the personal character and work of Christ. In its more immediate aspect, the period may be regarded as the one peculiarly appropriated to the developement of the life and relations of the covenant-people, in connection with their tribal separateness, yet collective unity. Free scope was given to the exercise of the powers belonging to them, as a royal priesthood, whether as individuals, or by means of their tribal constitutions. But unfortunately the trial only shewed how inadequate the covenant-arrangements then existing were to secure a state of proper rest and blessing, and how much every thing still bore the stamp of imperfection. The general

nature of the period, and its unsatisfactory results, are very graphically described by the sacred historian near the commencement of the Book of Judges:—"The children of Israel forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them, and bowed themselves unto them, and provoked the Lord to anger. And they forsook the Lord and served Baal and Astaroth. And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them; and he sold them into the hands of their enemies round about, so that they could not any longer stand before their enemies. Whithersoever they went out, the hand of the Lord was against them for evil, as the Lord had said, and as the Lord had sworn unto them: and they were greatly distressed. Nevertheless the Lord raised up judges, which delivered them out of the hand of those that spoiled them. And yet they would not hearken unto their judges, but they went a whoring after other gods, and bowed themselves unto them: they turned quickly out of the way which their fathers walked in, obeying the commandments of the Lord; but they did not so. And when the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge, and delivered them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge: for it repented the Lord because of their groanings by reason of them that oppressed them and vexed them." (Judg. ii. 12-18).

These verses present us with an epitome of the whole history of the period under consideration, and bring out prominently its two great features—the spirit of degeneracy and backsliding in the people, and the still abiding faithfulness and love of God. The more, too, the details of the history are examined, the more does the wonderful goodness of God appear. The very troubles that were allowed to befall the people—the sources of vexation left to work upon them from within, and the heavier calamities ever coming on them from without, were proofs of this; as they were all wisely ordered and arranged, to check the spirit of defection, and drive the people back on the only arm of strength that could support and bless them. And the distributive manner in which the means of deliverance were provided for the occasion, was also eminently calculated to diffuse a revived and faithful spirit through

the community. Not only were persons of suitable gifts and endowments raised up from time to time to do the part of deliverers, but these persons were obtained from the different tribes in succession—for the purpose, no doubt, of shewing more manifestly, that the eye of a gracious God was on them all, and that if *their* eyes were but turned toward him, as they should have been, every district and corner of the land might have been replenished with life and vigour. The tribes of Judah, of Ephraim, of Manasseh, of Issachar, of Zebulun, of Naphtali, of Benjamin, of Dan, as well as the land of Gilead, each in turn furnished the person who was honoured to save and judge Israel. Thus God distributed the more singular gifts of his grace throughout the tribes, that the benefit and honour connected with their exercise might be shared by the different sections of the community, and that they might be the more united together as by the bond of a common interest in the Lord. Instead of this, however, jealousy and strife were too commonly the result of any distinction given in that respect to one tribe above another. The tribe of Ephraim especially gave frequent manifestations of a selfish and factious spirit, and shewed a disposition to lord it over the rest. But in the latter portion of the period, great disorders of every sort manifestly prevailed, and there were fierce outbreaks of carnal rivalry and reckless daring, as well as symptoms of wide-spread apostacy from the true worship and service of God.

In these later times of general declension and disorder, it pleased the Lord to raise up one, who was, in some respects, the most singularly endowed of all the Judges, and in a peculiar sense “a sign and a wonder” to his people. This was the Nazarite, Samson, a man of the tribe of Dan. Separated from his mother’s womb for special service to the Lord, by the Nazarite vow, not voluntarily undertaken, as in ordinary cases, but solemnly imposed by a messenger from heaven, he was in his very calling and endowments a witness from above, as to the real ground of all the troubles that beset them, and the way by which the return of strength and prosperity might be attained. It was their selfish and worldly spirit, carrying them away after the vain idols and corrupt pleasures of the world, which had caused their strength to depart from them, because it had separated between them and God. Would they but abandon these, and dedicate themselves with one heart and

soul to the service of Heaven, the might also of Heaven would become theirs, and the word of Balaam concerning them as a nation would be verified: "The Lord his God is with him, and the shout of a king is among them; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn; he shall eat up the nations his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows." Such was the instruction designed to be conveyed through the person and supernatural endowments of the son of Manoah. What he possessed quite miraculously in connection with his special separation to the Lord, the nation at large was taught to consider as ready to be imparted in sufficient measure for all their necessities, if, with solemn consecration of heart, they had resolved to be for God and not for another. In that case the marvellous impersonation of divine strength, which appeared in the person of Samson, would have transferred itself to them as a people; the spirit of the Lord would have moved them, as it moved him in the camp, so that instead of quailing before their enemies, "five should have chased an hundred, and an hundred put ten thousand to flight;" they might even have turned themselves on every hand with royal freedom, and multiplied occasions of meeting with their adversaries with no other effect than that of increasing their opportunities of successful conflict. But it was very different in the reality: the people were too selfish and degraded to read the moral import of the sign that was given them from Heaven; and the man in whom that sign appeared, instead of being taken as a rallying-point, around whom they should gather to revive the languishing cause of God, was eyed with jealousy and distrust, and within as well as without found his path encompassed with snares and discouragements. It proved too much for him; borne away by the evil of the times, he sold his strength, which had carried him in triumph through so many dangers, into the enemy's hands. But in this also he was a sign to his degenerate countrymen. This violation of his Nazarite vow, and the humiliating condition to which it reduced him, was a living image of the faithless part they had themselves acted, and the disastrous results that had flowed from it. And though no excuse could thence be derived for the waywardness of his course, yet the instruction ministered through him to Israel would not have been complete, he would not have been the sign to Israel he actually was, unless the secret of his might

had for a time departed from him ; and in this respect also he had appeared as a personified Israel. But he fell, as God's people generally, only for a time ; and the last great effort of his gigantic strength, though fraught with ruin to himself, was pregnant with hope to his people. For, as his fall shewed how everything of good depended on fidelity to the vow of God's covenant, so the revival of his strength with the growth of " the hair of the head of his separation " proved that for those who returned to their allegiance, recovery was possible even from the lowest depths ; and that the people had but to lay hold anew of the covenant of their God in order to awake as a giant from his sleep.

It is only when viewed thus as a sign to Israel, that we obtain an adequate explanation, either of the miraculous circumstances connected with the birth of Samson, or of the prominence given to his singular history. The things recorded would not have been entitled to so large a place, had they referred merely to the case of a private individual, and were they to be judged by a merely personal standard. It is also, when thus viewed, that the transition presents itself as alike natural and instructive, from the history of Samson to the things that occurred presently afterwards in Israel. In its immediate results, the mission of the son of Manoah had comparatively failed ; it wrought no great deliverance in the earth ; but we know not how many bosoms may have been awakened by it to more earnest thoughts concerning the work and service of God. Its affecting close especially was fitted to beget deep searchings of heart regarding the cause of such a painful result, and to stir up spiritual longings after that God who had given such a striking manifestation of his power and goodness. And it is more than probable, that in this way a real connection subsists between the life and death of Samson, and the birth of the next great instrument of God—that of the pious Samuel. It must have been at a period not very remote from the death of the former, that Hannah asked this child of the Lord, and coupled the request with a promise, that if her prayer were granted, she would devote the child from his birth by a Nazarite vow to the Lord (1 Sam. i. 11). Given, as he thus was, in immediate answer to prayer, and to be a Nazarite from the womb, there was something also in *his* case supernatural ; and in his very existence and calling he too was a sign to Israel. But a sign of a higher kind.

The comparative failure in the case of Samson had arisen from the too great predominance of the merely outward and physical, and the want in himself and the people around him of the higher elements of power. It is not too much to suppose, that the pious Hannah perceived this, and at all events it was perceived by the penetrating eye of God. Hence, it was ordered that the next peculiar light given to Israel, should not only be a Nazarite from his birth, but a Nazarite of the tribe of Levi (1 Chron. vi. 28), and as such capable of being dedicated to the Lord for special service in connection with the house of God, and the things that more immediately concerned his service. By this, it was virtually intimated, there was need for an inward, before there could be any proper ground to expect an outward, revival of the cause of God: the restored life and energy must begin at the centre; and only if the worship of God was purified, and the hearts of the people were turned back again to the Lord God of their fathers, could they be again raised to external honour and prosperity. That such was really the divine order was proved by the result. Samson, with all his corporeal might, had failed to recover his people from the dominion of the Philistines; and during the feeble and corrupt administration of Eli that followed, the evil still waxed worse, until the ark itself was carried away in triumph by the adversary. But Samuel's Nazarite service was of a nobler kind. He began and carried forward a great spiritual reformation; instituted schools or settlements of the prophets, whose lively zeal and devotedness rebuked the languid spirit of the times; and produced such a resuscitation of faith and piety among the people, that more even than Samson's might was conferred on them, and the Philistine yoke was broken, as if it had been but "flax that was burnt with fire." Thus, the Lord taught his people then, and he teaches us still, how much the spiritual in his kingdom transcends that which is physical; and how, if his servants would be borne triumphantly through the trials of life, and do great things for his cause on earth, they must seek the chief elements of their strength in faith upon his word, and devotedness to his fear.

SECTION THIRD.

THE KINGLY INSTITUTION.

THE circumstances connected with this institution, which occurred in the latter period of Samuel's administration, too plainly proved that the revival effected by him was far from being complete, and that much of the old leaven of corruption still remained working. We have already referred to these circumstances, when treating of that combination of type with prophecy, which arose out of the institution of the kingdom of David's house, and have also both there and in the Appendix on the Old Testament in the New explained the typical relation of David's throne to that of Christ (vol. i. B. i. 4, and Appendix B. sec. 3); so that a few supplementary remarks are all that can be required here. It was not, as formerly stated, to the proposal itself to have a king, that any objection lay in the constitution of the theocracy; and Moses had even prescribed certain rules to be observed by the people, in case they should resolve on electing a king, and by the king whom they might elect, (Deut. xvii. 14-20). Nor can we doubt that, in anticipation of such a change ultimately taking place in the form of the government, the priesthood was made so exclusively spiritual in its functions, that there might be no intermingling of the two lines in what properly belonged to each. The only danger in the matter was, that the people, on their part, should proceed in a wrong way to the election, and that the king, on his, should exercise his royal powers in an improper manner. It is simply, indeed, to these two points, that the prescriptions of Moses refer. They require that the people should be careful to appoint only him whom the Lord chose, and that the king chosen should rule only in the name, and in conformity with the law of God, who was still to continue the supreme head of all power and au-

thority in Israel. It was because the people were not paying due regard to these instructions, and also because the king they desired was not likely to rule according to their spirit, that the Lord gave, through Samuel, strong evidence of his dislike to the proposal, and at length altogether rejected the king on whom the choice had fallen. The whole train of circumstances connected with this rejection, and with the subsequent appointment and elevation of David to the throne, were ordered with a view to the bringing out of the twofold fact, that the visible king over God's heritage must be one who had the seal of God's election to the office, and that he must rule in God's name and stead, and for the promotion of the great ends of righteousness. These conditions were such unusual exactions from kings, and in themselves so contrary to the will of the flesh, that even the house of David soon failed to comply with them, and the covenant made with him respecting the perpetuation of the royal dignity in his house was at last suspended, till He should come, in whom no sin or imperfection of any kind should be found.

How clearly David himself perceived the nature of the kingdom connected with his house, and how anxious he was that his posterity should also perceive and act on it, appears, in the first instance, from the great striving of his life, which was directed toward the establishment of a pure worship and a living piety; then, from the large body of psalmodic poetry he left behind him, in which the calling and duties of the king are often vividly delineated; and, finally, from the last words he indited, which were evidently meant as his dying testimony to those who should inherit after him the kingly office. In this testimony he expressed, as with his last breath, his firm belief of the certainty of that covenant which God had made with him, his clear apprehension of the spiritual and holy ends for which it was instituted, and the glorious results for mankind in which it should terminate. "David the son of Jesse saith, and the man raised aloft saith, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet Psalmist (literally, of sweetnesses in the songs) of Israel: The Spirit of Jehovah spoke by me, and his word was upon my tongue; the God of Israel said to me, the Rock of Israel spoke, The ruler among men is righteous, the ruler in the fear of God. And he is as the light of the morning; the sun (viz. such a morning as that when

the sun) goeth forth, a morning without clouds ; from the brightness, from the rain the tender grass [springeth] out of the earth. Is not my house so with God ? For he hath made with me an everlasting covenant,—(or, For, is not my house so with God, that he hath made with me an everlasting covenant)—ordered in all things and sure ; for it is all my salvation and all my desire—shall he not make it to flourish ?¹ But Belial [men] are as thorns thrust away, all of them ; are they not taken by hand (or, by violence) ? And the man that strikes at them is fenced with iron and the staff of a spear, and with fire shall they be utterly burnt without fail” (2 Sam. xxiii. 1-7). The description is made general as to the subject of it (“ the ruler among men”), not as if David were simply drawing a delineation of kings at large, but because he understood that the right to rule among men in the proper sense, the authority to exercise lordship and control in God’s name, and with blessing to the world, was now permanently vested in his house ; so that the special, in one respect, was the most general in another. And hence he immediately couples the ruling power spoken of with the sure and everlasting covenant made with himself. It is as if he said, There is no kind of ruling worth naming but this ; and he that exercises it—he, who is capable of doing so—he who does it according to the intention and appointment of God, reigns in righteousness, and, because he so reigns, is the instrument of conferring the richest and most refreshing benefits on the subjects of his sceptre ; while the enemies of righteousness shall be brought to desolation. David wished nothing more for his house, than that it might fulfil aright its destiny to supply the world with such a righteous administration, and holds up before his successors on the throne the pattern for their imitation. But David himself knew, and we know yet better, that the description should be properly realized only when the kingdom came into the hands of Immanuel, who was personally to fulfil all righteousness, and by his word and Spirit was ultimately to diffuse its blessings to the farthest bounds of the habitable earth.

The institution of a kingdom, then, in the house of David was

¹ The *is* here, and at the beginning of the verse, is best understood, and is now commonly understood by interpreters, interrogatively, as in 1 Sam. xxiv. 20 (Heb. Bible) and 2 Kings xviii. 34.

but a change in the external form of the theocracy, not an interference with its spirit and design. It was not intended to displace God from the supremacy in it, but only to give God, in the person of one of its members, a visible and human representation. A shadow was thus presented from the outset of the incarnation of the Son, and the ground laid for the comforting assurance, that as the future High-priest of men, so also their everlasting King, should be one taken from among his brethren. And, as in the earlier prototype, so in the ultimate form of the institution, it is God's throne, which the anointed king occupies, and God's kingdom over which he rules and presides. Hence, when Christ represents himself as sitting on his Father's throne (Rev. iii. 21 ; Eph. i. 20), it is not, as if he held that throne now, and at some future period were to come and occupy his own. He and the Father are one. The kingdom, with all its fulness of life and blessing, is the Lord's. Christ's office throughout is mediatorial, delegated, vicegerent ; and as in the days of his flesh he did all in his Father's name, in that name also will he reign and rule. It was his peculiar glory to be able to say, " All things that the Father hath are mine ;" and to sit on the Father's throne, and wield, in the behalf of his redeemed, the destinies of the Father's kingdom, is but the further developement of that glory. Beyond this, there is nothing more to be attained, nothing higher to be conceived—till the kingdom itself in its mediatorial aspect shall be consummated, and God himself shall be all in all.

SECTION FOURTH.

THE PROPHETICAL ORDER.

It was no more alien to the theocratic constitution as set up by Moses, to admit of an order of prophets bringing from time to time special messages from above, than it was to concentrate its executive powers in the kingly institution. The occasional employment of such divine messengers was from the first anticipated by Moses; and certain characteristics were given by which to test the veracity of those who might appear with that name, and also directions issued how to deal with the announcements they made (Deut. xviii. 15-22). Such an anticipation alone bespoke a sense of the relative imperfection of the dispensation introduced by Moses. It was a virtual confession, that further revelations than it imparted were needed to carry on the work of God among the Israelites, and make them fully acquainted with the truths of God's kingdom. Yet they were not on this account to slight what was already given, or to regard it as insufficient for their instruction in all ordinary circumstances. Indeed, as actually employed, the dispensers of this new and superaddition light derived their calling, and the occasion of their communications, from the sinful neglect of what had been revealed of truth and duty by the ministrations of Moses. It was rather for remedying an existing evil, than for communicating an additional good, that the prophetic gift was in the first instance conferred, and the authority connected with it exercised. The spirit of prophecy that appeared in Samuel, with whom the more regular prophetic agency began, and to whom may be ascribed the institution of a prophetic order, was called forth by the cry of abounding iniquity and general disorder. It awoke then into living and sys-

tematic energy, when the ordinary means of instruction had proved manifestly insufficient, and exerted itself at first chiefly in rousing men to a sense of guilt in having departed from the requirements of the law, and in earnest strivings after a better state of things. It was essentially a spirit of revival ; though employing for the promotion of its objects, not merely the more lively and exciting exercises of devotion, but also the occasional announcement of coming events. In David's time, too, the Spirit of prophecy partook largely of the same character ; in rousing and energetic strains it exhibited the real design and object of the Mosaic institutions, and strove to have the old framework of the law lighted up in all its departments by the flame of a sincere and ardent piety, and in its practical observance rendered the faithful exponent of a righteous people. Along with this, however, the spirit of prophecy in David and his inspired associates took a loftier flight, and gave promise of a time, when other agencies than those then at work would be brought into the field—when the divine kingdom would be set up in higher hands than those which then directed its concerns—when the righteousness of God, holding the sceptre of the kingdom, should diffuse itself in acts of mercy and judgment among the people, and not only in the land of Canaan, but throughout the nations of the earth, should establish the just, and destroy the seed of evil-doers. The whole of this stream of prophecy—prophecy of the Davidic type—may be said to run in the channel of the older covenants, those of Abraham and Sinai ; yet so as, at the same time, to bring out their real import and design—to inspirit them with new meaning—to shew, that when fulfilled according to their true intent, there would be not merely the decencies of a formal service, and the pomp of a sacrificial worship, but far more and better than these—the spirit of truth in the inward parts, the delighting in the law of God in the heart, and the exhibition of his truth and righteousness before men. What was aimed at for the present, and what was predicted to take place sometime in the future, was the indefinite rise and extension of the divine kingdom, by the growth of a true spirit of piety and worth, or the copious production of such a genuine seed of blessing as God from the first sought among men.

It soon became evident, however, that this great end was not

to be secured by any partial improvement in the polity introduced by Moses, such as took place when the supreme power in the administration of its affairs was vested in an earthly head. The change for a time wrought well, but only for a time. Ere long degeneracy and corruption entered into the royal house itself, and spread like a pestilence throughout the land. As the spiritual distempers grew, the judgments of God fell in successive and deepening visitations of evil ; and a time came, when not the realization of splendid hopes, but the doom of irrecoverable desolation and ruin seemed to be the consummation in prospect. It was when matters were verging towards such a state, or had actually reached it, that prophets with the higher gifts of the Spirit were raised up, and brought the more into play the extraordinary powers vested in them, the more inadequate common resources were seen to have become. Among these prophets there are characteristic differences, both in respect to the nature of their several communications, and to the form in which they are presented. But in certain leading characteristics there is an entire coincidence. There is so, first of all, in the relation occupied by the prophets, as a class, to the law ; they were one and all the asserters and expounders of its righteousness. This they constantly held up as in itself right and good, and charged upon the people's heedless and unprincipled violation of its commands, whatever was to be found of trouble or calamity in their condition, holding out the prospect of a return to blessing and prosperity only through a return to the obedience required at their hands. Such prophetic ministrations clearly implied, that while the law was laid upon the nation collectively, it was also laid upon the conscience of each person individually ; and, indeed, that the righteousness it demanded was a work, a life, for which every one in his particular place was responsible. In this part of their labours, too, it is to be observed, that the teaching of the prophets fell in with the more spiritual operation of the law itself. When pressing the obligations of the law's righteousness, they never fail to make it understood, that what they meant by this was something very different from a merely external show of obedience, or a multiplication of sacrificial offerings ; it was a sincere and hearty surrender to the will of God, in all that was morally and spiritually good. They often even disparage the outward appearance and

the ritual service, when these were not rendered as the expression of inward principles and feelings, but put as a substitute for them (Isa. i. 11-15, lxvii. 1-3, Micah vi. 6-8, &c). On this point it is justly remarked by the author of *Ancient Christianity* (vol. I. p. 161), that the prophets and other inspired writers of the Old Testament always chiefly insist upon "the great principles and the unchanging requirements of justice, mercy, temperance, as well as upon the development of the more intimate principles of the spiritual life. What is the book of Psalms? Is it a manual of monkery? What are the prophets? Are they the zealous sticklers for ablutions? And do they chafe and fret on points of the ascetic ritual? Such are not the characteristics of the inspired writers of the Old Testament; who are manifestly imbued with the spirit and the power, with the truth, the reason of the apostles—although they did not enjoy the same light."

We cannot but notice it also as a characteristic of the prophetic teaching, and a preparation for the change to be introduced by the kingdom of the Messiah, that there is less of the national aspect in the form of instruction communicated, more of the individual and personal; and not unfrequently the distinction is very pointedly drawn between the one and the other, and the sincere and spiritual, though ever so few and humble, are preferred above all that was outwardly great or esteemed. The prophets render more prominent than was done even in the Psalms, the election within the election—the real seed of blessing as but a part of the children of the covenant. Thus the prophet Isaiah distinguishes between the two: "Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with *him*, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with *him*, for the reward of his hands shall be given him." And again, "To this man will I look (not to other things, however externally beautiful or attractive—not to the temple itself, and its outward worship, but to this man) who is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word" (ch. iii. 10, 11, lxvi. 2). The writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel contain many passages of a similar import. Especially striking is the representation of Ezekiel, in which he exhibits the glory of Jehovah forsaking the earthly temple, and appearing on the banks of Chebar, that he might there be a sanctuary to such as sought him with a true heart and a right spirit (ch. x. xi. 16-25). And in the latest prophetic

writings, those of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, there is a constant reference, in connection with the future manifestations of God, to the essential distinction between the spiritually good and bad in Israel ; and the design and effect of the coming manifestations are represented as differing according to the relation in which men might stand to the truth and righteousness of God.

In fulfilling these departments of their office, as expositors of the law of God and preachers of righteousness, the prophets had to encounter many trials and hardships. Indignities, persecutions, imprisonment, and even death, were too often what came upon them as the reward of their spiritual life and faithful representations. They were obliged to become as aliens to their own brethren, and in what they experienced typified the condition and treatment, which on a like account, and in a more intense degree, were to befall Jesus as the great prophet of his church. Their word, however, lived and proved itself to be the word of God, as Christ's also did in his time, by the response it met with in enlightened bosoms, and the confirmation it received by the dispensations of God. And looking even to that part of their writings, which may be said to be of a more strictly legal and didactic nature, it is manifest, that the hope was, in a manner, abandoned of obtaining, as things then stood, a national exhibition of the truth and righteousness of God, and that consequently, when the divine kingdom should come to be reconstructed and placed on a better foundation, respect should be had mainly to the personal and spiritual characteristics of the individuals who should belong to it.

As to that better foundation itself, or the higher form which the kingdom was to assume in the future, and which it was the part also of the prophets to unfold, there is a considerable diversity, as well as a comprehensive fulness in the instruction which is furnished by their writings. And if we should look merely to the form of their communications, undoubtedly it might often seem as if they only anticipated a revival and enlargement of the old ; since it is usually under the aspect of what had been, that they foretel what was yet to be. There are not wanting traits and incidents, however, in their delineations of the future, which plainly enough imply that the future was to differ very materially from the past, and to differ especially in the more effective agencies it would employ to secure a spiritual and godly seed, and the more

marked distinction that should be made between such and others of an opposite description. The later prophecies of Isaiah especially are full of this. The bright and elevating hopes there held out to the people of God, all turn on manifestations of God's grace and goodness, which were to exceed all that had been in the past, and were to be the means of bringing forth a seed so full of faith and holiness, so replenished with the spirit and strengthened with the might of God, that outward evil should gradually give way, and every thing rise to a higher sphere of blessing. Jeremiah, in like manner, speaks of that better time, as one in which the people should be fed with knowledge and understanding—when they should no longer need such imperfect instruments of sanctification as the ark of the Lord—when the covenant in its old form should be done away, and a new covenant with better promises and more spiritual powers should take its place (ch. iii. 15, 16, xxxi. 31). In the same direction also point the great evangelical prophecies of Ezekiel and Joel concerning the outpouring of the Spirit, with its blessed results of a spiritually enlightened and regenerated people (Ez. xxxvi. 25, 26, Joel ii. 28) ; and, to mention no more, the prediction of Malachi concerning the Lord's coming to his temple, that he might purify the sons of Levi, and obtain an offering of righteousness. A church or kingdom framed in accordance with such representations, and fitted to give them practical effect, must necessarily have been one that primarily took account of the state of the inner man, and required as its fundamental condition, that its members should be rightly affected in their hearts toward God. A conviction to this effect would naturally grow and deepen in thoughtful minds, when they considered the many intimations contained in prophecy respecting the extension of God's kingdom to other nations of the earth—a change that necessarily implied the elevation of spiritual characteristics over all merely national peculiarities. It was impossible, in short, to examine carefully the prophetic intimations of the coming age, without perceiving that the spiritual element was to be much more prominently displayed in the divine kingdom ; that by a new revelation of the Lord's glory and the richer communication of his grace to men, the outward and symbolical was in many respects to be supplanted by the inward and real, and the children of God raised to a much nearer resemblance to his image and a higher fitness for his service.

SECTION FIFTH.

THE BABYLONISH EXILE AND ITS RESULTS.

THE strong tendency we have marked in the prophetic teaching to characteristics of a more spiritual and personal kind, was confirmed by an event in providence which, in the long run, was perhaps even more influential in its working. This was the Babylonish exile, or, as it may more fitly be termed, the dispersion which began with the Babylonish dominion, but extended to other lands, and continued even to apostolic times. The dispersion itself came as the judgment of Heaven on account of Israel's long-continued and incorrigible apostasy. The laying of Jerusalem on heaps by a heathen power, the subversion of Judah's independence, and the banishment of her people to a foreign region, were in themselves evils of the greatest magnitude. They were an appalling sign before the world, that the mission of Israel as a separate and highly-privileged people had comparatively failed, and that they were appointed to shame and humiliation among men, because they had been tried by God, and found miserably wanting. But God's work of judgment upon his own people differs from that inflicted upon aliens; there is always intermingled with it an element of good; and not uncommonly does it form the commencement of a new and more effectual mode of working out the purposes which had failed to be accomplished in the original and more direct line. It certainly was so in the case now under consideration.

Babylon was allowed, as a chastisement to the covenant-people for their sins, to lay waste their heritage, and lead them captive at her chariot-wheels as hapless exiles. But Babylon was soon made to feel, that a power mightier than her own slumbered among these very exiles, and that the conquered were, in a sense, to give laws to their conquerors. It was simply the want of per-

sonal holiness—the want of a living faith in God, and of an unswerving devotedness to his service, which had cast Israel down from her pre-eminence among the nations. But now the desolating judgments of God were overruled to the awakening in many bosoms of the ancient spirit of piety, and caused them to seek for the old paths. The sign of Samson in the prison-house of Gaza began at length to find its realization in the prisoners of Babylon—the strength that had departed from them in the season of their unfaithfulness again returned. It returned first of all in Daniel and his three youthful companions, who held fast their allegiance to the God of heaven amid all the fascinations and splendour of a heathen palace; who, in the face of the assembled might and glory of the kingdom, withstood the peremptory decree to worship the golden image set up in the plain of Dura; who were enabled to reveal secrets, which baffled the skill of the wise and learned in Babylon, nay, to read out the doom of Babylon herself from the mystic handwriting of heaven on the wall—a doom, too, declared to have been precipitated by the pride and insolence of her behaviour toward the God of her Jewish captives. These wonderful beginnings of grace and power, conferred on a mere handful of those who had been exiled to Babylon, were the testimony of Heaven, that though few in number, they might still be powerful in influence; and though no longer dwelling as a nation in Canaan, or celebrating the outward ritual of Moses, they might yet be both blessed and made a blessing to the world. Nothing could have shewn more conclusively, that as the outward privileges and institutions of Israel had existed only for the sake of the internal principles of holiness they were intended to protect and nourish; so if, without the external framework, the inward result were attained, the favour and blessing of Heaven would not fail to rest upon them. The occupation of Canaan, with the whole machinery of its legal arrangements and priestly ministrations, was thus seen to have been but means to an end; and the end might be reached even at a distance from Canaan, and away from all its distinctive privileges—if only there was a return to the faith and service of Jehovah.

It was, no doubt, some feeling of this kind which induced many even of the better portion of the Jews to remain in the countries of their dispersion, after the liberty had been secured to them of

re-occupying the land of their fathers. Daniel himself, who acted so important a part in obtaining the decree of release, appears to have entertained no thought of availing himself of the opportunity it afforded of exchanging Babylon for Jerusalem; nor was it more than a small portion of those who had been scattered abroad, that from any quarter found their way back to Judea. More, certainly, should have returned than actually came, to assist their brethren in the work of re-establishing the temple-service, and making suitable preparation for the better order of things, which the prophets had foretold. But, on the other hand, matters did not at first assume such an aspect there, as to admit of all, or perhaps even the greater part returning. Difficulties on every side beset the portion who did return, and the work in which they were engaged. Their poverty and fewness were in a great degree their safety. And we may not doubt, that the hand of God was also in this. He saw it better for the great ends of his spiritual government to allow the dispersion to a large extent to continue, that the light of his truth might be more widely diffused abroad, and he might have, in all the more important seats and centres of heathenism, his means and instruments of working.

In this turn of affairs there was altogether a wonderful display of the wisdom and power of God, in bringing good out of evil, and advancing his cause in the world by what was primarily most adverse to its interests. Shortly after the dispersion took place, the relative position of the kingdoms of the world materially changed. Canaan no longer remained, as it had been before, in the centre of the world's power, civilization and commerce. The world, in its active energies and influential agencies, began to move westward; and centuries before the Christian era, the ascendancy in all that constitutes dominion among men, had become the inheritance of the Greeks and Romans; while the regions in the neighbourhood of Judea had sunk to the rank of dependent and tributary provinces. How wise, then, to direct the current of events respecting the covenant-people, in such a manner as to adapt their position to the altered state of the world's kingdoms, and to give them a place of influential working in connection with these, after they had been themselves somewhat weaned from their former corruptions, and awakened to a sense of their proper calling? They might thus, in some measure, do

individually and separately, what they could no longer have done collectively and nationally; and to some extent they actually did it. Through their instrumentality a knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures was diffused among the heathen. Proselytes in considerable numbers joined them, even in the most polished communities; and when the time had come for planting the standard of the cross in the world, there were found, partly of Jewish, partly of Gentile extraction, in almost every city of the Roman empire, the elements already existing for the immediate formation of a Christian church.

This, however, was not the whole; a change of another kind was meanwhile proceeding. By the separation of so many of the covenant-people from the temple and its rites, the bands became loosened in their minds to what was merely local and symbolical in Judaism. They could think of God apart from the material house and altar at Jerusalem, and could contemplate the possibility of religion existing in its more vital energies without the accompaniment of a fixed and stately ceremonial. The synagogues, with their simple worship, their governing college of elders, and their regulated discipline, everywhere presented a historical basis and rudimentary model for the Christian church. The worship of the synagogue (to use the words of Mr Litton) "formed the point of transition between the symbolical services of the temple and the verbal services of the new economy; and, by habituating the Jewish mind to the offerings of prayer and praise instead of the bloody sacrifices of the law, and to the ministry of the Word instead of the ministry of types, it smoothed the way for the gospel dispensation." The relation of those synagogues to the temple is also instructive, and has its parallel in the new dispensation. "However much synagogues might be multiplied, there was but one temple, one divinely-appointed priesthood, one altar; and the synagogues, otherwise distinct societies, were connected together by their common relation to the temple. The pious Jew, in what part soever of the world he might be, regarded the temple, with its priesthood, sacrifices and ritual, as the centre of national unity. Now the Jewish temple, as every reader of the New Testament knows, has in Christianity no material counterpart; it is the church, the mystical body of Christ, composed of those who are in living union with him, that

is now the abode of God's covenanted presence. Hence, there being in Christianity no material temple, the visible centre of unity to the local societies which constitute collectively the visible church, there are no visible temple-services, priesthood, or sacrifice. Whatever there is in the Christian church of a sacerdotal character, is of the same nature with the Christian temple itself—that is, it is spiritual and invisible. Christ, the only priest of the new temple, is in heaven, not upon earth; and the only sacrifices now offered by the Christian are the spiritual ones, which are acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. The temple-services of Christianity, whatever they may be, belong not to visible churches as such, but the mystical body of Christ, and, like that body, are spiritual, or removed to a higher sphere.”¹

Thus, by a series of acts and operations, institutions of worship and dispensations of Providence, all wisely ordered and arranged, was the way prepared for the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. What was from the first aimed at—the cultivation of personal faith and holiness—was continually brought out with greater prominence and distinctness, as the indispensable condition of such a kingdom as God sought among men. The local, the outward, the shadowy was gradually displaced by the diffusive, the spiritual and abiding. And when Christianity opened on the world with its new and higher life, it had but to throw off the shell of forms and observances, which had already become unsuitable, and expand the kernel, which lay within, into something of nobler growth and more perfect organization.

¹ Litton on the Church of Christ, p. 254, 618.

APPENDIX A.

VIEWS OF THE REFORMERS REGARDING THE SABBATH.—

P. 136.

WE regret that Hengstenberg, in his recent treatise on the Lord's day, takes much the same course with those referred to in the note, of producing quotations from the writings of the Reformers, that present only one side of their opinions, and without any qualifying statement as to there being grounds on which they did acknowledge the abiding obligation of a weekly Sabbath. Any one would conclude, from the representation he has given, that the stream of sentiment ran entirely in one direction. There are undoubtedly very strong, as we think, unguarded and improper, and, as might seem at first sight, quite conclusive declarations in the writings and authorized standards of the Reformers, against Sabbatical observances. Thus Luther, in his larger Catechism, says, "God set apart the seventh day, and appointed it to be observed, and commanded that it should be considered holy above all others; and this command, as far as the outward observance was concerned, was given to the Jews alone, that they should abstain from hard labour, and rest, in order that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not be worn out by constant work. Therefore, this commandment, literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, bound to modes, and persons, and times and customs, all of which are now left free by Christ." So again, in the Augsburg Confession, expressing the mind not only of Luther, but also of Melancthon and the leading Lutheran Reformers, "Great disputes have arisen concerning the change of the law, concerning the ceremonies of the new law, concerning the change of the Sabbath, which have all sprung from the false persuasion, that the worship in the church ought to correspond to the Levitical service. They who think that the observance of the Lord's day was instituted by the church in place of the Sabbath, as a necessary thing, completely err. Scripture grants, that the observance of the Sabbath now is free; for it teaches, that since the introduction of the Gospel, Mosaic ceremonies are no longer necessary." To add only one more, and that from the Reformed Church, the Helvetic Confession drawn up in 1566, after referring to the observance of Sunday in early times, and the advantages derived from it, adds the following statement: "But we do not tolerate here either superstition or the Jewish mode of observance. For we do not believe that one day is holier than

another, or that rest in itself is pleasing to God. We keep the Sunday, not the Sabbath, by a voluntary observance."

Now, we freely admit, that such statements, taken by themselves, and viewed apart from the circumstances of the time, might very naturally be understood to imply an absolute freedom from any proper obligation to keep the Lord's day. But it ought, first of all, to be borne in mind, that the subject engaged a comparatively small share of the attention of the Reformers, and that, in so far as it did, they were placed in circumstances fitted to give a peculiar bias to their thoughts and language. There is no regular and systematic treatise on the Sabbath in the works of the more eminent divines of that period; it is only incidentally alluded to in connection with other points, such as the power of the church in decreeing ceremonies, or briefly discussed in their commentaries on Scripture, or, finally, made the subject of a few paragraphs under the Fourth Commandment, in their elements of Christian doctrine. A few minutes might suffice to read what each one of the Reformers has left on record concerning the permanent obligation of the Sabbath; indeed, that part of the question is rather summarily decided on, than calmly and satisfactorily examined. It was only about the beginning of the seventeenth century, when a controversy arose concerning it in Holland, that it began to attract much notice on the continent, and that a careful investigation was made into the grounds of its existing obligation. Before the meeting of the famous Synod of Dort, considerable heats had been occasioned by the subject in the province of Zealand; and with the view of somewhat allaying these, or at least restraining them within certain bounds, that Synod, in one of its last sederunts, held on the 17th May 1618, and after the departure of the foreign deputies, passed certain resolutions which were intended to serve as interim rules for the direction of those who might still choose to agitate the controversy, until it might be fully and formally discussed in a future synod. These resolutions were passed in the course of one day, and were carried with the consent of the Zealand brethren themselves, so that they may be regarded as embodying the nearly unanimous judgment of the Dutch Church of that period. They are as follows:—1. "In the Fourth Commandment there is something ceremonial and something moral; 2. The ceremonial was the rest of the seventh day, and the rigid observance of that day prescribed to the Jewish people; 3. But the moral is, that a certain and stated day was appointed for the worship of God, and such rest as is necessary for the worship of God, and devout meditation upon him; 4. The Sabbath of the Jews having been abrogated, the Lord's day must be solemnly sanctified by Christians; 5. From the time of the apostles this day was always observed in the ancient Catholic Church; 6. The day must be so consecrated to divine worship, that there shall be a cessation from all servile works, excepting those which are done on account of some present necessity, and from such recreations as are discordant with the worship of God."

The publishing of these resolutions had not the desired effect; for neither did the controversy cease, nor was it carried on within the prescribed bounds. A few years afterwards a treatise on the subject was published by Gomar, then at the head of the Calvinists, disputing two or three of the resolutions.

He was soon replied to at considerable length by Walæus; and still more elaborately, some years later, by J. Altingius. It was then first that the points connected with the permanent obligation of the Fourth Commandment came to be fully discussed in the churches of the Reformation. And if certain mistakes in the way of handling the matter appeared in the writings of the earlier divines, we may be the less surprised when we know the comparatively small share it had in their inquiries and meditations.

But if we further take into account the circumstances in which they were placed, we shall be still less surprised at the particular error they adopted; for these naturally gave their minds the bias which led them to embrace it. The gigantic system of heresy and corruption against which they had to contend, was chiefly distinguished by the multitude of its superstitious rites and ceremonies, and the substitution of an outward attendance upon these for a simple faith in Christ, as the ground of men's acceptance before God. This false method of salvation by works had branched itself out into so many ramifications, and had taken such a powerful hold of the minds of men, that the Reformers were in a manner constrained to speak of all outward observances as in themselves worthless, and not properly required to the salvation of sinners. They represented, in the strongest terms, the inward nature of the kingdom of God, its independence of things in themselves outward and ceremonial, so that no bodily service, merely as such, was incumbent upon Christians as it had been in Judaism, but was only to be used as a help for ministering to, or an occasion for exercising the graces of a Christian life. Hence, in the Augsburg Confession, difference of days and distinctions of food are classed together, as things about which so many false opinions had gathered, that "though in themselves indifferent, they had become no longer so." And the false opinions are particularly specified to be such as tended to produce the conviction, that people thought themselves entitled by those corporeal satisfactions to deserve the remission of their sins. Melancthon, in his defence of that Confession, arguing against the idea so prevalent regarding the church and her external ceremonies, affirms, that "the apostles did not wish us to consider such rites as necessary to our justification before God. They did not wish to impose any burden of that kind upon our consciences; did not wish that righteousness and sin should be placed in the observance of days, of food, and such things. Nay, Paul declares opinions of such a kind to be doctrines of devils." In like manner, Calvin, in his remarks upon the Fourth Commandment, contained in his Institutes, says, that as the Jewish Sabbath was but a shadow of Christ, "there ought to be amongst Christians no superstitious observance of days;" and that to regard the sanctification of every seventh, though not precisely the last day of the week, as the moral part of the Fourth Commandment, was "only to change the day in despite of the Jews, and at the same time to keep up in the mind the conviction of its sanctity." Quotations of a like import might be multiplied almost indefinitely; but there can be no need for it, as all who are even moderately acquainted with the times and writings of the Reformers must know, that from the circumstances in which they were placed, and the peculiar nature of the warfare they were called to wage, such expressions regarding outward ceremonies in general, and the sanctification of

the Lord's day in particular, are both of frequent occurrence, and easily accounted for. At the same time, though such expressions unquestionably involve a doctrinal error, so far as the Lord's day, at least, is concerned, no one really acquainted with the spirit of their writings can need to be told, that it is the mere *opus operatum*,—the outward service alone that is there spoken of. Nothing more, after all, is meant, than that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink,—that there is no essential inherent sanctity in the days and observances considered by themselves, as apart from the way in which they are used, and the ends for which they are appointed. That the Reformers did not mean the statements referred to, to be taken in the most unqualified sense, is evident alone from their views of the primeval Sabbath. They held, we believe without any exception worth naming, that the weekly Sabbath appointed at the creation had a universal aspect, and has a descending obligation to future times. We have already given the judgment of Calvin, and also of Luther on the subject. (Sec p. 121).

Beza was of the same mind, as will appear from a quotation to be produced shortly. So also Peter Martyr, who, in his *Loci Com.*, says,—“ God could indeed have appointed all or many days for his own worship, but since he knew that we were doomed to eat our bread by the sweat of our face, he rested one in seven, on which, discarding other works, we should apply to that alone.” And Bullinger, who says on Matt. xii.,—“ *Sabbath* signifies rest, and is taken for that day which was consecrated to rest. But the observance of that rest was always famous and of highest antiquity, not invented and brought forth for the first time by Moses when he introduced the law; for in the Decalogue it is said, ‘Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy,’ thereby admonishing them that it was of ancient institution.” And to pass over many of the learned writers, from whom similar extracts might be taken, we conclude with the testimony of Pareus, who, though not properly a Reformer, was yet the disciple of the Reformers, and who, in his commentary on Gen. ii. 3, says,—“ It pertains to us to keep holy the day sanctified by God, by imitating his rest. To imitate the rest of God is not to be idle, to do nothing, for God was not idle, nor did he bless idleness; neither is it to feign that a sanctity was impressed upon that day (as hypocrites do, who make an idol of the Sabbath); but it is, according to God's example, to cease from our works, that is from sins, which properly are our works, tending most of all to desecrate the Sabbath, and from the labours of this life, to which the six days are destined. It is, further, to apply the Sabbath to divine worship, by teaching, hearing, meditating, doing those things which pertain to the true knowledge and worship of God, to the love of our neighbour, and our own salvation. Such sanctification is suitable every day; for in blessing the seventh day, God did not curse other days; but the sanctification was, by way of distinction, pronounced upon that day, on which no other labours were to entangle us.”

It is evident, that with such views regarding the original appointment and descending obligation of a weekly Sabbath, the Reformers could only have disowned the duty of keeping a Christian Sabbath, by being inconsistent with themselves, and could only have denied the abiding obligation of the Fourth Commandment, by holding some peculiar notions (different from

those now generally entertained) respecting the import of that commandment. We believe that they were at one in holding the Decalogue to be the revelation of the moral law, and as such, therefore, binding in all its precepts upon men of every age and condition of life. As a specimen, we may take what Melancthon says of it in the introduction to his treatise on the Decalogue, contained in vol. ii. of his works, which he begins with these words:—"It is necessary to retain the usual division; the principal part of the law is called the moral, which is the decalogue rightly understood." Then, shortly after, describing this decalogue as a whole, he says,—"**THE MORAL LAW** is the eternal and unchangeable wisdom that is in God, and a rule of life, distinguishing what is right from what is wrong, commanding the one, and with severe indignation forbidding the other, the knowledge of which was in creation implanted in rational creatures, and afterwards often repeated, and by divine voice proclaimed, that men might know that God is, and what he is, and that he is a judge who obliges all his rational creatures to be conformed to himself, to yield our obedience entirely accordant with his law, and accusing and destroying all that are not possessed of this conformity." In like manner, Calvin, in his Institutes, heads the chapter which treats of the Decalogue, "An explanation of the Moral Law," describes it as "the rule of perfect righteousness," and gives it as the reason why God has set up this law in writing before us, "both that it might testify with more certainty what in the law of nature was too obscure, and might more vividly, as by a palpable form, strike our mind and memory."

Regarding the Decalogue in this light, the Reformers plainly ought to have considered the Fourth Commandment, as well as the others, of universal and permanent obligation. And yet it is certain they did not. They laid down right premises on the subject, while, by some strange oversight or misapprehension, they failed to draw the conclusion they inevitably lead to. It was the unanimous opinion of those divines, that the rest enjoined in the Fourth Commandment was of a ceremonial and typical nature, that, as Luther expresses himself, "it was entirely outward," and as such, therefore, consummated and done away in Christ. Even Alting could not get rid of this view of the matter, and consequently feels himself necessitated to maintain the extraordinary position, that man was not only made, but also sinned and fell on the sixth day, and that the rest of the Sabbath having been brought in subsequent to the fall, was even, in its first observance, a type of redemption. By such a position, though too improbable to be generally received, he of course vindicated his consistence, in regard to the rest of the Sabbath, as being from the first of a typical nature. The Reformers, however, cannot receive the benefit of the same vindication, not having broached the opinion, that the original institution of the Sabbath was subsequent to the fall. The inconsistency probably never struck them, from the subject having occupied so comparatively small a share of their attention. And what seems more than anything else to have misled them, was the passage in Colossians, where "Sabbath days" are classed by the Apostle among the things which were shadows of Gospel truth, and hence done away when Christ, the substance, came. They constantly bring forward this passage when speaking of the ceremonial and typical nature of the Jewish Sabbath.

But how did they reconcile to their own minds the manifest inconsistency of at once holding the Fourth Commandment to be of moral and perpetual obligation, and, at the same time, of considering the sacred rest imposed in that commandment as of a ceremonial nature, and only of temporary obligation? There was here a real difficulty in the way; and though we find some variety in their endeavours to get rid of it, yet they all concurred in introducing into this part of the Decalogue the distinction—at variance as it was with the general view they entertained of that code of precepts—that the precept was partly ceremonial, and partly moral. It was ceremonial, as interdicting all servile work, and enjoining a day of outward unbroken rest,—thus typifying the peaceful and blessed rest which believers enjoy in Christ; free alike from the labours of sin and the fears of guilt. But did the typical stand, in that day of rest being simply one in every seven, or in its being precisely the seventh and last of the ever-returning circle? Here we find great diversity of opinion. And did the moral stand, in the appointment of one day in every seven, though not precisely the last in order, as a day of bodily rest and spiritual employment, or, more generally, in its requiring adequate and proper times to be set apart for these merciful and holy purposes? Here also no less diversity.

Some of the Reformers descended so little into particulars, that we cannot, for certain, know what opinion they held on these points. For example, Melancthon, in his *Loci Theol.*, and in his treatise, *De Lege Divina* (using almost the same words), writes thus:—"In this commandment there are properly said to be two parts,—the one natural, the other moral; the one the genus, the other the species. Of the former it is said, that the natural part or genus is perpetual, and cannot be abrogated, as being a command concerning the maintenance of the public ministry, so that on some one day the people should be taught, and divinely appointed ceremonies handled. But the species, which bears respect to the seventh day in particular, is abrogated." He carefully avoids saying whether he looked upon the abolition as standing precisely in the change of the day from the seventh to some other; and also, whether the morality of the commandment required the day preserved to be some one day in every week. His language does not necessarily imply any positive decision on these points, although the natural inference is, that by the day still to be observed for pious purposes, he meant one day in each week, and by the abrogation of the species, the mere removal of that day from the last to any other day of the week.

The opinions of the reformed divines, however, are generally expressed with sufficient distinctness upon the points in question; and they divide themselves into two leading classes. One class, with Calvin at their head, maintained, that the typical mystery of the Sabbatical rest stood not simply in its being held on the seventh or last day, but in that along with the other six preceding days of work—in the number seven viewed as one whole, and terminating in the most strict and rigorous cessation from all labour; hence, the removal of the day from the first to the last of the week, if the day itself was still viewed in precisely the same character, did not essentially alter the nature of the institution,—the number seven was still preserved, and if viewed in the same light, and in all its parts held equally binding as before,

the Jewish ordinance, in their estimation, was substantially retained. Considering the Sabbatical rest, therefore, of every seventh day as a shadow of Gospel realities, they conceived that the moral obligation couched under the figure could be carried no further than to impose the necessity of setting apart such times as might be sufficient to maintain the worship of God; but that it did not strictly bind Christians to confine themselves to one day in seven, as if to take more would be to err in excess, or to take fewer would be to err by deficiency. The exact length of the period which was to separate one day of rest from another, under the Christian dispensation, they held should be determined by other considerations. But did they, therefore, question that that should be one in seven? Not in the least, for there were considerations enough besides to fix that as the proper rotation. Gomar, indeed, says, that days for the solemn worship and service of God ought to be more frequent now than under the Jewish dispensation; and he gives us to understand, that to impress this upon the minds of Christians, was one of his reasons for undertaking to shew the abrogation of the Jewish seventh-day Sabbath; for God, he contends in sect. 5th, imposed only one day in seven upon the Jews, because they were a carnal and stiff-necked people, and were burdened with many heavy ceremonies; and hence arises a clear obligation, in the altered and improved circumstances of Christians, to have, when they can, more frequent days of sacred rest for the worship of God. Gomar, therefore, held the propriety, and even the obligation, if circumstances permitted, to have a more frequent than a seventh-day Sabbath.

But he seems to stand alone in deriving such an obligation from the Fourth Commandment. The Reformers, at any rate, appear to have had no doubt that the day to be observed for holy purposes was to be one in each week, not excepting those of them who took the most general view of the moral obligation imposed in the Fourth Commandment, feeling themselves drawn to that conclusion by a regard to the other purposes for which it was given, as well as from the primeval character of the ordinance, and the recorded procedure of the Apostolic Church in keeping the first day of the week. Luther, in his German annotations on the Fourth Commandment, says,—“Although the Sabbath is now abolished, and the conscience is freed from it, it is still good, and even necessary, that men should keep a particular day in the week for the sake of the Word of God, on which they are to meditate, hear, and learn, for all cannot command every day; and nature also requires that one day in the week should be kept quiet, without labour either for man or beast.” In like manner, in his Larger Catechism, after stating that the worship of God is “not now bound to certain times, as it was among the Jews, as if this day or that were to be preferred for such a purpose, for no day is better or more excellent than another;” he goes on to remark, that “since the mass of men cannot attend on it every day, from the entanglements of business, some one day, *at the least*, in the week must be chosen for giving heed to that matter,”—mentioning the example set by the Apostolic Church in choosing the first day of the week as what ought to determine the church in succeeding times. Calvin is, if possible, still more decided; for he holds, that even as imposed upon the children of Israel in the Fourth Commandment, the Sabbath was designed, not merely

to prefigure spiritual rest, but also to afford an opportunity for engaging in religious exercises, and for a respite from labour to the humbler classes of society. And, "since these two latter reasons," he remarks in his Institutes, "ought not to be numbered amongst the ancient shadows, but alike concern all ages, although the Sabbath is abolished, it yet has that place among us, that on stated days we meet for hearing the Word of God, for partaking of the Lord's Supper, and for public prayers; also that servants and work-people may have a respite from labour." And a little afterwards, more expressly, he speaks of "the Apostle having retained the Sabbath" for the poor of the Christian community, so far keeping up the distinction of days, and of the danger of superstition being almost taken away by the substitution of another day of the week for religious purposes, instead of that which the Jews held to be peculiarly sacred.

There was, however, another class of opinions, or rather of divines holding the opinion, that the Sabbatical rest, as enjoined upon the Jews in the Fourth Commandment, was, indeed, typical of the spiritual rest of the Gospel, but that the mystery or type existed in the day of rest being precisely the seventh or last day of the week,—that the moral obligation contained in the precept for all times and ages, was its imposing the duty of hallowing one day in seven,—and that, consequently, by changing the day from the last to the first, which was done by the apostles under the direction of the Holy Spirit, the moral part of the commandment was retained in full force, while the Jewish mystery necessarily ceased. This more correct opinion was, I should say, more generally adopted by the earlier divines after the Reformation, than the one just considered. Beza may first be mentioned, who thus writes on Rev. i. 11 :—"He calls that day *the Lord's*, which Paul names *the first of the week* (*μία σαββάτων*), 1 Cor. xvi. 2, on which day it appears that even then the Christians were accustomed to hold their own regular meetings, as the Jews were wont to meet in the synagogue on the Sabbath, for the purpose of shewing that the Fourth Commandment, concerning the sanctification of every seventh day, was ceremonial, *as far as it respected the particular day of rest and the legal services*, but that, as regards the worship of God, it was a precept of the moral law, which is perpetual and unchanging during the present life. That day of rest had stood, indeed, from the creation of the world to the resurrection of our Lord, which being as another creation of a new spiritual world (according to the language of the prophets), was made the occasion (the Holy Spirit, beyond doubt, directing the apostles) for assuming instead of the Sabbath of the former age or the seventh day, the first day of this world, on which, not the corporeal and corruptible light created on the first day of the old world, but this heavenly and eternal light hath shone upon us. Therefore the assemblies of the Lord's day are of apostolical and truly divine tradition; yet so that a Jewish cessation from all work should not be observed, since this would manifestly be not to abolish Judaism, but only to change what respected the particular day. This, however, was afterwards introduced by Constantine, as appears from Eusebius and the laws of the emperor, and was afterwards, by succeeding emperors, restrained within still narrower bounds; till at length, what was first instituted for a good purpose, and is still properly retained, namely *that the mind*,

freed from its daily labours, should give itself wholly up to the hearing of the Word of God, came to degenerate into mere Judaism, or rather the most vain will-worship, innumerable other holy-days having been added to it."

This passage puts it beyond a doubt that, according to Beza, the ceremonial part of the Fourth Commandment consisted only in the particular day, and the legal services, and that the moral part required still one day in seven to be set apart for the worship of God. What he says of the manner in which the rest should now be observed, will fall to be noticed under the next head. Peter Martyr expresses the same opinion in his *Loci Communes*, under the Fourth Commandment, remarking, that "as in other ceremonies there is something abiding and eternal, and something changeable and temporal (as in circumcision and baptism, it is perpetual that they who belong to the covenant of God, and are admitted among his people, should be distinguished by some outward sign), the *kind* of sign was changeable and temporary, for that it might be done, either by the cutting off of the foreskin, or by the washing with water, God manifested by his appointment. In like manner, that one fixed day in seven should be set free (*mancipetur*) for the worship of God, is fixed and determined; but whether this or that day should be appointed, is temporary and changeable." To the same effect also, Ursinus, the friend of Melancthon, in his Catechism,—“That the first part of the command (that, namely, which enjoins the keeping holy of a seventh-day Sabbath) is moral and perpetual, appears from the end of the institution, and the reasons assigned for it, which are perpetual.” Then, after mentioning these, he concludes, that as “they relate to no definite period, but to all times and ages of the world, it follows that God wished to bind men from the beginning of the world even to its end, to keep a certain Sabbath.” And again, “Though the ceremonial Sabbath is abrogated in the New Testament, a moral Sabbath still remains, and itself therefore a kind of ceremonial Sabbath, *i. e.* some regular time must be set apart for the ministry. For it is not less needful now in the Christian, than it was formerly in the Jewish Church, that there be some fixed day on which the Word of God may be taught, and the sacraments publicly administered, which, however, we are not strictly bound to make either the third, fourth, fifth, or any other determinate day of the week.” He evidently means, that so far as the morality of the Fourth Commandment is concerned, it simply obliges us to one day in the seven. It is almost unnecessary to mention the names of more who adhered to this opinion. We may just add, that it seems to have been that of Bucer, and of Viret, the colleague of Calvin; that it was the opinion of Pareus is certain, as it seems also to have been that of the Synod of Dort, if we may judge from what may be regarded as the natural import of their resolutions; and both Walæus and Altingius have not only affirmed it as their opinion, but are at considerable pains to prove that the very substance of the Fourth Commandment is its requiring the sanctifying of one day in seven for the service of God,—that unless it included an obligation to this, there could be no proper meaning in the express mention of six days as the appointed period of weekly labour, continually succeeded by another of rest, and no force in the appeal to God’s example and work in creation,—and consequently, that while the moral requires the observance of

one day in seven, the ceremonial ceased when the change took place from the last to the first day of the week.

There is still another point, on which it is of importance to give a correct exhibition of the views of the Reformers, viz. in regard to the due observance of the Lord's day, the Christian Sabbath. Here it is necessary to premise at the outset, what must have occasionally struck those who have read the preceding quotations, that some of the reformed divines looked upon the cessation from work on Sabbath as more strictly and absolutely required of the Jews, than is now binding on Christians, and that the entireness of the prohibition in that respect was essential to the mystery wrapt up in the Sabbath. In proof of this they generally refer to such passages as Exodus xvi. 23, xxxv. 3, which they understand as prohibiting all preparation of food even on Sabbath. Altingius has endeavoured to shew, and I think with perfect success, that such was not really the meaning of those passages, and that such works as were necessary for the ordinary support and refreshment of the body were always permitted, and practised too, among the Jews. We have already discussed this point, however, and shall not further refer to it here. But the Reformers undoubtedly did believe that a degree of rigour, an extent of prohibition belonged to the Jewish Sabbath, for which we find no proper warrant in Scripture; and well knowing, from New Testament Scripture, that no such yoke was laid upon the Christian church, they naturally drew the equally unwarranted conclusion, that the strictness of prohibition as to the performance of works requiring labour was somewhat relaxed. In using such language, they still did not mean that ordinary works might be performed on any plea of worldly convenience or pleasure, but such only as were performed by our Lord,—works required for the necessary support or the comfort of men, and some of which, at least, they conceived to have been interdicted to the Jews, for the purpose of rendering their Sabbatical rest more exactly typical of the spiritual rest enjoyed by believers in Christ.

For the proof of this we can appeal to a case which will put the matter, in regard to one great man, at least, beyond a doubt,—we mean the venerable Calvin. During his lifetime a book was published by some Dutchman, in which the lawfulness of images in divine worship, to a certain extent, was maintained on the following ground:—That though all use of images, and consequently all kinds of image-worship, were prohibited in the Second Commandment, yet this was not to be understood too rigorously; for we have the same exclusive prohibition of all work on Sabbath in the Fourth Commandment, and yet we know that Christ both did and allowed certain kinds of work on that day; so that either he must be held to have violated the Sabbath, or the commandment must be regarded as less strict in its prohibitions of work, than the plain import of its words would lead us to suppose,—an alternative, he contended, which would render it equally consistent with the purport of the Second Commandment to make some use of images in the worship of God. Calvin wrote a reply to this treatise, which is contained in vol. viii. of the Amsterdam edition of his works. We quote only that part of it which bears upon our present subject. At p. 486, he says, "They who profess Christianity have always understood, that the obligation by which the

Jews were bound to observe the Sabbath-day, was temporary. But it is quite otherwise in regard to idolatry. I grant it, indeed (that is, the Sabbath), as the bark of a spiritual substance, the use of which is still in force, of denying ourselves, of renouncing all our own thoughts and affections, and of bidding farewell to one and all of our own employments (*operibus nostris universis valedicendi*), so that God may reign in us, then of employing ourselves in the worship of God, learning from his Word, in which is to be found our salvation, and of meeting together for making public profession of our faith,—all which differ from the Jewish shadows; for it was so servile a yoke to the Jews, that they were bound on one day of each week to abstain from all work, so that it was even a capital offence to gather wood or bear any burden." And then he goes on to defend Jesus from the charge of having broken the Fourth Commandment by performing works of healing on the Sabbath, on the ground that such works did not fall within the prohibition,—that they were properly God's works, and in no age, on no occasion, were unseasonable or improper.

It is singular that this great man did not here perceive the full force of his own argument, and is another proof that the subject had not, in all its bearings, been fully weighed by his masterly mind. For the same argument which he applied to the defence of Christ, in the liberties he personally took with the Sabbatical rest, would, if properly carried out, have equally availed to shew that the Sabbath, as imposed upon the Jews, was not the servile yoke it is here represented; that all work was not absolutely forbidden to them on that day,—not simply the engaging in *any* worldly employment, or the bearing of *any* burden, for *whatever purpose*, but only such as was done in the way of ordinary traffic, or worldly business,—for purposes merely of temporal profit or carnal pleasure, not immediately called for by any proper plea of necessity or mercy. It is strange also, that Calvin, and many of the other Reformers, should have spoken so often of the Sabbath enjoined in the Fourth Commandment, as if it had been an ordinance of mere bodily rest. They did not so interpret the other commandments. They did not make the fulfilment of the second to stand in the mere rejection of idolatry,—nor that of the sixth in the simple withholding of the hand from murder; and why should they ever have thought or spoken as if the fourth only enjoined a day of outward rest, and not that as a means only for the higher end of sanctification? But with such mistakes regarding the Jewish Sabbath, properly considered, the above passage from Calvin gives us very distinctly to understand how he conceived the ordinance of the Sabbath, as still binding on the Church, should be observed; that though the obligation was not the same in his judgment as in the Jewish Church, yet so much was it to be made a day of spiritual and sacred rest, that not only is it to be hallowed by the denying and crucifying of our sinful affections, but also by taking a solemn leave of our own, that is, undoubtedly, our common worldly occupations, and employing ourselves in the public and private exercises of God's worship. The distinction, as he regarded it, between the Jewish and the Christian Sabbath, was not that the latter admitted, while the other did not, of manual labour or worldly employments, without any urgent plea of necessity or mercy, but that the Jewish Sabbath so rigorously enforced the outward rest, as to pre-

vent things being done which were necessary to the ordinary comfort, or conducive to the higher interests of man. He held the obligation still in force to keep the Sabbath, as a day set apart for the peculiar worship and service of God, liable to be interrupted only by doing what might be required for the relief of our present wants, or by labours of love for our fellow-creatures.

At the risk of being tedious, and for the sake of removing all possible doubt about the real sentiments of Calvin concerning the way in which the Christian Sabbath ought to be spent, we produce other two extracts from his works,—passages found in his discourses (in French) to the people of Geneva on the Ten Commandments. The fifth and sixth of these treat of the Sabbath. And in the fifth, after having stated his views regarding the Sabbath as a typical mystery, in which respect he conceived it to be abolished, he comes to shew how far it was still binding, and declares, that as an ordinance of government for the worship and service of God, it pertains to us, as well as to the Jews. “The Sabbath, then,” says he, “should be to us as a tower whereon we should mount aloft, to contemplate afar the works of God, when we are not occupied nor hindered by any thing besides, from stretching forth all our faculties in considering the gifts and graces which he has bestowed on us. And if we properly apply ourselves to do this on the Sabbath, it is certain that we shall be no strangers to it during the rest of our time, and that this meditation shall have so formed our minds, that on Monday, and the other days of the week, we shall abide in the grateful remembrance of our God,” &c. Again,—“It is for us to dedicate ourselves wholly to God, renouncing ourselves, our feelings, and all our affections; and then, since we have this external ordinance, to act as becomes us, that is, to *lay aside our earthly affairs and occupations, so that we may be entirely free* (vaquions du tout) to meditate the works of God, may exercise ourselves in considering the gifts which he has afforded us, and above all, may apply ourselves to apprehend the grace which he daily offers us in his Gospel, and may be more and more conformed to it. And when we shall have employed the Sabbath in praising and magnifying the name of God, and meditating his works, we must, through the rest of the week, shew how we have profited thereby.”

It is only necessary to bear in mind the explanation already given regarding the sentiments generally entertained by the Reformers of the Jewish Sabbath, to see that Beza, in his remarks on Rev. i. 2, is of the same mind with Calvin, as to the exclusion of worldly employments from the proper observance of the Lord's day. When he speaks there of a Jewish cessation from all work not being now imperative, he evidently means in the sense already explained—the mistaken sense, as we have endeavoured to shew—for he not only affirms that the sanctification of the seventh day was a part of the moral law, as regards the worship of God, ceremonial only in so far as it respected the particular day and the legal services, but also expresses it as proper, on that day, for the mind to be freed from its daily labours, that it may give itself wholly up to the hearing of the Word of God. And that Viret, another of Calvin's colleagues, entirely concurred with him regarding the due sanctification of the Lord's day, his discourse on the Fourth Commandment is abundant evidence. For he thus expresses himself there:—“Since we have from God every thing we possess, soul, body, and outward

estate, we ought never to do anything else all our lives, than what he requires and demands of us for the true and entire sanctification of the day of rest. Nevertheless, we see that he assigns and permits us six days for doing our own business, and of the seven he reserves for himself only one,—as if he had contented himself with the seventh part of the time, which was specially given up and consecrated to him, and that all the rest was to be ours. . . .

. . . What ingratitude is it, if in yielding us six parts of the seven, which we owe him, we do not at the least strive with all our power to surrender the other part, which he exacts of us, as a token of our fidelity and homage." Then, in reference to the objection, that it seemed to follow from his views of the Sabbath, that after the public duties were over, men might spend the remaining hours of the day in other occupations, he replies,—“ Since we are permitted all other days of the week, excepting this, for attending to our bodily concerns, it seems to me that we hold very cheap the service of God and the ministry of the Church, on which we ought to wait more diligently on that day than any other, if we cannot find means for employing one whole day of the week in things which God requires of us upon it. For they are of such weight and consequence that we must take care, in every manner possible, lest we occupy ourselves with anything which might turn our attention elsewhere ; so that we may not bring our hearts by halves, but that ourselves, and all our family, may without distraction apply,” &c.

Bucer, the friend both of Luther and Calvin, expresses sentiments quite similar, in the fifteenth chapter of his work on the kingdom of Christ : “ Since our God, with singular goodness towards us, has sanctified one day out of seven, for the quickening of our faith, and so of life eternal, and blessed that day, that the sacred exercises of religion performed on it might be effectual to the promoting of our salvation ; he verily shews himself to be a wretched despiser, at once of his own salvation, and of the wonderful kindness of our God towards us, and, therefore, utterly unworthy of living among the people of God, who does not study to sanctify that day to the glorifying of his God, and the furthering of his own salvation, especially since God has granted six days for our works and employments, by which we may support a present life to his glory.” Then, in reference to the neglect of daily worship, through the carelessness of some, and the impediments in the way of others, he asks, “ Who, therefore, does not see how advantageous it is to the people of Christ, that one day in seven should be so consecrated to the exercises of religion, that it is not lawful (*fas*) to do any other kind of work, than assemble in the sacred meeting, and there hear the Word of God, pour out prayers before God, make profession of faith, and give thanks to God,—present sacred offerings, and receive divine sacraments, and so, with undivided application, glorify God, and make increase in faith ? For these are the true works of religious holy-days.” And he goes on to mention, with satisfaction, the laws made by Constantine, and other emperors, to prohibit, by penalties, the transaction of ordinary business, the exhibition of spectacles, and such things, on the Lord's day.

It is abundantly obvious, from the quotations already given, that the Reformers, from whom they are taken, inculcated the duty of keeping the Lord's day, not in part merely, but as *a day* of spiritual rest and sacred employment ; and of doing this, first of all, by ceasing from all ordinary labours and

occupations, in so far as the claims of necessity might permit ; then, by giving attendance upon the means of grace in public ; and finally, by ordering our thoughts and behaviour during the other parts of the day, so as still to make it available to our spiritual improvement. The more express and definite statements contained in these quotations prove, that though frequently in the writings of the Reformers the duties proper to the observance of the Lord's day are spoken of in a general way, as consisting in doing what pertains to the preservation and improvement of the public ministry, they did not, by so speaking, mean to intimate, that, excepting what was spent at church, the time might be taken up in any worldly business or recreation. They are most pointed in excluding all worldly occupations whatever,—the proper work of the six days, whether done for profit or for pleasure. And in dwelling so specially as they sometimes do upon the public ministry, it was not as if they slighted the more private and family duties—for these, we see, they also enforced—but only because they regarded them as in a manner bound up with a faithful attendance upon the public services of religion. For the school of Geneva, in particular, as it existed under the teaching of Calvin, Viret, and Beza, nothing can be more satisfactory than the manner in which they practically inculcated the devout and solemn observance of the Lord's day ; and that their own practice, and their general doctrine upon the subject, was in perfect accordance with the extracts that have been produced, we have a striking proof in the taunt which Calvin, in his Institutes, says was thrown out against them by some restless spirits, as he calls them (probably the libertine Anabaptists), "that the Christian people were nursed in Judaism," because they kept the Lord's day. The very accusation bespeaks how strict was the enforcement of that day, and how orderly its observance at Geneva during the ascendancy of those great men.

It appears, then, upon a full and careful examination of the whole matter, that the Reformers and the most eminent divines, for about a century after the Reformation, were substantially sound upon the question of the Sabbath, in so far as concerns the obligation and practice of Christians. Amid some mistaken, and inconsistent representations, they still for the most part held that the Fourth Commandment strictly and morally binds men, in every age, to set apart one whole day in seven for the worship and service of God. They all held the institution of the Sabbath at the creation of the world, and derived thence the obligation upon men of all times to cease every seventh day from their own works and occupations. Finally, they held it to be the duty of all sound Christians to use the Lord's day as a Sabbath of rest to him,—withdrawing themselves, not only from sin and vanity, but also from those worldly employments and recreations which belong only to a present life, and yielding themselves wholly to the public exercises of God's worship, and to the private duties of devotion, excepting only in so far as any urgent call of necessity or mercy might come in the way to interrupt them. We avow this to be a fair and faithful representation of the sentiments of those men upon the subject, after a patient consideration of what they have written concerning it. We trust we have furnished materials enough from their writings, for enabling our readers to concur intelligently in that representation. They

will see, that the summary given by Gualter of their views (as quoted at p. 134) is greatly nearer the mark, than the one-sided representation of Hengstenberg. And they will henceforth know how to estimate the assertions of those, who, after glancing into the works of the Reformers, and picking up a few partial and disjointed statements, presently set themselves forth as well acquainted with the whole subject, and as fully entitled to say, that the Reformers agree with them in holding men at liberty, if they might only go to church, to work, or travel, or enjoy themselves as they please, on other parts of the Sabbath. Such persons may be honest in representing this as the mind of the Reformers, but it must not be forgotten that their credit for honesty in this matter rests upon no better ground than that of ignorance and presumption.

It were wrong to bring our remarks on this subject to a close, without pointing to the solemn lesson furnished both to private Christians, and to the church at large, by the melancholy consequences which soon manifested themselves as the fruit of that one doctrinal error into which the Reformers did certainly fall regarding the Sabbath. For, though there was much in their circumstances to account for their falling into it, and though it left untouched, in their opinion, the obligation resting on all Christians to keep the day of weekly rest holy to the Lord,—yea, though some of them seemed to think that one day in seven was scarcely enough for such a purpose, yet their view about the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, as a Jewish ordinance, told most unfavourably upon the interests of religion on the Continent. There can be little doubt that this was the evil root from which chiefly sprung, so soon afterwards, such a mass of Sabbath desecration, and which has rendered it so difficult ever since to restore the day of God to its proper place in the feelings and observances of the people. It was well enough so long as men of such zeal and piety as the Reformers kept the helm of affairs—their lofty principles, and holy lives, and self-denying labours, rendered their error meanwhile comparatively innoxious. But a colder age both for ministers and people succeeded; when men came to have so little relish for the service of God, and were so much less disposed to be influenced by the privileges of grace, than to be awed by the commands and terrors of law, that the loss of the Fourth Commandment, which may be said to be the only express and formal revelation of law upon the subject, was found to be irreparable. The other considerations, which were sufficient to move such men of faith and piety as the Reformers, fell comparatively powerless upon those who wanted their spiritual life. Strict and positive law was what they needed to restrain them, which being now in a manner removed, the religious observance of the day of God no longer pressed upon them as a matter of conscience. The evil, once begun, proceeded rapidly from bad to worse, till it scarcely left in many places so much as the form of religion. No doubt many other causes were at work in bringing about so disastrous a result, but much was certainly owing to the error under consideration. And it reads a solemn and impressive warning to both ministers and people, not only to resist, to the utmost, all encroachments upon the sanctity of the Lord's day, but also to beware of weakening any of the foundations on which the obligation to keep that day is made to rest; and here as well as in other things, to seek with Leighton,

that they may "be saved from the errors of wise men, yea, and of good men."

APPENDIX B.

BÄHR'S VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.— P. 286.

THE doctrine which this learned author seeks to establish, and which he mainly grounds upon, Lev. xvii. 11, is radically much the same with that formerly propounded in this country by Sykes and Taylor, and frequently advocated by Unitarian writers since, but in none of these with so much depth of thought, and apparent conformity to the fundamental truths of Scripture, as have been exhibited in the pages of Bähr. The first great point he endeavours to make good, is, that it was simply the blood sprinkled on the altar, which formed the central part of the idea of sacrifice—the blood, however, merely as the bearer of the life, irrespective of the death, which (incidentally, indeed, but still only incidentally, not as a proper and essential part of the transaction) had to be inflicted in the obtaining of the blood. It is not, therefore, he maintains, the execution of a punishment—the punishment of death—with which we have properly to do, but the giving away of a life to God—the giving away of the life or soul of an irrational animal, as symbolical of the offerer's giving away of his soul to God; in other words, his returning back again to God by repentance, and faith, and self-dedication, after having been separated from him by sin. There is nothing, consequently, according to his view, strictly vicarious or substitutionary in the matter—no infliction of a punishment deserved by the offerer, and symbolically transferred to the thing offered; and he thence draws the conclusion, that the death of Christ was no satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of men, but a self-dedication or surrender of the life to God, to be ever appropriated and repeated, by his people spiritually, when they renounce sin and turn to God. So that the death of Christ, relatively to the life of his people, is just a great symbol—the symbol of symbols—representing outwardly, and by means of his personal history, how sinful men, dead because of sin, were to re-unite themselves to the life and fellowship of God.

It is justly remarked by Kurtz, at the commencement of his able refutation of this view of Bähr, p. 7, 12, that it proceeds upon a somewhat mistaken view of the passage in Lev. xvii. 11—as if that professedly treated of sacrifice; whereas it directly treats only of the blood, and not properly of the blood as a constituent part of sacrifice, but as matter of food, and of sacrifice only in so far as the blood belonged to the sacrifice. It is, therefore, to exalt that passage, however otherwise important, out of its due place, when it is regarded as alone sufficient to determine the whole nature and constitution of sacrifice. True, "it speaks only of the blood, it makes ac-

count of nothing but this, and does not mention death as the means of atonement." But neither should we have expected it to do so, however necessary the death might be for the effecting of the atonement; for the passage does not discourse of sacrifice, as such, or of death as connected with the sacrifice, but is simply intended to exhibit the ground of the prohibition regarding the eating of blood. For this, it was enough to state, the relation of the blood to the sacrifice.

There are two questions that naturally arise in discussing the subject; the first of which is: What the *nepesh* or soul ($\psi\chi\alpha$), is in beasts and men? This is answered with substantial correctness by Bähr, though without giving due prominence to the principle of accountability in man. "By the *nepesh*," he remarks, "in beast, as well as in man, the Hebrews denoted the animal principle of life, without which the body is a mere lump of matter, hence the word commonly signifies *life*. But in man, while the *nepesh* in one respect corresponds to that in beasts, in another it is of a higher kind; because it stands in closest connection, as on the one hand with the body, so on the other with the spirit, is indeed the bond between the two. As such a bond, it is the seat and source of all the emotions, both higher and lower—whence the purely animal appetites of hunger and thirst are ascribed to it, and, at the same time, the purely human and higher affections of love and hatred, joy and sorrow."—(Symb. ii. p. 208.) It is not, however, these affections in themselves, which properly constitute the distinctive superiority of the human, but rather their connection with conscience and free-will, bringing them within the province of the moral and accountable. This especially is what raises man above the brute-creation.

But the second question—In what relation do the two *nepesh*, in man and beast, stand to each other in sacrifice? bears much more closely upon our author's peculiar views, and it is here especially that his erroneous sentiments discover themselves. "It is not to be denied (he says) that in one respect the *nepesh* of the sacrificial blood is placed on a par with that of the sacrificer, but that in another the sacrificial blood serves also as the means of atonement and salvation for the sacrificer, therefore is an antidote for his sinful nature, and so far stands in a counter-position to his *nepesh*. The sacrifice itself is thereby constituted into a symbolical sacramental act; the equalizing or putting on a par of the two *nepesh* giving to it a symbolical, and their counter-position a sacramental character." This statement itself is defective; for, in the words of Kurtz, "the equalizing of the two *nepesh*, and consequently the symbolical character of the sacrifice, rests upon this, that both have a common basis, as being the seat and source of life; the antithetical, and consequently the sacramental character, rests (since every thing in sacrifice has to do with sin and atonement) upon this, that the one *nepesh* is free from sin and guilt, while the other is laden with both. The guilt of the one requires an antidote, the guiltlessness of the other fits it for being such." This explanation, however, would certainly square ill with the theory of our learned opponent. But let us hear him farther: "The symbolical character of the sacrifice stands in this, that the presentation and bringing nigh of the *nepesh* in the sacrificial blood upon the altar, is the symbol of the presentation and bringing nigh of the offerer to Jehovah. As

the presentation of the blood of the beast is a giving up and away of the beast-life in death, so must also the natural (seelische), that is, selfish life of the offerer, acting in contrariety to God, be given up and away, *i. e.* die; but since this is a giving away to Jehovah, it is no mere ceasing to be, but a dying which, *eo ipso*, goes into life. . . . The natural dying is the condition of the true life. Accordingly, the meaning of a sacrifice is in short this, that the natural, sinful being (life), is given up to God in death, in order to obtain the true being (sanctification), through fellowship with God."

"This whole representation (Kurtz continues), which leads us into the centre of the sacrificial system, and should give us the kernel of it, presents not a few weak points. It seeks to unfold the symbolical aspect of the idea of a sacrifice. This rests, as already indicated, upon the resemblance of the two nephesh, on account of which the nephesh of the beast is made to stand as the image and representative of man's. Now, were this resemblance really the foundation of the view exhibited above, we could have nothing to reply to it. But we find precisely the reverse to be the case. It is not that, in which both are alike to each other, viz. that both are the seat and source of life, feeling, desire, and aversion, which is made the foundation of the symbol, but the very thing which renders them unlike to each other. It is not the giving up simply of the life, which it regards as symbolized in the sacrifice, but the giving up of 'the natural, selfish life, acting in contrariety to God;' and this is precisely what renders the soul of a beast dissimilar to that of a man.

"But this is by no means the only contradiction into which Bähr has fallen with his theory; we detect three others. (1.) The import of a sacrifice, he says, is this, that the selfish, natural, sinful being, or life, is given up to death. Through this, therefore, is the atonement made, which effects the covering and extirpation of sin. Here, then, sin and death come so near to each other, that one is involuntarily reminded of the words: Death is the wages of sin; or, Sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death; or, in the concrete declaration of the Old Testament, In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die. And is there not to be found an idea there, that namely of punishment, from the application of which to sacrifice Bähr shrinks on every hand with the strongest aversion, but which forms the necessary, unavoidable link of connection between sin and death? We present to our opponent the following progression of ideas: blood, nephesh, lust, sin, punishment, death, atonement. Can he fail to recognize it as his own? We could substantiate it word for word by citations. Undoubtedly, the single word 'punishment' is nowhere to be discovered. But it is merely omitted, and naturally suggests itself. So that the definition given by our opponent has after all opened the door to the idea, to which it is so fundamentally opposed. He appears to have been somewhat conscious of this himself, and endeavours to meet it in a twofold way. First, by determining the giving up of the sinful nephesh to death more closely, as a giving up in death to Jehovah, which is a dying that, *eo ipso*, goes into life. But the *sinful, selfish* nephesh was not to be given up to Jehovah, but, on the contrary, covered through the sacrificial atonement; that is, had to be put away out of Jehovah's presence, that he might not see it. The giving up of sin, that is, of

death in death, is certainly the negation of sin and death, therefore the true life; but then this is no giving up to Jehovah, but giving away from Jehovah, for Jehovah's sake.—The second shift looks more fortunate: the dangerous relationship between sin and death is disposed of, as soon as for 'the giving up of the selfish, sinful, ungodly nephesh in death to Jehovah,' there is substituted, 'the giving up of the whole being to God, or the giving up of that which is most peculiarly one's own, the principle of personality or of the individual life.' This giving up of the whole life to Jehovah is certainly a receiving, a putting into exercise of life, but it is no giving up in death. But without contending about this substitution, nothing after all is gained by it. For the idea of sin, as the starting-point of sacrifice, cannot possibly be overlooked, and how important and closely related to the idea is death in the sacrifice, is clear even from Bähr's interchange of terms in p. 210. One of two alternatives alone remains: Either to subtract the idea of sin and death, which would certainly make the symbol but ill accord with the idea; or it continues to possess both of those ideas, or one of them—then, in the first case, the giving up of the *sinful* nephesh in death is nothing but the symbolizing of the idea of punishment; but in the second, the giving up of the *sinful* being to Jehovah would be in contrariety to the idea of atonement (the covering); and in the third, the giving up to Jehovah in death of the nephesh simply, as that 'which is most peculiarly one's own, the principle of personality, or of the individual life,' would suit well enough indeed to a mystical-pantheistic nature-religion, but extremely ill to the plain, theistical religion of Moses.

"(2.) Bähr repeatedly (for ex. B. ii. p. 270, 343) throws it out as a reproach against the juridical view, which he so strenuously opposes, that it makes the sacrifice culminate in the death. This, he contends, shews at once how entirely erroneous it is; for nothing can be more unquestionable, than that the blood, and not the death, is the very essence and core of the sacrifice.—But now, let any one just read Bähr's own development of the idea of sacrifice, and mark how often death and its synonyms occur there; since the subject continually pressed is of a giving away, or a giving up of life in death, of a dying, a ceasing to live, an *ἀποθανεῖν*, as the most essential and innermost idea of sacrifice. When he says, for example: 'As that presentation of the victim's blood was a giving up and away of the life in death, so must also the selfish, natural life be given away, *i. e.* die'—is not this in the strongest manner to identify blood and death? This may well satisfy us that to make the sacrifice culminate in death, and identify death and blood, cannot be so very senseless and wrong a thing as he would have us to suppose.

"(3.) Sacrifice must symbolize the idea of a giving up and away of the life in death to Jehovah. But this is no common dying, not a mere ceasing to be, not a sort of negative thing only, but a dying that, *eo ipso*, goes into life, is indeed the true life, the life of active and holy energy. The dying thus modified comes out, then, as the chief and most prominent thing. The symbol, however, still remains but a symbol, and as such must correspond to the idea, at least, in its most essential part, resemble and image it. But on our author's supposition, that essential part would be the very thing, of which

no trace were to be found in the symbol. The dying of the beast is really an absolute ceasing, a simple negative; the beast is and remains dead, and nothing whatever takes place to represent the idea of a resumption of life, brought into being through death. Let it not be said, that this could not be expected, as such a symbolizing would lie beyond the range of possibility; for we can point to Bähr himself, B. ii. 516, 617, where he shews in the transaction with the two birds at the cleansing of the leper, and with the two goats on the day of atonement, that such a thing was quite possible."

So far, the exposure of what is fallacious and unsatisfactory in Bähr's views, has respect only to the first, the symbolical aspect of sacrifice; the other, or sacramental aspect still remains, and there the heterodox character of his views comes still more prominently out. We give first his representation of this bearing of the rite of sacrifice:—"The means of atonement and sanctification must be something apart from the person to be atoned, another thing than himself, and indeed something chosen and appointed by God; for man has not in himself the principle of sanctification; it can proceed only from God, he alone, therefore, can ordain the means of sanctification. . . . But, on the other hand, it must be nothing absolutely different, foreign, or contrary; for it must, at the same time, be the means of salvation (covering), and must, therefore, enter into an exchange of relationship with the person to be sanctified. This, however, was only possible, if it was somehow related to him, if it was analogous in nature, homogeneous. That other thing, through which the *nepshesh* of the offerer was atoned, or covered, was itself again a *nepshesh*."—II. 212, 213.

Kurtz justly objects to this representation, that it does not properly and fairly touch the important question, how the blood in sacrifice should have come to possess the sacramental character of a means by which the sin or soul was covered, and the offerer was again re-united with Jehovah, and sanctified? Bähr himself seems to be conscious of its defective and unsatisfactory nature; and calls to his aid "the peculiar nature of the Old Testament economy, as in itself external, corporeal, and imperfect, but as such carrying in its bosom the kernel of the perfect, the higher and spiritual. The blood of beasts, which itself was only external, effected also a merely external sanctification and purity. The true and perfect means of salvation and atonement is the blood of Christ, the shedding of which was *eo ipso* the giving up of his soul (Matth. xx. 28), with which the eternal Spirit was united" (Heb. ix. 12, 14.)

This line of argument is the more extraordinary, Kurtz remarks, "as the author throughout his whole work manifestly avoids bringing typical references within the circle of his investigations. Such a flying for refuge to an element quite foreign to the whole tendency of his work, therefore, appears as a mere expedient, and betrays the strait in which the author found himself. Still we would not particularly quarrel with him for making our Lord and his atoning death a sort of cat's-paw for his literary necessities, if indeed it had been the aim of Christ's incarnation and death to be a cat's-paw for necessities of another kind. This, therefore might not prevent us from heartily rejoicing at the open and decided recognition here given of the typical bearing of the most important part of the ritual worship. But we

are again checked in this joy, since it is not enough to have robbed the Old Testament sacrifice of its true import to us; the same must also be done in regard to the far more important sacrifice of Christ. The mediation of Christ is therefore only a—though indeed the perfectest—symbolical substitution, not a real one, no exchange of places; so that also this sacrificial act, if what it represents is not done over again on the part of man, becomes worthless and vain.' Yet the proper character of Christ's death is somewhat away from the point. The question here simply is, whether what is obscure and unsatisfactory in the representation given of the sacramental character of the Old Testament sacrifice, is thereby removed. We think not,—for a transference of the (improved) Old Testament idea to that of the New Testament for the purpose of proving that from this, is only moving in a circle.

"We place in opposition to Bähr the following train of thought upon the important passage in Leviticus :—The soul of the flesh is in the blood. The soul is the seat of feeling, and therefore of lust. But lust gives birth to sin. That properly which sins in man is, therefore, the soul; and as this is associated with the blood, the blood also stands in a causal connection with sin. Now, it is an eternal law, *per quod quis peccat per hoc punitur et idem* (to make the punishment alight on that which has been used as the organ of sin) The soul, the blood was the moving force, the starting-point of sin; and now in turn against the soul and the blood comes the punishment, the counter-impression on the part of moral government in the world, paralysing the impression of sin. The sin was the offspring of lust; now the punishment recoils upon the lust, and so becomes a reversal of lust, aversion (unlust.) The soul, in so far as it is life, has sinned; it is also punished, in so far as it is life, therefore, with death: death is the wages of sin. The sinner has involved his blood, his soul in guilt; if the claims of justice are satisfied, he must be visited with death—temporal, which, by being allowed to continue, becomes eternal. God, however, does not wish the death of the sinner; he has promised redemption, and already begun to carry it into effect. A manifestation of this tender grace on the part of God is the institution of sacrifice. I have given you, he says, the blood (of the slain victim) upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls. Therefore, blood for blood, soul for soul; that the sinner may escape death, death must alight on the sacrifice; the guiltless blood is shed, in order to cover, to atone for the guilty. Death is the wages of sin; the sacrificed animal suffers death, not in payment of its own sin, for it is without sin, guiltless, but as payment of another's sin; it therefore suffers death as a substitution for the offerer, and Jehovah, who gave the blood as the means of atonement, recognizes this substitution. The blood shed, and flowing out in death, is then the atonement of the sinner; while the sin has been imputed to the victim, the satisfaction that has been made through death is imputed to the sinner."

The learned author proceeds to state at some length, in opposition to certain objections of Bähr, that the Old Testament sacrifices of irrational victims, could not possibly possess the virtue of making a proper satisfaction for the sins; that, in the language of New Testament Scripture, "the blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin; and that, consequently, their

expiatory worth was all derived from the blood of the great sacrifice, afterwards to be offered in Christ, to which they pointed the faith of the worshippers. The Old Testament sacrifice was, therefore, only an image of the New, a kind of substitute and compensation for it till the fulness of times."—We subjoin the substance of the replies, which Kurtz has given to the several objections brought by Bähr against what he calls the juridical view of the ancient sacrifices, or their vicarious character.

(1.) It is objected, that as the punishment, death, is made prominent in this view, if it were sound, the punishment should have been inflicted by the priest, God's representative; whereas it was the offerer himself who killed the victim.—But the relation, says Kurtz, p. 65, "of punishment to sin, is a necessary one; the punishment is the continuation (no longer depending on the sinner's choice) of the sin, its filling up or complement. Sin is a violation of the righteous government of the world, an impression against the law; the punishment is the law's counter-impression, striking the sinner and paralyzing his sin. But all punishment runs out into death, which is the wages of sin. 'Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death.' Sin, therefore, is a half, incomplete thing, calling for its proper completion in death, which again is not something foreign and arbitrary, but essentially belonging to sin; so that the sinner himself may justly be regarded as self-punished. No doubt, the execution of the punishment might also be properly ascribed to God as the righteous governor of the world; but there is a special propriety in allowing the sinner himself, in the institution of sacrifice, to perform the symbolical act of punishment. For there God appears as the merciful Being, who wills not the death of the sinner, but his atonement, his deliverance and salvation—of course in the way of righteousness—the sinner, again, as one who has drawn upon himself through his sin condemnation and death, and conscious of this being the case. Here, then, especially was it peculiarly proper and significant, that he should accuse himself, that he should pronounce his own judgment, should bring it down symbolically upon himself. Whoever can explain how the criminal, that has deserved death, should even desire this, and so put himself out of the reach of the grace of his monarch, can find no difficulty in explaining how the symbolical act of punishment in sacrifice should have been left to the execution of the sinner himself."

(2.) The juridical view, it is again objected, makes the death, not the blood, the means of atonement, contrary to Lev. xvii. 11. To this Kurtz replies, that the objection does not apply to his view, as he does not by any means make the death, but the blood—the blood, however, as shed, as carrying death along with it—the means of atonement. And as the passage referred to treats, not directly of sacrifice, but only of the prohibition against eating blood, it simply indicates that this was done, because in the blood, the life-blood poured out in death, was to be found by divine ordination the means of atoning for the sins of men, or in other words, saving them from death.

(3.) According to this view the wrath of God is appeased through the infliction of death on the victim, and hence not man, but God is atoned. God, however, cannot be and never is the object of the atoning (covering, כִּפּוּר).—"The atoning is the design of the sacrifice; God is never the object of this, but only man; for in God there is nothing to be covered, while in man there

is his sin, his desert of condemnation requiring to be covered. No change passes upon God by the atonement, but only on man. It is the same God, who in just displeasure at the sinner, is ready to destroy him; and who, himself unchanged, meets in love and fellowship the justified, whose sin has been atoned. It is the same sun that ministered to the growth and prosperity of the tree, while its roots were implanted in its native soil, and causes it, after having been torn up, to wither and decay. So God remains unchangeably one and the same, whether the saint becomes a sinner, or the sinner a saint, although his agency toward him will display itself in a quite different, and indeed opposite manner."

(4.) If the death of the victim were a punishment, then every sin, for which a sacrifice was brought, must appear deserving of death. But sin-offerings were commanded to be offered for unconscious, and not properly moral, but only theocratical offences. Could God be justly represented as inflicting the punishment of death for such? "The objection (replies Kurtz) proceeds upon a misapprehension of the nature of sin and death. It applies a subjective measure to sin, and overlooks its objective aspect. Every sin is a transgression of the divine will; this is the common basis of the smallest, as well as of the greatest sin. In this point of view every sin is alike deserving of the curse; death is the wages of the least, as well as the greatest. The death of the victim stands parallel to the death of the offerer, who has deserved death by his sin. The latter is certainly not mere corporeal death, but death in general, in the entire compass, which the usage of Scripture gives to the word death. That the death of the sacrificed beast was not equivalent to this death, is obvious; as it is also obvious, that the nephesh of the victim, which was given in death, was in no respect equivalent to the nephesh of the sinner; but in this precisely stood the imperfection of the ancient sacrificial system, which implied and predicted a better one." The learned author might here also have pressed the objection as equally valid against Bähr's own view, as the juridical view he opposes. For if such sins, as those referred to, could not justly expose the individual to the punishment of death, how could they any more, according to the theory of Bähr, produce separation from God, moral death, and require a sacrifice to bring him near again? If they should not have entailed the one consequence, we cannot understand how they should have entailed the other.

(5.) The juridical view, it is once more alleged, exchanges the symbolical substitution for the real, the religious for the righteous; the sacrifice loses all its (symbolical) religious character, and is turned into a purely external mechanical act.—To this Kurtz briefly replies, that it is an entire misrepresentation of the vicarious character of the Old Testament sacrifices, as commonly entertained. So far from being an act of a merely outward and mechanical nature, it was expressive of the deepest and most solemn feelings of which the human heart is capable. And the same may be said in a still higher sense of the vicarious death of Christ, which not only the writings of the New Testament, but the experiences also of the most devout in every age, prove to be capable of stirring the inmost depths of the soul, and drawing around it the loftiest thoughts and aspirations.

It is deeply to be regretted that a work distinguished by such learning,

and replete with such depth and freshness of thought, as Bähr's, should carry in its bosom so radical a defect as the false and most unscriptural view of sacrifice, to which the preceding extracts refer. We trust the sounder theology and solid refutation of Kurtz will go far to neutralize the evil in Germany; and tend to re-establish on a firmer basis than ever the view, which Bähr admits (ii. p. 277) to have on its side, not only the most of the rabbinical writers, but also by far the greater number of the most learned and pious of Christian divines. Nor is it to be regarded as any mean confirmation of the truly scriptural character of the view in question, that even such men as Gesenius, De Wette, Winer, and many others of the present day, against strong doctrinal prejudices, have given their assent to it as the doctrine of Scripture. Whatever liberties they have thought themselves warranted to take with the doctrine itself of the vicarious import of ancient sacrifice, they have found the doctrine too plainly written in the Word of God, to deny its existence. And we are persuaded that the more thoroughly the subject is examined and considered in all its bearings, the more deeply and broadly will this doctrine be found to have its foundations laid in the pages of revelation, and the clearer also the conviction of its necessary connection with the peace of the sinner and the essential interests of righteousness.

APPENDIX C.

ON THE TERM AZAZEL.

THE term Azazel, which is four times used in connection with the ceremony of the day of atonement, and nowhere else, is still a matter of controversy, and its exact and determinate import is not to be pronounced on with certainty. It is not precisely applied to the live-goat as a designation; but this goat is said to be "for Azazel" (זֵזַעֵזֵ.)

1. Yet one of the earliest opinions prevalent upon the subject regards it as the name of the goat himself; Symmachus *τράγος ἀπερχόμενος*, Aquila *τρ. ἀπολελυμένος*, Vulg. *hircus emissarius*; so also Theodoret, Cyrill, Luther, Heine, Vater, and the English translators, *scape-goat*. When taken in this sense, it is understood to be compounded of *az* (ז) a goat, and *azal* (זֵזַע) to send away. The chief objections to it are, that *az* never occurs as a name for a buck or he-goat (in the plural it is used as a general designation for *goats*, but in the singular occurs elsewhere only as the name for a she-goat), and that in Lev. xvi. 10 and 26, Azazel is expressly distinguished from the goat, the one being said to be *for* the other. For these reasons, this view is now almost entirely abandoned. 2. It is the name of a place, either a precipitous mountain, in the wilderness to which the goat was led, and from which he was thrown headlong, or a lonely region where he was left; so Pseudo-Jonathan, Abenezra, Jarchi, Bochart, Deyling, Reland, Carpov, &c. The chief objection to this view is, that it does not seem to accord with what is said in v. 10: "to let him go for Azazel into the wilderness," which would then mean, for a desert place into a desert place. 3. It is

the name of Satan, or an evil spirit: So the LXX. ἀποσπομπαῖος (which does not mean "the sent away," the scape-goat, as most of the older interpreters took it, and as we are still rather surprised to see it rendered by Sir J. Brenton in his recent translation of the LXX, but "the turner away," "the averter." See Gesen. Thes., Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 270). So probably Josephus, Antiq. iii. 10, 3, and many of the Rabbins. In the strongest and most offensive sense this opinion was espoused by Spencer, Ammon, Rosenmuller, Gesenius, who all concur in holding, that by Azazel is to be understood what was called by the Romans averruncus, a sort of cacodæmon, inhabiting the desert, and to be propitiated by sacrifice, so that the evils he had power to inflict might be averted. The opinion was first modified by Witsius (who is also substantially followed by Meyer, Turretin, Altling, &c.) to indicate Christ's relation to the devil, to whom he was given up to be tried and vexed, but whom he overcame. And in recent times, it has been still further modified by Hengstenberg, who says in his Christology on Gen. iii., "The sending forth of the goat was only a symbolical transaction. By this act the kingdom of darkness and its prince were renounced, and the sins to which he had tempted, and through which he had sought to make the people at large or individuals among them his own, were in a manner sent back to him; and the truth was expressed in symbol, that he to whom God grants forgiveness, is freed from the power of evil." The opinion has been still further explained and vindicated by the learned author in his Eg. and books of Moses, where he supposes the action to carry a reference to the practice so prevalent in Egypt of propitiating, in times especially of famine or trouble, the evil god Typhon, who was regarded as peculiarly delighting in the desert. This reference he holds, however, not in the gross sense of the goat being a sacrifice to the evil spirit; for both goats he considers to have been the Lord's, and this latter only to have been given up by the Lord to the evil spirit, after the forgiven sins were laid on it, as indicating that that spirit had in such a case no power to injure or destroy. Comp. Zech. iii. 1-5. 4. Many of the greatest scholars on the continent—Tholuck first, then Steudel, Winer, Bähr—take the word as the Pealpal-form of *azal* (אָזַל), to remove, with the omission of the last letter, and the putting in its place of an unchangeable vowel; so that the meaning comes to be, for a complete removing or dismissal. Kurtz hesitates between this view and that of Hengstenberg, but in the result rather inclines to the latter. Certainly the contrast presented respecting the destinations of the two goats, is best preserved by Hengstenberg's. But still, to bring Satan into such prominence in a religious rite—to place him in a sort of juxtaposition with Jehovah, in any form, has an offensive appearance, and derives no countenance from any other part of the Mosaic religion. And, however, on a thoughtful consideration, it might have been found to oppose a tendency to demon-worship, with the less thinking multitude, we suspect, it would be found to operate in a contrary direction. Besides, if it may be objected, as it has been, to Tholuck's view, that it takes a very rare and peculiar way of expressing a quite common idea, so unquestionably to designate, according to the other view, the evil spirit, about whom, if really intended, there should have been no room for mistake, by a name never again occurring,

appropriated solely for this occasion, is yet more strange and unaccountable.

This very circumstance of a word having been coined for the occasion, and entirely appropriated to it, suggests what seems to me the right view. That appears to have been done on two accounts—partly, that no one might suppose a known and real personage to be meant—and partly, that the idea, which the occasion was intended to render peculiarly prominent, might thus be presented in the most palpable form—might become for the time a sort of personified existence. The idea of utter separation or removal is what Hengstenberg, as well as the other eminent scholars who hold the last opinion specified, regard as the radical meaning of the term; and by its form being properly a substantive, he conceives that it denotes Satan as the apostate, or separate one. But there is nothing in the whole transaction to lead us to suppose that such an adversary is brought forward; and when the goat is sent away, it is simply said to be “that he might bear the iniquities of Israel into a land of separation,”—the conductor of the goat has fulfilled his commission when he has “let go the goat into the wilderness,” v. 22. To have the iniquities conveyed by a symbolical action into that desert and separate region, into a state of oblivion, was manifestly the whole intention and design of the rite. And why might not this condition of utter separateness or oblivion, to render the truth symbolized more distinct and tangible, be represented as a kind of existence, to whom God sent and consigned over the forgiven iniquities of his people? Till these iniquities were atoned for, they were in God’s presence, seen and manifest before him; but now, having been atoned, he dismisses them by a symbolical bearer, to the realms of the ideal prince of separation and oblivion, that they may never more appear among the living (Micah vii. 19.) From the great peculiarity of the service, it is impossible to support this view by any thing exactly parallel; but there is certainly something not very unlike, in the personification which so often meets us of Sheol or Hades, as the great devourer and concealer of men.—Comp. especially Psalm xvi. 10, xlix. 14; Isa. xiv., xxv. 8, &c.

INDEX OF CONTENTS.

A.

AAHON'S rod in the Most Holy Place, II. 303.
Abel, not a type of Christ as a shepherd, I. 85.
 ———, how his faith and sacrifice differed from Cain's, I. 257.
 ———, feelings of Eve at his birth, I. 274.
Abraham, the connection between his call and the blessing on Shem, I. 302.
 ———, his faith as connected with the call, I. 308, *sq.*
 ———, the supernatural nature of the things promised in it, I. 309.
 ———, the trial of his faith in obeying it, I. 310.
 ———, his relation to Melchisedec, I. 312.
 ———, how his faith was counted for righteousness, I. 315.
 ———, the covenant made with him in its first stage, I. 316, *sq.*
 ———, the covenant in its second stage, I. 318, *sq.*
 ———, his offering up of Isaac, I. 328.
 ———, how the heir of the world, I. 346.
Adultery, why punished with death, II. 370.
Alexander, Dr., his typological views, I. 49.
Altar of burnt-offering, II. 282.
 ———, the fire on it, II. 284.
Alting, his opinion about the first Sabbath, I. 202.
Analogy in God's methods of preparatory instruction, I. 168.
 ——— of faith and practice, I. 171.
Animals for sacrifice, why to be taken from the herd and the flock, II. 290.
Anointing with oil, of what symbolical, II. 233, *sq.*
Antichrist may have his types, I. 142.
Antinomianism, its opposition to Scripture, II. 187.
Ark of the Covenant in comparison with Heathen shrines, II. 299, *sq.*
Azazel, meaning of the term, II. 484.

B.

BABEL, TOWER OF, for what purpose probably erected, I. 289.
Babylon, deliverance from, its relation to Messianic prophecy in Isaiah, I. 123.
Babylonish exile and its results, II. 455.

Bacon's remark on the nature of prophecy, I. 131.
Bähr's view of the cherubim, I. 245.
 ——— of the origin of sacrifice, I. 254.
 ——— of the independent origin of the Mosaic institutions, II. 205.
 ——— of the difference between the spirit of the Mosaic and Heathen institutions, II. 218.
 ——— of the colours and materials of the tabernacle, II. 225, *sq.*
 ——— of the general design of the tabernacle, II. 240.
 ——— of the doctrine of atonement, II. 476.
Baptism, its relation to the deluge, I. 285.
Bitter herbs, why eaten with the passover, II. 408.
Borrowing of jewels from Egypt, proper meaning of, II. 53.
Brazen serpent, how typical, I. 81.
 ———, false explanations of, I. 150.
Bricks, making of, in Egypt of great antiquity, II. 11.
Buddeus, his views on typical interpretation, I. 32.
Burnt-offering, its nature and design, II. 352, *sq.*

C.

CAIN, feelings of Eve at his birth, I. 273.
Cainites as a party, I. 275.
Calvin, his views on the Sabbath, II. 120.
Canaan, why especially cursed in Noah's prophecy, I. 298.
 ———, inheritance of, how promised, I. 342, *sq.*
 ———, boundaries of, I. 346.
 ———, conquest of, explained and vindicated, II. 428.
Candlestick in the Sanctuary, its structure, II. 328.
 ——— lighted only at night, II. 329.
Cedar wood, why probably used in some purifications, II. 380.
Cherubim, their appearance and import, I. 221, *sq.*
 ——— on the mercy-seat, II. 301.
Childbirth, defilements and purifications connected with, II. 386.
Christianity, its present condition and future prospects, I. 185, *sq.*

Circumcision, its nature and meaning, I. 321, *sq.*
 -----, its relation to baptism, I. 325.
 -----, why suspended in the wilderness, II. 81, *sq.*
 Clean and unclean in food, II. 293, *sq.*
 Clement of Alexandria, his allegorical interpretations, I. 22.
 Clothing of Adam and Eve with skins, why done, I. 258, *sq.*
 Cloud of glory, why connected with the ark of the Covenant, II. 305.
 Cocceian School of typologists, I. 36, *sq.*
 Combination of type with prophecy, I. 100, *sq.*
 Connection between the Old and the New, organic as well as typical, I. 177.
 Cornelius, his prayers and alms-deeds described as a meat-offering, II. 327.
 Corporal issues, defilements and purifications connected with, II. 386.
 Covenant, ratification of, at Horeb, II. 365.
 Croly, his view of the origin of sacrifice, I. 260.

D.

DARKNESS and light, of what symbolical, II. 330.
 David's party in its earlier stages, I. 31.
 -----, emphatically the Lord's servant, I. 117.
 Davison's view of the double sense of prophecy, I. 136.
 ----- of the origin of sacrifice, I. 252.
 -----, his objections to the divine origin of sacrifice, I. 446.
 Day of atonement, services connected with, II. 307, *sq.*
 Decalogue, its perfection and completeness, II. 87, *sq.*
 -----, its division into two fives, II. 97.
 ----- has respect to the heart as well as the outward conduct, II. 101, *sq.*
 Delitzsch's view of the cherubim, I. 247.
 ----- views on circumcision, I. 327.
 Deluge, what typical of, I. 283, *sq.*
 Double sense of prophecy examined, I. 127, *sq.*
 De Wette's remarks on Old Testament typology, I. 45.
 Drawing near to God often given as a description of the priest's work, II. 255.

E.

EAGLE, its symbolical import in the cherubim, I. 226.
 Egypt, the bondage of the Israelites there, II. 8.
 -----, worship practised there, II. 13.
 -----, plagues of, their nature and design, II. 43, *sq.*
 -----, the period of the children of Israel's sojourn in, I. 317.
 Election, mistakes regarding the doctrine of, corrected, I. 161.
 -----, principle of, in connection with the first promise, I. 273.
 Enoch, his faith and the fruits of it, I. 277.

Evangelists all begin their gospels with reference to Christ's divine nature, I. 403.
 Exaltation of Christ properly began at his death, II. 345.

F.

FALL, doctrine of, I. 209.
 Fathers, their views respecting man's original state, I. 201.
 -----, their opinion respecting the Mosaic ordinances, II. 196.
 Feasts, stated, their proper meaning and design, II. 399, *sq.*
 First-born of Egypt, why alone slain, II. 49.
 -----, Israel, why specially redeemed, II. 51.
 -----, church of, II. 52.
 ----- not distinctively priests, II. 245.
 Fulness of typical matter in Scripture as connected with the fulness of time, I. 94, *sq.*
 Future state, doctrine in Old and New Testaments respectively, I. 172, *sq.*
 -----, general belief of, among the heathen, I. 425, *sq.*
 -----, unsatisfactory nature of metaphysical arguments for, I. 433.
 -----, argument for, from analogy, I. 434.
 -----, argument for, from conscience, I. 436.
 -----, argument for, from a present moral government of the world, I. 437.
 -----, the doctrine of, not advanced in Scripture as a formal difference between the Old and the New Dispensations, I. 442.
 Friederich's view of the tabernacle, II. 241.

G.

GARDEN of Eden the region of holy life, I. 230.
 Glass's typological views, I. 28.
 Goats, why two on the day of atonement, II. 391.
 Goshen, land of, locality and fertility, II. 7.
 Gospel realities not necessarily perceived by ancient worshippers, I. 72, *sq.*
 Grace, its exhibition after the fall, I. 206.

H.

HABITS of activity and skill among the necessary preparations for heaven, II. 20, *sq.*
 Hannah's song, I. 111, *sq.*
 Headship, principle of, in connection with the first and second Adam, I. 208, *sq.*
 Heaving, its import in sacrifice, II. 359.
 Hebrews, epistle to, by whom written, I. 418.
 -----, the singular use made in it of the Psalms, I. 420.
 Hengstenberg's view of the cherubim, I. 246.
 Herder's view of the cherubim, I. 242.
 Historical types, their nature and reality, I. 78.

Historical notices of ancient Scripture, their necessity and importance, I. 177, *sq.*
 Holy place in the sanctuary, mistaken views of, II. 332.
 Honey, why prohibited in sacrifices, II. 262.
 Human guilt and corruption, doctrine of, in connection with the fall, I. 204.
 Hutchinsonians' interpretations, I. 36.
 ———— views of the cherubim, I. 244.
 Hyssop, why probably used in some purifications, II. 380.

I. & J.

JACOB, and Patriarchs, I. 324, *sq.*
 Jacob's conduct in getting the blessing not typical, I. 140.
 Japheth, the blessing on him by Noah, I. 300.
 Jealousy of God, its proper nature, II. 112, *sq.*
 ———, trial and offering of, II. 369, *sq.*
 Jebb's view of Hannah's song, I. 113.
 Jehovah, import of the name, II. 29.
 Jesus, his recal from Egypt in relation to that of Israel, I. 163, *sq.*
 Jews, perhaps, to be converted quite gradually, I. 418.
 Immortal life, the hope of, an element in the first religion, I. 216.
 Imposition of hands in sacrifice, import of, II. 292.
 Incense, symbolical meaning of, II. 320,
 ———, altar of, II. 318.
 Inheritance destined for the redeemed, what, I. 363, *sq.*
 Joseph, how far his history a type of Christ's, I. 337-8.
 Israel's proper calling and destination, I. 398.
 Israe'lites, their civil condition when in Egypt, II. 19.
 ———, their typical position in Canaan does not necessitate their final return to it, I. 450.
 Jubilee, year of, II. 425.
 Judges, period of, II. 439, *sq.*

K.

KINGLY government in Israel, its institution and influence on Messianic prophecy, I. 114, *sq.* II. 445.
 Klausen's Hermeneutik, I. 47.

L.

LAMECH's speech to his wives, I. 276.
 Laver of tabernacle, its construction and use, II. 279.
 Law, prepared for, as well as the Gospel, I. 193, *sq.*
 ———, not the form of God's earlier revelations, I. 203.
 ———, what strictly and properly called such, II. 86, *sq.*

Law, what it could not do, II. 145, *sq.*
 ———, misapprehensions regarding its design, II. 152, *sq.*
 ———, the purposes for which it was given, II. 159, *sq.*
 ———, connection between its moral precepts and ceremonial institutions, II. 168.
 ———, relation of Christians to, I. 170, *sq.*
 ———, not properly abrogated, I. 186, *sq.*
 Leaven, why not allowed to be present in meat-offerings, II. 362.
 Leprosy and its purification, II. 381, *sq.*
 Levites, their relation to priests, II. 258.
 Lion, its symbolical import in the cherubim, I. 226.
 Litton's view of circumcision, I. 328.
 Living ones, cherubim, why so called, I. 228.
 ———, their connection with the seven-sealed book, I. 239.
 Lord's Ecclesiastical and Literary Journal, examination of its views on the types, I. 49, *sq.*
 Luther, his view of primitive Sabbath, II. 121.

M.

MANNA, natural and supernatural, II. 61, *sq.*
 ———, pot of in the Most Holy Place, II. 303.
 Marsh, Bishop, his school of typology, I. 33, *sq.*
 Meat-offering, its nature and design, II. 361, *sq.*
 ———, why not mingled with leaven or honey, II. 362.
 Melchizedec, who he was, and how greater than Abraham, I. 313.
 Mercy-seat, object and meaning of, II. 300.
 Messianic Psalms, I. 399, *sq.*
 Michaelis's view of the cherubim, I. 242.
 Moses, the wonderful circumstances connected with his preparation, II. 23, *sq.*
 ———, the coloured notices of Josephus regarding him, II. 26.
 ———, his Egyptian learning, what influence it had on his legislation, II. 195, *sq.*
 Müller's view of the origin of symbol and sacrifice, II. 216.
 Murder, purification from an uncertain, II. 374, *sq.*

N.

NATHAN's prophecy to David, I. 121.
 Nazarite, ordinance of, and his offerings, II. 389.
 Noah and the deluge, I. 280, *sq.*
 Noah, in what sense an heir of righteousness, I. 290.

O.

OLD TESTAMENT worshippers, their knowledge of types and prophecies not to regulate ours, I. 143.
 Old Testament Scripture, its life-like freshness, I. 181.