



$$\frac{1741}{2}$$

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE PENTATEUCH:

AN INQUIRY, CRITICAL AND DOCTRINAL, INTO THE GENUINENESS,
AUTHORITY, AND DESIGN OF THE MOSAIC WRITINGS.

BY THE

REV. DONALD ✓ MACDONALD, M.A.,

AUTHOR OF "CREATION AND THE FALL."

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS & CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCLXI.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME SECOND.

BOOK THIRD.

THE DESIGN OF THE PENTATEUCH AS A DIVINE REVELATION, AND THE BASIS OF THE HEBREW CONSTITUTION AND POLITY.

	PAGE
PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS—THE VARIOUS ENDS OF THE PENTATEUCH,	1

CHAPTER I.

THE CHIEF END OF THE PENTATEUCH—THE REVELATION OF GOD.

SECT. I. The Method and Extent of God's Revelation of Himself in the Pentateuch,	13
SECT. II. Objections to certain Representations of the Divine Character examined,	44
§ 1. God's command to sacrifice Isaac,	46
2. The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart,	50
3. Visiting the Sins of the Fathers upon the Children,	53
4. The Mutability of God in the case of Balaam,	54
5. The Israelites borrowing from the Egyptians,	57
6. The Extermination of the Canaanites,	60

CHAPTER II.

MAN THE OBJECT AND CHIEF MEDIUM OF DIVINE REVELA- TION—HIS CONDITION AND PROSPECTS AS PRESENTED IN THE PENTATEUCH.

SECT. I. Man's Original State, his Fall and Restoration,	67
§ 1. The Original State of Man,	68
2. The Fall of Man,	76
3. The Restoration of Fallen Man,	89
SECT. II. Doctrine of a Future State and a Resurrection,	94
§ 1. The Tree of Life and the Cherubim—Adam's idea of Life,	97
2. Death of Abel and Translation of Enoch,	105
3. Other Indications of a Future State and of Belief in that Doctrine,	109

CHAPTER III.

GOD'S REMEDY FOR FALLEN MAN—i. THE PLAN OF REDEMPTION,		121
SECT. I.	Intimations of the Plan of Redemption prior to the Law,	123
§ 1.	The Offerings of Cain and Abel,	124
2.	Other Ante-Levitical Sacrifices—The Divine Covenants,	135
SECT. II.	The Plan of Redemption under the Law—The Levitical Sacrifices,	147
§ 1.	The Place of Sacrifice and the Levitical Sanctuary,	149
2.	The Kinds of Sacrifices enjoined in the Law,	155
3.	The Design of Sacrifice,	160

CHAPTER IV.

GOD'S REMEDY FOR FALLEN MAN—ii. THE PERSON AND OFFICES OF THE REDEEMER.

SECT. I.	Direct Intimations on this Subject,	181
§ 1.	The Seed of the Woman,	182
2.	The Curse and Blessing of Noah,	196
3.	The Seed of Abraham—the Blessing of the Nations,	208
4.	The Prophecy of Jacob—Shiloh,	216
5.	Prophecy of Balaam—The Star and Sceptre of Israel,	227
6.	The Prophet like Moses,	235
SECT. II.	Institutions indicating the Character and Offices of the Redeemer,	240
§ 1.	The Hebrew Goel or Kinsman-Redeemer,	240
2.	The Aaronic Priesthood—The Personal Call and Qualifications,	249
3.	The Sacrificial Victims—Their Necessary Qualities,	262

CHAPTER V.

A FURTHER END OF THE PENTATEUCH—THE TRAINING OF A PEOPLE FOR BEING THE MEDIUM OF REDEMPTION,

SECT. I.	Israel's Separation one end of the Theocratic Constitution,	277
§ 1.	Providential Arrangements for this Separation,	278
2.	Institutions and Enactments for that Purpose,	290
3.	Judaism not of an Absolutely Exclusive Character,	299
SECT. II.	Israel's Conservation for the Purposes of their Calling,	304
§ 1.	Principles in their Pohty productive of Unity,	306
2.	Compensatory Principles of the Law,	314
3.	Certain Provisions of the Law liable to Misconception,	319

	PAGE
SECT. III. Israel's Training for their Vocation—i. Direct Instructions—	
The Sinaitic Law,	325
§ 1. Circumstances attending the Promulgation of the Law,	326
2. Names and Design of the Law,	327
3. Its Perfection and Spirituality,	332
4. The Perpetuity of the Law,	339
5. The Penalty of the Law,	345
SECT. IV. Israel's Training—ii. The Instruction conveyed by the Theo- cratic Institutions and Ordinances,	349
§ 1. Principal Religious Features of the Theocratic Law,	350
2. The Mosaic System as related to Ancient Symbolism in general,	364
3. Value of this Correspondence—Spencer's Theory,	384

CHAPTER VI.

THE RELATION OF THE PENTATEUCH AND THE MOSAIC IN- STITUTIONS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT,	401
SECT. I. General Considerations of the Provisional and Preparatory Character of Judaism,	402
§ 1. The Imperfections of the Theocracy in its Religious Aspect,	403
2. Evidence of the Provisional Character of the Theocracy,	410
3. The Law preparatory to a better Dispensation,	419
SECT. II. Special Relation of the Pentateuch and Judaism to Christianity,	432
§ 1. The Historical Relation of the Pentateuch to the New Testament,	434
2. The Doctrinal Relation of the Same,	441
3. Their Prophetical and Typical Relation,	449
INDEX,	479

INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH.

BOOK THIRD.

THE DESIGN OF THE PENTATEUCH AS A DIVINE REVELATION, AND THE BASIS OF THE HEBREW CONSTITUTION AND POLITY.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS—THE VARIOUS ENDS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

THAT a correct judgment may be formed regarding the Hebrew Scriptures, as ancient literary productions, it is requisite to consider the circumstances of time and place which may have contributed in imparting to them their precise form and complexion, as well as to keep in view, with respect to their claims to a Divine origin, the ends, principal and subordinate, which it will appear any particular portion was designed to serve. In a work like the Pentateuch, of so great antiquity, and particularly of such varied contents, historical, doctrinal, and legislative, these considerations assume special importance; and here, if anywhere, attention must be given to the circumstances in which the work was produced, the principle by which it is pervaded, and likewise the scope and the relation of its several parts to the leading idea or ideas as discernible from a survey of the contents.

That the manifestation of the Divine character, or the presenting of a revelation, of which God is the subject no less than the author, was the chief design of the writer of the

Pentateuch, is a fact so obvious as to appear self-evident. It is so, notwithstanding any inference arising, it may be, from the circumstance of the large space assigned in the work to matters more or less directly of a civil and political nature, some of which, at least, as such, might antecedently be supposed, if not incompatible with, yet unnecessary in, a professed revelation of the Divine character and purposes. It will, however, be desirable to determine, though only in a general and preliminary way, the distinguishing characteristics of the Pentateuch as a Divine revelation, and to indicate how the varied contents of the work, whether historical or legislative, have not even the semblance of antagonism to its doctrinal matter, but how, on the contrary, they all combine to further the one object contemplated, while serving several subordinate purposes closely related to the principal one.

The contents of the Pentateuch may be arranged according to their chief characteristics, as history, legislation, and prophecy; not, however, that such a division is clearly marked in the work itself, or that any considerable portion is simply and exclusively of the nature indicated by these terms respectively. On the contrary, as will appear from the following observations, there is scarcely any portion which is not of a more or less mixed character—the prophetic element, in some form or other, chiefly predominating and giving a particular complexion to the whole.

1. A considerable portion of the work is of an historical character, and, indeed, the entire contents may be said to be enclosed in such a frame. The history of the Pentateuch, commencing with the origin of the earth and of mankind, extends to the period when the Israelitish nation, whose growth, ordination, and constitution, comprise formally the great subject of the work, was ready to take possession of the land long before promised by God to their fathers. But, as was remarked in an earlier portion of this work,¹ it is not a general record of mankind, or even, in the usual sense of the term, a history of the Israelitish people. To meet the first of these objects, had such been the writer's purpose, the subject is too special, and the treatment of the parts utterly

¹ See above, vol. i., pp. 59. 60.

disproportioned; seeing that, for instance, a larger space is devoted to one century, concluding with the death of Abraham, and the concerns of that patriarch, than to the whole period antecedent to his call, though embracing such matters as the creation and the fall, the deluge and the subsequent re-peopling of the earth. Even for a history of Israel—a supposition to which the space dedicated to their great ancestor lends much countenance—the work is too fragmentary in its character, passing over the period of their Egyptian sojourn, and the greater part of the time spent in the desert previous to their entrance into Canaan. All such anomalies, however, whether as regards omissions, or the insertion of matters, as the record of those creations which preceded the entrance of man upon the earth, and from which human agency was utterly excluded, disappear whenever the work is viewed in its proper light as a history of God's acts and administration, of his dealings with mankind, with the patriarchs and their Israelitish descendants, not simply on their own account, or for the furtherance of temporal interests, but mediately with respect to the world and all time.

The specific object of the Mosaic history is stamped on its opening page. In the creation of the universe, and of man, its central object, constituted "the image of God," the Divine Being had in view the revelation of himself as the Author and Governor of nature; and for the same purpose, a record of his works was placed at the very outset of his Word, wherein he discovers himself more fully to his moral creatures. And as it is through man, the head of the lower creation, as well as for his immediate behoof, that this revelation purports to be made, a place was necessarily given to the account of his transgression and fall, the result of which was, notwithstanding an expressed Divine purpose of remedying the evil, the almost universal corruption which ensued, and which called for the deluge to sweep away the guilty race. Such matters, however, only are noticed as served to exhibit the Divine character, or that of man in one or other of the classes into which, in the first commencement of mercy, the race was prophetically, and from its first propagation, historically divided. The same object was further contemplated, in the copious biographies, at a subsequent period, of

individuals expressly selected for representing in a mediate relation the purposes entertained from the beginning respecting man, and to which every other subject, whether formally introduced, or only incidentally noticed in this history, is clearly made subordinate.

The memorials, in this manner, supplied both of primeval and patriarchal times, and in respect of faith and practice, afford evidence of the nature of that dispensation which originated and sustained these principles amid the hostile influences to which they were exposed. As an historical record of a controversy incessantly carried on between two portions of the human race, since the fall introduced a change of relation between the Creator and his moral creatures, the Pentateuch, and Genesis in particular, possessed this peculiar distinction, that while concerned with the present, it yet, in every succeeding age, pointed to a future where the principles which it represented should receive their full realisation. It was in this way that Scripture history, even in its strictest sense, was never simply retrospective, or a bare record of things and relations that had ceased to be. On the contrary, it had always an aspect to the future in its promises of a blessing for mankind. But while thus largely imbued with a prophetic element for sustaining hope in the midst of trials, the history also presented throughout somewhat of a legislative character, prescribing particular lines of conduct by its judicial decisions, which, though not expressed in words, were indicated by the recorded results of particular acts. This history, in short, is occupied not with temporal or material interests, whether individual or national, but with principles of a moral and spiritual nature, in its notices as well of persons as of passing events; and it is on that ground alone, or chiefly, that such notices are introduced.

2. Matters of a legislative nature form a large portion of the contents of the Pentateuch. Besides references to, and illustrations of, those fundamental principles of law which are impressed on the human consciousness through its felt relation to a moral Governor, and which, therefore, might naturally be expected to occupy a prominent place in a revelation of Divine truth, there is in the Pentateuch a system of legislation, civil, criminal, and ecclesiastical, for the use of the

Israelitish community, and from its peculiar character, adapted for no other people.

The large space occupied with matters of this latter description, gives to the Pentateuch an apparently anomalous aspect. The conversion of any part of a professedly Divine revelation into a national statute-book, which must ever vary with the natural development and other relations of a people, would seem to be utterly derogatory to the character of such a work, and opposed to the aim so decidedly expressed by other portions of it. What adds to the difficulty is, that many of the ordinances and enactments of the system regard matters which legislation usually views with indifference; and further, that this, in many respects, peculiar, minute, and rigid legislation, was made so obligatory, that the neglect of any of its enactments was not merely criminal, but sinful, as in the view of God and conscience, and so entailed consequences more or less serious on the community or the individual. These considerations have certainly much force, and if this legislation had respect merely or even chiefly to the civil or social exigencies of the people on whom it was authoritatively imposed, not only would its claim to Divine origin be questionable, but its insertion in a record, which is avowedly a revelation of God with respect to man's spiritual interests and destinies, would be exceedingly inexplicable. If this legislation had no higher aim than the mere reducing into order and subjection a people circumstanced as the Israelites were at the time of their emancipation from Egyptian servitude, preparatory to their being put into possession of new territories, and therefore requiring such a stringent discipline as was here supplied, some of its provisions it would be difficult to defend, or at least explain, while the system itself would scarcely merit the special sanction by which it was enjoined.

Difficulties and objections of this kind proceed, however, from an erroneous view of the Mosaic legislation, from looking at it apart from the scheme of which it formed an essential element, or assuming, contrary to evidence furnished both in the history and legislation itself, that its ultimate object was different from that proposed in the other parts of the Pentateuch. That the Israelitish economy in its civil aspect,

and even in its seemingly most trivial arrangements, had an aim which fully vindicated for it a place in a Divine revelation, will at once appear, when it is considered in connexion with the purposes entertained respecting that people, and with its own fundamental articles. These matters have been already partially noticed,¹ and will be fully discussed in the sequel; meantime, one or two observations may suffice to indicate the importance of this constitution, and its relation to the Divine purposes with respect to man's redemption through the seed of Abraham.

(1.) The Israelitish nation occupied a distinguished and clearly defined place in the scheme of redemption; and which conferred both on themselves and their institutions a character not shared in by any other people. The declaration of the Divine purpose to enter into covenant with them on their deliverance from Egypt, preceded the promulgation of any part of the law, although the covenant itself was not formally ratified until some progress had been made in the legislation. (Ex. xix. 5-8; xxiv. 8). By this covenant the Israelitish people were invested with a sacred character, and with a certain mediatorial office, being brought into a relation which, as respected God and intercourse with him, was intended to affect others as well as themselves. (Ex. xix. 6).

(2.) The separation of this people from the world, for the purposes thus intimated, had been long before announced, in various promises which God made to their ancestors (Gen. xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxii. 18; xxvi. 4), and to which repeated references were made in preparing the Israelites for their departure from Egypt; (Ex. iii. 15; vi. 8) An external separation had, indeed, been partially effected through God's providential dealings with them, particularly by their sojourn in Egypt; but this must not only be completed by superadding thereto an internal separation, it must also be maintained until the purposes contemplated in their peculiar vocation have been effected. Hence the peculiar polity whereby this community was hedged about, and separated from the rest of the world.

(3.) The decalogue, as a summary of moral duty, formed the fundamental article of the Mosaic legislation. This alone

¹ See above, vol. i. pp. 83-85.

imparted to it a specific character, which raised it from the sphere of all merely human systems of law. As the circumstances already referred to gave it a more comprehensive aim than that which had respect to the interests of any one people, however numerous and powerful, so this other indicated, with equal certainty, that the interests contemplated were not merely temporal, but chiefly moral and spiritual, as was also plainly expressed by the priestly functions, for the discharge of which, in the Divine constitution, the Israelites had been set apart (Ex. xix. 6), although, for various reasons, not the least of which was the national aspect rather than the individual and personal bearing of the transactions, temporal considerations may have been most apparent.

If the legislation of the Pentateuch had thus particularly in view the preparation, including therein the separation, conservation, and moral training of a people specially constituted the channels of a spiritual redemption, to be realized in the future, there is sufficient ground why it should hold a place in that record, whose chief end, it clearly appears, was to disclose the character and the purposes of God with respect to that redemption which, from the outset of the history, it was seen He had intended for fallen man. If it can, by any such considerations, be shown that the legislative enactments of the Pentateuch are, in their own place, and with regard to their object, entirely consonant with the remaining contents of that work, this should save them at least from being summarily stigmatised as trivial or unworthy of a place in the sacred volume.

3. Witheven more certainty may the design of the Pentateuch, and accordingly the harmony in that respect of its varied contents, whether in the form of history or of law, be deduced from its prophetic intimations. The prophetic is, indeed, not so much a distinct and separable portion of the Pentateuch as a characteristic of the whole work. These premonitions of various Divine purposes, as presented in the Mosaic writings, embrace various subjects, some of which may have no direct bearing on the great theme of the work, if limited simply to the scheme of redemption, as sometimes viewed, though all are intimately connected with what really appears to be its object, —the revelation of God in every aspect in which Himself deemed it desirable He should be known by His moral creatures.

Confining the attention, however, to those pre-intimations which more directly bear on the great work of redemption, they are essentially of two kinds,—the earlier, which, as the more general, regarded directly the future of mankind; and the later, which immediately respected the posterity of Abraham, but ultimately mankind as affected through it. Again, as regards the form of these disclosures, it is twofold: 1. Verbal prophecies, either direct communications made by God to individuals, or intimations from such as were thus favoured, or were otherwise directed in their conclusions from earlier declarations of the Divine will. 2. Adumbrations of the future in the events of Providence, in Divine acts and institutions, sometimes accompanied by verbal explanations, but usually the import of which was left to be inferred from the course of events or from analogy, and in the case of prescribed ordinances, from the symbols appropriated to the several observances.

These various prophecies, however expressed, were based on the principle that the Divine purpose exhibited in creation, and chiefly in the moral constitution of man, as God's representative on the earth, was to be realized through redemption, or a deliverance from the state induced through the fall. Creation had shown God to be absolute and supreme, infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness; but the fall, by bringing into view an antagonistic Power, cast a momentary shadow on this representation of the Divine attributes. Any doubt on this point was, however, straightway dissipated by the first prophetic announcement after the fall, which, though necessarily obscure, was yet comprehensive of all that followed. The aggregate of the prophetic intimations relative to redemption, comprised, even at the stage of development reached in the Pentateuch, four leading ideas: (1.) The plan of redemption; (2.) The person of the Redeemer; (3.) The people constituted the channels of redemption; and (4.) The nature of redemption, or the blessings to be obtained in and by it. And further, as connected with these expressions of Divine truth, whether by words or symbols, and in reality constituting their proper foundation, the various institutions and observances of a religious character previous to and under the law were designed to deepen and perpetuate these two prin-

eiples :—first, that man is in a state of estrangement from God ; and again, that God is possessed of an attribute of mercy, by the exercise of which, in harmony with truth and righteousness, and so without prejudice to his moral government, there can be complete and lasting reconciliation between Him and sinners restored from the ruin of the Fall.

Accordingly, it thus appears that the primary object of the Pentateuch, both in its record of primeval and patriarchal experience, and in its detailed recital of the constitution and laws conferred upon the Israelitish community, was to furnish the groundwork of a revelation of God, not confined to one particular aspect or relation, but embracing every point of view in which, to infinite Wisdom and Goodness, it appeared desirable for the Creator and Governor of the universe to manifest himself to creatures made capable of knowing and enjoying the Author of their being. However diversified its contents, this grand aim of the record, it will be found, is never lost sight of ; and that object is effected by making it simultaneously a revelation of man himself, primarily concerned in this matter, and whose character, both in his original state and fallen condition, is to be learned, not so much from abstract statements as from an infallible narrative of his acts and utterances, particularly when taken in connection with the Divine requirements expressed in the law, and with the provision graciously made for his varied necessities.

The revelation which God gave of himself, it may be further noticed, never assumed an abstract form, but was always connected with the circumstances and wants of his people at the time. It had a present purpose to serve, as well as a prospective one, these standing, however, to one another in the relation of means to an end. In judging, therefore, of the character of the Pentateuch, its subordinate purposes must be taken into consideration along with its primary aim. The former, indeed, occupy a more prominent place in the scheme, as might naturally have been expected, especially at the particular stage of the Divine economy there represented.

The state of things, particularly as regards the unfolding of the Divine purposes at the time of the composition of the Pentateuch, and the character which that circumstance would

impart to the work, deserve special attention. The Pentateuch purports to be a revelation of God to man, first in a state of innocence, and subsequently of sin. This latter period of human experience embraces, as usually reckoned, two dispensations,—the Patriarchal and Levitical: not distinct and independent, but consecutive parts of one whole; for the latter, it will be found, is only the development and the application of the earlier economy to new exigencies and relations. One of these consisted in the fact, that God's special dealings were henceforth to be no longer confined to individuals, but were to be extended to a people sustaining a representative character, and therefore the instructions which previously served for the guidance of individual conduct were no longer adequate. From the beginning God revealed his will to mankind, represented by the first man, or to particular individuals, as occasion required. He afterwards used the ministry of men for the warning and instruction of their fellows; adding from the first sacred rites for the expression of Divine truth. But it was not until Moses was commissioned as a lawgiver and prophet that these communications were put upon record, at least in the form in which they were presented to the Israelitish people; and that the ordinances, designed still further to impress these lessons, and to train a community appointed to be the medium of blessing to mankind, were reduced into an orderly system, sufficiently enlarged and explicit for the purposes for which it had been designed.

In order to judge of the suitableness of the laws and ordinances which particularly distinguished the Mosaic economy to the special ends for which they were appointed, they must be viewed in relation not only to the purposes entertained concerning the Israelites as the peculiar people of God, but also to their circumstances at the time when they were brought under its influence. The great design of this economy being the external separation of the Israelites for a time from the rest of the world, and their subjection to a course of discipline productive of such a training as would best qualify them for their special vocation, the question for consideration is not whether the Divine dealings or ordinances here were absolutely the best provisions for the exigencies or interests, either temporal or spiritual, of that or any other people; but whether

they were the best in view of all the circumstances and conditions of the case, and for the attainment as well of the ultimate as of the various mediate or subordinate ends?

There are thus it is evident what may be termed the circumstantials of the Pentateuch as embodying a Divine revelation, and of its principal component, the law, as an example of Divine jurisprudence, which give to the whole, as well as to the parts, a particular form and impress, and for which in any examination of the character and purposes of the work proper allowance must be made. Such circumstantials, whether connected with the condition, intellectual and moral, of the people for whose immediate use the Pentateuch was composed, or owing to the imperfections necessarily attaching to the earlier stages of a revelation which is in its nature progressive, or to whatever other cause they may be due, must, as far as possible, be separated from the more essential parts of the revelation which it embodies of moral and spiritual truths. This, however, is a process which demands the utmost caution, owing to the uncertainty which attaches to the precise purpose of many of the Mosaic ordinances from want of sufficient information regarding those times. Still, the historical details which precede and accompany the giving of the law, indicative of the apprehensions and bent of the people, supply invaluable materials for this purpose, which will be further enhanced by a careful comparison of the legislation of Deuteronomy with that of the earlier books. It would certainly be futile to attempt accounting for all the reasons which may have influenced the lawgiver in his numerous and diversified enactments, for where such reasons are not expressly stated, or left to be inferred analogically from any of the general principles which regulate the system, they are frequently so recondite, because dependent it may be on relations no longer existing, or so modified as to be hardly recognisable, that there is in such cases but little promise of any satisfactory result. Some of the enactments may have been occasioned by circumstances connected with the residence of the people in Egypt or in the wilderness, and indeed these must have given a certain direction to the whole system. Some again had only a temporary object, being shortly after their promulgation modified or repealed, while others were simply permissive

in consideration of an intractable disposition in the subjects of the law, and therefore no indication of the mind of the lawgiver.

Accordingly, it will be found that mental and even material relations occasionally modified if they did not predominate over the moral design; but even imperfections of this kind, as they may certainly be termed, were significant, and they are not to be overlooked in forming an estimate of the law, were it only that they furnished indications of its provisional character. While it would, therefore, be futile to look for moral reasons for all the ordinances of the Mosaic legislation, it would, on the other hand, be positively injurious to overlook, even in its minor elements, the great moral substratum of the whole, and resolve, as is sometimes done, some of these matters into regulations of police, having respect only to interests of a social, sanitary, or other collateral character, though a reference to such purposes may indeed be allowable, provided they are viewed only as means to a higher end.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHIEF END OF THE PENTATEUCH—THE REVELATION OF GOD.

THE primary end of the Pentateuch being thus seen to be a revelation of God through his dealings with man, it will be needful, at the outset, to consider generally the various modes adopted by Supreme Wisdom for communicating the contemplated information, not so much directly as to its constituting a permanent record, and also the fundamental truths thus presented with respect to the Divine perfections.

SECT. I. THE METHOD AND EXTENT OF GOD'S REVELATION OF HIMSELF IN THE PENTATEUCH.

Hävernick, *Vorlesungen üb. die Theologie des alten Testaments*, pp. 34-80. Erlangen, 1848. Alexander, *Connexion of the Old and New Testaments*, pp. 50-90. Lond. 1853. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, Pt. I., pp. 76-94. Camb. 1855.

The teaching of the Pentateuch, as of Scripture in general, on the nature and character of God, though, as already shown, such formed the primary object of that record, has nothing of a formal or abstract character, and is partly more a matter of inference than of direct and express statement. The Bible, from its very commencement, is chiefly a revelation of God by being a faithful record of his actings in creation and providence, so that it has much more of an historical than a strictly dogmatic aspect. Another of its characteristics—and, indeed, a fundamental principle—is, that it does not submit its truths to man's judgment. They are presented entirely on the authority of the Revealer, and so to be re-

ceived or rejected according as that authority is recognised or disowned.¹

In particular, the writer of the Pentateuch, though expressly commencing his work with the very beginning of all history and revelation, makes no attempt to prove the being of God; nor does he deem such necessary. He assumes it as a primary, indisputable truth; he does not even present it in a formal statement, but proceeds at once to the history of God's actings. The opening announcement, though not in set terms, is, that God is the supreme, absolute, universal Creator; after which he allows the Divine character, as respects power, wisdom, goodness, and various other attributes, to be learned very much from his works, and especially from his dealings with man, expressly constituted his "image," and the end of creation. But while man, as will presently be shown, was the chief organ of Divine revelation, and also its primary object, there was a variety of methods, as appears from the Pentateuch, adopted by Divine Wisdom for communicating to, and impressing upon the human mind the truths of revelation.

1. Direct statements respecting the Divine will and purposes necessarily formed the basis of all revelation. Without some specific explanation of his relation to God, and of the nature of the government under which he was placed, creation must have presented to the first man an inexplicable enigma. All needful explanations with regard to such matters were, however, doubtless communicated to him, for part of them at least is put upon record for subsequent use, and as a foundation for more varied and enlarged disclosures of the Divine purposes concerning the human family. Thus, the place assigned to man himself in the creation was explicitly announced in the Divine blessing which accompanied his

¹ "There are truths which cannot be either discovered or proved by any exercise of reason, whether direct or mediate — truths depending on the sovereign will and inscrutable counsels of the Omniscient Mind, which have no natural evidence, and can only be supernaturally revealed; and in regard to these truths, we yield, not to the authority of evidence, for they are neither self-evident nor capable of rational proof, but to the *evidence of authority*; we receive them simply on the testimony of the Revealer."—Recent Applications of Philosophy to Theology: Brit. and For. Evang. Review, April 1859. p. 448.

formation, (Gen. i. 28,) while his relation to the Creator was no less plainly declared by the law which bound him to be subject to the Divine will. The intimation, "Thou shalt not," with respect to a particular act which was thus interdicted, and the penalty which should follow transgression, indicated the moral rule under which man was placed, (Gen. ii. 17). The character of the Creator was set before him, however, not so much in words as in acts which provided both for his physical and social wants. That act, in particular, which secured for man a suitable companion, showed to him, in a way far more expressive and forcible than any verbal statement, his peculiar standing in the creation, (Gen. ii. 20). After the fall, there was a communication made to him which presented the Divine character in an aspect of which previous announcements could have given no pre-intimation, (Gen. iii. 15,) although, when made, it might be seen to be in complete harmony with the purpose expressed in the designation of man as the "image of God."

Divine communications were at first made to individuals without respect to their character; for, next to Adam, Cain was twice directly addressed by God; and it was the same afterwards when occasion required it, as in the cases of Abimelech and Laban, to both of whom God appeared in a night vision, laying upon them certain commands, (Gen. xx. 3-7; xxxi. 24). Still more was this seen in the case of Balaam, whom God made a direct instrument in publishing his will, (Numb. xxii. 20, 35). But, ordinarily, God used the ministry of men who stood in a special relation to himself for communicating his will to others. The first that was thus distinguished was Enoch, (Jude, ver. 14, 15); and although no notice is taken of this fact in its appropriate place in the history, it fully accords with the character and standing there assigned to the patriarch. Noah also was a distinguished recipient of Divine communications; as were afterwards Abraham and the other Israelitish fathers. But the communications addressed to these were of a more special character than those made to Enoch and Noah, which were chiefly designed for the immediate instruction and warning of their contemporaries. But it was Moses to whom, more than any other, was revealed the Divine mind, and who was instructed

to commit to writing all that was needful of the prior revelations for completing the Divine record.

With respect to several statements in these earlier records, it is observable that some of them were communications made directly by God, while others were conclusions to which individuals were specially directed, or which they themselves, with greater or less certainty, deduced from earlier declarations of the Divine will. This latter may be called the expression or experience of faith, a particular instance of which is the confidence which Joseph expressed at his death concerning the deliverance from Egypt, relying on the promises made to his fathers, (Gen. i. 24, 25). Other examples are the name Eve, given by Adam to his wife after the fall, (Gen. iii. 20), and the observations of the latter on the birth of her sons, Cain and Seth, (iv. 1, 25). Sometimes, in cases of this kind, there may be an infusion of erroneous elements, owing to human fallibility either in the interpretation of Divine truth, or its application to particular times or persons, as in Eve's anticipations respecting Cain, and probably also Lamech's, at least partially, with regard to his son Noah, (v. 29). But in all such matters, the value of the statement is to be judged from the connexion, the analogy of Scripture, and the manner in which it is introduced by the historian, or the purpose which he designed its insertion in the record to subserve.

Under this head of direct statements must be reckoned the revelations made through the Divine names, which served to unveil the Being by whom they were appropriated, and to indicate the relations which he sustained to his creatures, whom he taught and encouraged to address him by such appellations. The value of the name for identifying the person or describing his character, appears from the remark of Moses, when receiving the Divine commission for the liberation of his brethren: "And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?" (Ex. iii. 13). This was a consideration, the importance of which God at once admitted, by declaring the name by which the Israelites should recognise him. And to a subsequent request of Moses for a sight of the Divine glory, God intimated: "I will make

all my goodness to pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee," (Ex. xxxiii. 18, 19). Than this answer nothing could more expressly declare the essential relation of the name to the person and character of God so revealed. Accordingly, when God was about to renew and enlarge his promises to Abraham, He appeared to him and said, "I am EL SHADDAI, (the Almighty God,) walk before me, and be thou perfect," (Gen. xvii. 1; comp. Ex. vi. 3)—this Divine name being exceedingly appropriate, as presenting an important element for sustaining the patriarch's faith for the exercise here prescribed to him.

Closely connected with this particular in the method of God's making himself known, is his direction to give certain names to individuals at their birth, or subsequently to change the original names for others, corresponding to some new feature or relation in their history. Thus the name Ishmael, "God hears," (Gen. xvii. 20,) which Hagar was directed to give to her son when he should be born, was specially designed to comfort her in the circumstances in which she was found at the time, by assuring her of an interest in Divine providence. In like manner, the change of Abram and Sarai into Abraham (father of nations) and Sarah (a princess) respectively, was an incident exceedingly significant. It installed, so to speak, these individuals into their future possessions. The promise to Abram that he should be "the father of many nations," (Gen. xvii. 5,) and to Sarai that "she should become nations," and that "kings of people should be of her," (ver. 16,) was henceforth incorporated in their names. God "could impart for the future nothing more powerful to allay every anxiety about human causality, than the *name*, long before the *thing* which it expressed."¹ Indeed, the bestowal of names was a matter of deep interest in early times, so that the names occurring in the Pentateuch throw much light on various questions regarding the faith and other apprehensions of the men of those ages. Of this some use will be made in the following discussions.

2. The Divine acts and providential dealings recorded in the Pentateuch served also to reveal the character of God.

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, E. T., vol. i., p. 283.

The general object of these acts or events was either salvation or destruction ; but often one and the same act produced this twofold result, of course with respect to different persons. Such acts were seen in the Noachian deluge, and the drying up of the Red Sea, where, in both cases, the salvation obtained was directly through the destruction, in the first instance, of those who, by their wickedness, had corrupted the earth, and by their violence had, doubtless, aided in reducing the number of the faithful to the one family of Noah ; and, in the second, of the Egyptians in their pursuit of the Israelites escaped from bondage. In all these cases, as also in the deliverance of Lot from Sodom (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 7), the same principle was manifested, though in circumstances exceedingly different,—a principle first announced in the primeval promise of redemption (Gen. iii. 15).

Sometimes remarkable events in providence were accompanied by verbal explanations ; as, for instance, in the case of the twin children struggling in the womb of Rebekah (Gen. xxv. 23), or, when in the view of coming judgments, it was deemed necessary to give warning or to win attention to the Divine procedure, pre-intimation was given of the reasons which called for that particular exercise of power ; as in the case of the deluge and the destruction of the cities of the plain. In the latter instance a special communication was made to Abraham (Gen. xviii. 17), which served to throw much light on the divine character, through the intercession of the Patriarch for the sparing of the cities against which the judgment was denounced. Sometimes, however, the object of the act or event was so apparent as to require no explanation, or if not so, it was left to be inferred, from the subsequent course of events. Thus the cause of the fearful death of Nadab and Abihu was so obvious to Moses, that he immediately referred it to the transgression of God's direction as to the manner in which He should be approached (Lev. x. 3 ; comp. Ex. xix. 22). The record, again, of the severities and impositions which Jacob endured from Laban is unquestionably, although not so stated, the sentence of condemnation of his own previous conduct towards his father and brother. These, and various other acts recorded in the early history, testified more strongly than any words, not only to the universality of God's providence.

but also that He is not indifferent to moral conduct, but while long-suffering, as was evident in the respite which preceded the deluge, and even willing to spare such as had incurred his displeasure, as was still more apparent from his bearing to Abraham in his interposition for Sodom, He will inevitably punish sin and save his people from destruction.

Passing over numerous circumstances, which show that the primary object of the Mosaic history, from the very first, was to exhibit the relation which God sustained towards his creatures, and especially through the covenants into which he entered with individuals like Noah and Abraham, notice must be taken of the series of plagues on the Egyptians, which conduced to the Exodus, and which was eminently expressive of the character of the God of Israel. Referring for details to an earlier portion of this work, where the subject has been considered in another connexion, it is enough to remark, that it is expressly stated that the design of these manifold displays of power was to convince both the Israelites and the Egyptians that the God of the former was God alone over all the earth. The need there was of convincing proofs of Jehovah's supremacy over all the powers acknowledged as gods in Egypt, appears not only from the gross idolatry in which, as it is well known that people were sunk, but also from the defiant language with which Pharaoh received the message of Jehovah, addressed to him by Moses: "Who is Jehovah, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah, neither will I let Israel go," (Ex. v. 3). And as regards the Israelites themselves, such testimony was equally necessary, for it would appear that they had been brought very much under the influence of the religious associations around them, so that their bondage was as much of a moral as of a physical nature, for they had in a great measure lost the knowledge of the God of their fathers. The effects produced, however, on all parties, gave unmistakeable testimony to the power and perfections of the God of Israel, and his absolute supremacy over all competitors.

But, even more than in the conflict with the powers of Egypt, was the Divine character exhibited in dealing with the Israelites themselves at the Exodus and in the wilderness. The consideration manifested in not exposing them at once,

heartless and undisciplined, as in the circumstances they must have been, to the trials of warfare (Ex. xiii. 17), was a special token of goodness towards them, and typical of the Divine procedure. Power, too, greater, and of another kind than that exerted in Egypt, was called into exercise, not so much to supply the natural wants of such a host, and in circumstances unprecedented in the history of any other people, as to bring them to a moral fitness for the blessings designed for them. The attributes of righteousness and holiness also were strikingly exhibited in the punishments which this people, in their obduracy and rebelliousness, so often drew down upon themselves, and from which chastisements even Moses and Aaron, owing to their complicity in the common sin, were not exempted. But not less noticeable were the tokens of a Divine long-suffering, which endured the repeated provocations of this rebellious people (Num. xiv. 22), and of the goodness and faithfulness which brought them at length to the termination of their wanderings.

In a word, the various incidents in the history of the Pentateuch, beginning with its account of the first man down to God's dealings with Israel in the wilderness, gave clear indications of the principles of a moral government,—showing what God is; what he has purposed with respect to and provided for his people; what he requires them to be; and, on the other hand, how far they are naturally from answering those requirements. Accordingly, it will be found that God's declarations respecting his own character and that of man, considered as a fallen creature, fully explain the facts presented in the history, while these again completely verify the declarations.

3. The religious rites and ordinances of Divine institution mentioned in the Pentateuch were also a principal medium for making known the Divine character, and the purposes entertained towards man. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the origin of sacrifice, and other expiatory and purifying rites, it will not be denied, even by such as view these practices merely as the wild utterances of the human conscience itself, seeking to escape from guilt, that they bore testimony to the fact of man's alienation from God, and his unfitness to hold immediate communication with Him. But, taking

them as God's own appointment, unquestionably so represented, at least as respects their place in the Levitical system,—these rites and ordinances testified not only to the truth of man's estrangement from God, or to a contrariety between the Divine and the human character, but also to God's willingness, and indeed his purpose, to remove the grounds of separation, by thus indicating or sanctioning a method of reconciliation. It would appear that the promises and symbolical rites went together, both being coeval with man's fall, or, more strictly, with the announcement respecting his recovery. There was this distinction, however, that the former pointed more directly to the person of the Redeemer, the later to the plan of redemption. But though the Divine purposes were variously expressed, nevertheless they furnished mutual illustrations, and constituted, in fact, complementary parts of one great scheme.

The earliest of the symbolical institutions, at least according to the order in which such are expressly noticed in the Pentateuch, although various indications seem to require this priority for sacrifice, was not properly of the ritual class, but had a purpose distinct from all the other ordinances, and was therefore only of temporary duration. This was the location of the Cherubim in the Garden of Eden after the expulsion of man—an arrangement which set before him the prospect of a restoration, though it afforded no intimation of the way whereby this should be effected. This, however, was exhibited by other rites, at first few and simple, corresponding to the knowledge then attained of the Divine character and the consciousness of guilt. But with the advances in revelation, these rites were greatly multiplied, and under the legal economy their observance was made the subject of express command, and not left, as heretofore, to the option of individuals. Nothing, however, showed better the insufficiency of these ordinances to exhibit fully the mode of the Divine procedure, particularly in redemption, and no less their inadequacy for affording satisfaction to the worshipper himself, than their variety and number, and the necessity for their continued repetition.

4. Manifestations of God in human form largely contributed to the method of the Divine revelation. Creation, and providence in general, revealed certain features of the Divine character and administration. Communications made verbally,

or conveyed in symbol, enlarged this revelation, and corrected misconceptions which might arise from an erroneous interpretation of the facts and phenomena in creation and providence, without, however, imparting much information regarding the personality of God—a knowledge of which is indispensable to any correct acquaintance with his character. But in the history of the Pentateuch God appears in his personality from the beginning in the works of creation, and particularly in his intercourse with the rational and moral among his creatures. Nowhere, indeed, is he seen as a mere abstraction, or an embodiment of qualities and perfections. It was as a person God was known to the parents of mankind, and to some of their earlier descendants, as Enoch in particular, and also Noah. With such only could those patriarchs “walk.” It is not with a mere abstraction, or even a personality removed beyond human sympathies and conceptions, that it is possible for man to hold such converse as Enoch, Noah and Abraham maintained with God.

It must have been somehow in connexion with the idea expressed in man, as created after the Divine image, and also in view of a want (Ps. xvii. 15), which, originating, no doubt, in that primal constitution, was intended to find its full satisfaction in the assumption of the human nature by the Divine, but which ignorantly sought a substitute in deifying man, that, whenever God visibly appeared to any of his people, it was under the human form (see Gen. xviii.) To the same cause must also be ascribed the extensive use of anthropomorphic and anthropopathic language in the Scriptures, especially in the Pentateuch, as containing the earliest revelations. This mode of describing the Divine Being many regard as conveying only unworthy and confused ideas of the Spiritual and Unimpassioned, without at all taking into consideration whether such language may not even be a necessity arising as well from man’s limited conceptions as from his original constitution. But without entering here into a discussion of this point, it may be remarked that the use of such language, corrected as it is by other express declarations, constitutes in reality one of the chief excellences of Scripture, evincing its adaptation to the capacities of its readers, and is, moreover, not only consistent with but indispensable to the idea which

lies at the foundation of the revealed scheme—that man is the image of the Creator, and so the chief medium for disclosing the Divine glory and perfections, and in the realisation of which idea through Him, who is absolutely “the image” of God, being God and man in one person, revelation reaches its completion. Indeed, a sufficient vindication of the language in question is the distinct and correct conceptions which it conveys of the Great Being thus brought down to human apprehension, and quite different from anything to which reason or philosophy has ever attained.¹ In such cases the infinite and the personal are usually antagonistic. Thus, whereas the personality of God vanishes in the pantheism of India, his infinity is, on the other hand, lost in the polytheism of Greece. Not so, however, with the God of the Bible, who is thus seen to have been no creation of human reason, but is in every respect a self-manifestation of the Invisible.

The preceding observations have been necessarily of a general character, merely adverting to various topics to which special attention must be directed at a more advanced stage of this inquiry. Their object has been to present, as briefly as possible, a view of the different methods adopted by God for communicating to mankind in the early ages a knowledge of himself, and in order to prepare for an examination of the religious teaching of the Pentateuch thereby rendered formally so complex, and especially for judging of its large use of material forms and relations. The subject thus considered, it will have been remarked, is distinct from a discussion of the modes of inspiration, or the actings upon the mind of the individual who may have been constituted the medium of any Divine communication—a matter with which the present subject has no direct concern. The observations immediately to follow, it may be further remarked, must likewise be of a general character; the only point admitting of special illustration at present being the doctrine of the Divine Unity, so marked a feature in the Hebrew creed, when contrasted with the universal polytheism of the heathen nations of antiquity. A full

¹ “The representations of God, which Scripture presents to us, may be shown to be analogous to those which the laws of our mind require us to form; and, therefore, such as may naturally be supposed to have emanated from the same Author.”—Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought*, p. 28. London, 1858.

view of the doctrine of the Pentateuch respecting God's character, and of his purposes, as especially illustrating that character, will only appear when the whole economy embraced in that work has come under review, and been compared with its development in the New Testament Scriptures.

The natural disinclination of fallen man to retain the knowledge of God, (Rom. i. 28,) whatever may have been the method whereby that knowledge was communicated or acquired, must have early given rise to idolatry. But there is no indication that it was practised by the antediluvians,¹ though there is abundant evidence of an infidelity which eventually resulted in an almost universal corruption of morals, (Gen. vii. 1). Cain worshipped the true God, although in a way which did not meet the Divine approval, (iv. 5). The Cainites, indeed, were the first to employ a Divine name—EL, in the formation of their own proper names; as in Mehujael, מְהוּיָאֵל, *Smitten of God*;) and this individual's son, Methusael, (מְתוּשָׁאֵל, *Man of God*;) Gen. iv. 18; a practice afterwards followed by the Sethites, as in Mahalaleel, (מְהַלְלֵאֵל, *Praise of God*;) Gen. v. 12. Idolatry, however, was certainly practised soon after the flood, and among the Shemites, Abraham's own ancestors, (Josh. xxiv. 2); and even the patriarch himself may have been guilty in this matter. It is probably in reference to this, that when Laban, in his covenant with Jacob, appealed to the God of Abraham, the God of their father, Jacob swore merely by the Fear, (יִרְאָה, the object of reverence) of his father Isaac, (Gen. xxxi. 53). In Canaan the primeval light was not wholly extinguished, even at a later period, for Abraham, some time after his arrival thither, came into contact with the Canaanitish prince Melchizedek, who discharged the functions of priest of the Most High God, (אֱלֹהֵי יְיָ,) "possessor of heaven and earth," (Gen. xiv. 19, 20). But it is observable that Abraham on this occasion, while fully recognising the God whom Melchizedek worshipped, prefixed Jehovah to the designation of God used by Melchizedek, (ver. 22,)—a

¹ Selden, (*De Diis Syris*, p. 44, Leips. 1672,) Spanheim, (*Opera* i., 279,) and others, refer the origin of idolatry to the time of Enos, the grandson of Adam. But this rests entirely on a

misinterpretation of Gen. iv. 26, in which they follow the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and other Rabbinical authorities as Jarchi.

circumstance which indicates the patriarch's own progress in this Divine knowledge through the revelations made to him.

Abraham's kindred in Mesopotamia continued sinking deeper into idolatry, in common with the world at large, and on the return of Jacob from his sojourn there, mention is made of Terraphim, objects of idolatrous worship which Laban called his gods, (Gen. xxxi. 30,) and which, having been stolen by his daughter Rachel, were secretly retained in Jacob's family, until expressly charged by the patriarch, in consequence of Divine instructions, to proceed to Bethel to worship God, to put them away as אֱלֹהֵי הַנֶּגֶר, "the gods of the stranger," or "foreigner," (Gen. xxxv. 2). During their abode in Egypt, the Israelites must have been familiarised with idolatry of the very grossest kind; nay, more, they actually participated in it, (Josh. xxiv. 14). Their strong propensity to such practices was apparent, immediately after the Exodus, in the worship of the golden calf, and in circumstances altogether unexampled. Whatever may have been the mental reservations, if any, of the Israelites in this case, this act, so soon after the most signal interpositions of God, plainly manifesting the utter impotency of the gods of Egypt, and after the most solemn charges against every form of false worship, exhibited a sensuousness almost incredible, and yet the incident is thoroughly consistent with the disposition of the people, as shown throughout much of their subsequent history. But, indeed, this very marked disposition of the Israelites, so alien to the character which might be expected in a people whose literature and authoritative creed presented such pure and profound conceptions of Deity, is not without importance in estimating the character of their sacred books. The bearing of this will be seen in connexion with some of the following particulars:—

1. *The Unity and Personality of God.*—Notwithstanding the general defection of mankind from the knowledge and worship of the true God—a fact taught not only in the Bible, but in every other history, in direct opposition to those theorists who maintain that polytheism was the original belief of mankind—and notwithstanding, too, the special propensity of the Israelites themselves, during their sojourn in the wil-

derness, to lapse into idolatry, and to sacrifice “to gods whom they knew not,” (Deut. xxxii. 17-21,) and even long subsequently, to conform to the gross religious practices of the nations around them, the doctrine of the Divine Unity was, from the very first, one of the most prominent features of the national creed.¹ In no particular is the Pentateuch more distinguished from all other ancient religious systems, than by the place which it assigns to the unity of God, and the explicit terms in which it teaches this fundamental doctrine. Such, indeed, is the place occupied by this truth in the Mosaic record, that it constitutes the foundation not merely of its moral precepts and religious dogmas, but also of its entire history; so that, whether the subject be creation or providence, engaged in bestowing good or visiting with evil, the one living and true God is throughout recognised as the sole Author and Disposer of every act and event.

In the initial announcement of the Hebrew Scriptures, that “God created the heavens and the earth,” and the complementary notice, that “all the host of them” was completed in due time by his Almighty word, there was proclaimed the important principle, to which heathenism is a total stranger, that nature, in all its parts and arrangements, is wholly God’s creature, and as such, is entirely dependent on his will.² Thus the very first page of the Bible assigns, in terms as explicit as they are comprehensive and profound, his due place to God, as one supreme, and independent, and sustaining a personal relation to his moral creatures—a doctrine alike removed from Dualism and Pantheism. This universal government of God it is the object of the whole subsequent history to illustrate and define; while more particularly showing how He overrules all things for his own glory, and his people’s good.

The doctrine of the Divine Unity, which actually forms the very introduction to the Bible, is never for a moment lost sight of throughout the sacred volume, notwithstanding the

¹ Thus even Theodore Parker: “This must be confessed that, under the guidance of Divine Providence, the great and beautiful doctrine of one God seems quite early embraced by the great Jewish lawgiver, incorporated with his national legislation, defended

with rigorous enactments, and slowly communicated to the world.”—*Discourse*, pp. 65, 66.

² Witsius, *Symbolum Apostolorum*, Exercit. viii., § 10, p. 113. *Franeq.*, 1681. *Hävernick*, *Einleit.* I., ii. 244.

many counteracting influences of surrounding heathenism, to which the great mass of the Israelites themselves repeatedly succumbed. It had, indeed, been represented by facts of a most impressive character, long ere it was reduced to the verbal proposition: "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah," (Deut. vi. 4),—not, as rendered by Hofmann, after Le Clerc, though in a somewhat different acceptation, "Jehovah is our God, Jehovah alone."¹ When enunciated thus, or in any other form, it is in no hesitating or ambiguous terms. It does not appear as the result merely of a happy guess, or as the fruit of painful, perplexing cogitations. On the contrary, it clearly stands forth as the expression of a deep, unwavering conviction, and as distinct as any similar declaration of the New Testament. To prepare for the reception of this doctrine, and to impress it upon the covenant people, was one of the great ends of God's interpositions on their behalf, (Deut. iv. 35; xxxii. 39). But whether taught by these acts, or by express statements on the subject, the monotheism of the Pentateuch embraced two ideas: that God is one, as opposed to the heathen polytheism to which the Israelites showed so strong a leaning, (Deut. iv. 35); and that he is one, as the sole object of adoration and worship, (Deut. vi. 4). God is thus one, absolutely and exclusively: אֲנִי יְהוָה, "I, I [am] He," (Deut. xxxii. 39); with which may be compared Christ's declaration of himself, ἐγὼ εἰμι, in John viii. 24.²

The pure monotheism which thus formed so distinguishing a feature of the Hebrew Scriptures, and as distinctly taught in the oldest of these documents, as in the latest of the prophetic productions, when, as it is sometimes expressed, the national mind was more developed and matured, is a remarkable, and, indeed, apart from revelation, an inexplicable phenomenon. Of course, there is no lack of theories on the subject; and there are critics like Le Clerc, and more recently De Wette and Hartmann, who even detect traces of an earlier Hebrew polytheism, which has left an impress on the language, though

¹ Der Schriftbeweis, i. 85. Nördling, 1852. Hofmann takes this as expressing affirmatively, what is often declared negatively, that there is no other God than Jehovah, while he very

strangely denies that it has reference to the Divine unity.

² Hävernicks, Vorlesungen, p. 43. Hofmann, Der Schriftbeweis, i. 60, 61.

entirely banished from the creed. This allegation rests entirely on the plural form ELOHIM, the usual designation of God—a usage which admits, at least, of a more satisfactory explanation than the one thus suggested; but of this again. With respect, however, to this assumed polytheism, it might be enough to remark that such a view, besides being unsupported by any other evidence, labours under this serious disadvantage, that it fails completely to account for the causes which led to so complete a renunciation of polytheism in the national creed, that there is no other trace of it even in the earliest records, or in subsequent references to those early or pre-Mosaic times. The allegation, in particular, that the Hebrew monotheism is not older than the time of Moses, who was indebted for it to his Egyptian teachers, is so destitute of anything in the form of evidence, that it merits little consideration but for the authoritative manner with which it is often advanced, and the influence which, in some respects, the Egyptian education of the author of the Pentateuch unquestionably exerted on that composition.

With regard, however, to this assumption, it may first, in general, be remarked that, as connected with the composition of the Pentateuch, neither the time, nor any other circumstance in the case, was favourable for the discovery of this doctrine; nor if discovered, was the temper of the people to whom it was communicated such as to encourage a wise legislator to inculcate it so openly, so urgently and universally, as was done in this instance, unless impelled by a higher necessity than the mere pleasure which the reception of such a dogma must impart to its fortunate discoverer. But more especially, from all that is known either from sacred or profane history of the religious views of the Egyptians, the early education of Moses at the court of Pharaoh cannot be regarded as greatly contributing to the sublime conceptions of the Deity contained in his writings. On this it is remarked by a competent authority:¹ “With

¹ Prichard, *Egypt. Mythology*, p. 406. Lond. 1819. “The popular creed of Egypt was, in substance, nothing higher than a deification of the various energies of nature; and, in form, was one

of the least spiritual of the old polytheisms.”—Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, Pt. iv., p. 130. So also R. S. Poole: “The basis of the religion was Nigritian fetishism, the lowest kind of

respect to theology, no two systems can be more directly opposed to each other than the Mosaic doctrine was to that of the Egyptians." He was, indeed, "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians;" but even had that people been acquainted at any time with the profound truths embodied in the Hebrew Scriptures regarding the nature and character of God, and the rule of his administration, that knowledge ceased, long prior to the Mosaic age, to be a part of their "wisdom."

What the opportunities of Moses afterwards were in the land of Midian to attain to correct views on such subjects, it does not appear; for it is doubtful what was the precise religious standing of his father-in-law, the priest of Midian. Moses, however, was acquainted with the God of his fathers before any direct communications from God were made to himself, (Ex. xviii. 4). This knowledge he must have acquired from the early instructions of his mother; and this, again, according to the whole evidence of the case, uniform and consistent throughout with all the other particulars of the early Hebrew history, must have been part of the patriarchal faith from patriarchal times.

Should it be necessary, therefore, in these circumstances, to refer the origin of the doctrine of the Divine unity to a time anterior to that of Moses, the difficulty, in a rationalistic point of view, is only thereby increased, seeing that, on the principle maintained by the defenders of that scheme, this is only bringing it nearer to the originally universal polytheism. But how the Hebrew monotheism could naturally have arisen from such a state of things it is impossible to explain. There is, indeed, a marked progress in the manifestations of the Divine nature in the Pentateuch; the views of Abraham were more distinct than those of Melchizedek, and the theocratic idea, again, far surpassed the patriarchal (Ex. vi. 3); but the doctrine of the divine Unity was, from the beginning, an indubitable element of faith, and consequently of revelation, for it could have been derived from no other source. An original error could never have been developed into a truthful representation of the Di-

nature-worship."—Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. *Egypt*, i. 501. See also Kalisch, Com. on Exodus, p. 41, who remarks: "Of the notion of *monotheism*, we find in Egypt no trace what-ever."

vine idea, and so polytheism could never, by any natural process, pass into monotheism.

But even supposing that, by some profound reasoning, such a process was possible, how did it happen that this doctrine was limited to the Hebrew community? What were the peculiar conditions in their case, or in that of their ancestors, favourable to such a discovery? These, and other questions relative to this point, cannot be satisfactorily answered on rationalistic principles. Writers of that class discourse, indeed, on the progress of the Hebrew intellect, and on the improvement in their originally crude conceptions of a Deity having all the characteristics of a Moloch, who delighted in horrid rites, and to whom were actually offered human sacrifices,¹ until at length contemplated as a Being to whom all such rites were abhorrent; but they fail to give any explanation of the originating cause of such a remarkable change of view, or how the principle, whatever it may have been, was not applicable in the case of other nations, or if so, how it failed to produce similar results.

These theorists, when pressed to account for the correct views expressed by the Biblical writers, on such a subject, for instance, as the creation, so incomparably superior, as all must admit, to the various cosmogonies of heathenism, at once refer this superiority to the more worthy conceptions of the Hebrews regarding the Divine character, without at all adverting to the fact that this itself is a phenomenon which equally requires an explanation, and which, as long as it is unexplained, entirely precludes all rationalistic hypotheses. Such, however, is the ground on which Ewald² would explain the peculiarities and excellences of the Biblical narrative of the creation, in order to avoid ascribing to it a Divine origin. This explanation is obviously defective, so long as the cause assigned is itself unexplained, if indeed it be not inexplicable,

¹ Ghillany, *Das Menschen-opfer der alten Hebräer*. Nuremb. 1842. Mackay, *The Progress of the Intellect*, vol. ii. pp. 406-453. Lond. 1850. One sentence from this latter work will indicate the foundation of the theory: "The Hebrews were no strangers to human

sacrifices. The very foundation of their hereditary privileges was the 'faith' of their great patriarch in the authenticity of a Divine command to kill his own son."—P. 406.

² *Jahrbücher der Bib. Wissenschaft*, 1848, p. 80. Götting. 1849.

on any ground which would deny it to be the offspring of revelation.

The monotheism of the Pentateuch cannot, however, be properly apprehended apart from the doctrine of the divine Personality, to which some reference has been already made. Nowhere, not even in the narrative of the creation, does God appear merely as a Power, whose resistless energy man might contemplate with awe, but could not by any possibility love. On the contrary, the various acts of creation, and chiefly the formation of man, furnished ample foundation for those ideas of personality which afterwards found such striking expression in such passages of Scripture as Prov. viii. And so the whole history of the Pentateuch represents God as a Being who loves, and can be loved; One who is interested in all that affects the happiness of his creatures, and especially of those whom he formed capable of knowing and holding communion with Himself. The history of Adam, both before and after the fall; God's walking in the garden in the cool of the day (Gen. iii. 8), to mention no other incident, teaches this particular truth. So also the history of the other patriarchs, as Enoch's walk with God, and the various other instances of fellowship with God in those primeval times.

The idea of the Divine personality was more fully exhibited by the relation which God sustained to his people, when he styled himself *their* God. The germ of this appears in Noah's blessing on Shem: "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem," (Gen. ix. 26); but it is in the case of Abraham, who afterwards was specially designated "the friend of God" (Isa. xli. 8), that this relation was first expressly avowed by God himself (Gen. xxviii. 13), and which henceforth became a standing designation of God (Ex. iii. 6), so that the Israelites were distinguished as "The people of the God of Abraham." (Ps. xlvii. 9).

2. *Plurality in the Divine Essence.*—But while the doctrine of the divine Unity was thus taught in the most express terms, there are, at the same time, intimations that there subsists somehow a plurality in, or compatible with, this Unity. Elohim, the most usual, and probably the earliest name of God in Hebrew, is a plural term, but with very rare exceptions (*e. g.*, Gen. xx. 13; xxxv. 7; Ex. xxii. 8; xxxii. 4, 8) conjoined with verbs and adjectives singular. This remarkable

usage, in a religion so thoroughly monotheistic as that of the Hebrews, and so intolerant of the least semblance of polytheism, has been variously explained. Some, as already remarked, see in it merely the remains of an early polytheism, which, though discarded from the creed, left its impression on the language. Others take the plural to be intensive, indicating the fulness of perfections in the Deity, or consider it as denoting the abstract. It is unnecessary, however, to enlarge on these, or similar explanations, as none of them satisfies all the requirements of the case. But, on the other hand, seeing that in the later Hebrew Scriptures the doctrine of a plurality in the divine Essence is unquestionably taught, what occasion is there for denying that its germ is found in the Pentateuch,—a supposition which would at once account for the use of the plural term Elohim. A passage in Deut. vi. 4, already quoted, is very significant: “Hear, Israel, Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah.” Here plurality and unity are plainly ascribed to Jehovah at the same time. “The only expressible idea suggested by such a statement is, that whilst there is but one God, and whilst that God is one in substance, there is, nevertheless, a distinction of some sort or other co-existing with this unity, and compatible with it.”¹

Further, in various instances, God is introduced as speaking to or of himself in the plural. Thus, Gen. i. 26: “God said, Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness:” chap. iii. 22, “The Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as *one of us*:” and ch. xi. 7, “Go to, *let us* go down, and there [let us] confound their language.” Still more remarkable is the language of ch. xix. 24: “Jehovah rained . . . brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of heaven.” To suppose, with Aben Ezra and other Jewish writers, and with Schumann and Knobel among recent Biblical critics, that in the first three passages God adopts the style usual to sovereigns, or that, according to others, among whom, strange to say, is to be reckoned Delitzsch, He addresses the angels whom he associated with him in council, is only to manifest ignorance of the manners and style of antiquity, and on the latter assumption still more of the entire spirit of the Pentateuch. Equally futile is

¹ Alexander, *Connexion of Old and New Test.*, p. 65.

the supposition, that the remaining passage refers only to a local and not to a personal distinction.

But, besides these intimations generally of a plurality in the Godhead, particular mention is made of Agents, who are denominated "the Spirit," and "the Angel of God," or "Jehovah," respectively. The agency of the former first appears in the creation: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" (Gen. i. 2), preparing the dark chaotic mass for the evolutions which were to follow from the Divine fiat. That the "Spirit" in this case is not simply an attribute of the Creator, appears from the whole tenor of the narrative, and still more from the passage where mention is next made of the same Agent: "The Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man; for that he also is flesh" (Gen. vi. 3). Other references are, Ex. xxxi. 3: "I have filled him (Bezaleel) with the Spirit of God, in wisdom and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship;" Num. xxiv. 2: "The Spirit of God came upon Balaam;" ch. xxvii. 18: "The Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua . . . a man in whom is the Spirit;" that is, God's Spirit, as appears from ch. xi. 25, 29. It is by no means here contended, that there was in these intimations much more than a premonition of the being of the Divine Spirit, and of his functions in the natural and moral world, but that the doctrine did not escape observation, obscure though the light may have been, appears from the prayer of David: "Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me" (Ps. li. 11).

With respect, again, to the "Angel of God," or of "Jehovah," fuller and more precise information is afforded in the Mosaic writings. That this was a Divine Agent, and not a created angel or messenger of God, speaking and acting merely in the name of Him by whom he was commissioned, appears from various considerations. (1.) He makes statements and promises which imply the possession of Divine prerogatives: as in the promise to Hagar (Gen. xvi. 10) to Abraham (xxii. 12, 15-17), and to Jacob (xxxii. 11-13). It was this same Being to whom Jacob subsequently referred as the Angel who had redeemed him from all evil, and in whom he recognised a power to bestow blessing (xlviii. 15, 16). (2.) He is addressed as Jehovah and God, and is so styled by the writer of the

Pentateuch, showing that it was not through any misconception that these appellations were bestowed. Thus the person who appeared to Hagar is four times named the Angel of the Lord; and then it is added: "She called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God seest me" (xvi. 13). But the most explicit testimony is in Ex. iii. 2-6, where it is stated that "the Angel of the Lord" appeared to Moses in the burning bush; and then is added: "When the Lord saw that Moses turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush," and said, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham," &c. In reference to this theophany, Moses, in his concluding discourse, uses the expression, "He that dwelt in the bush" (Deut. xxxiii. 16), to designate Jehovah, to whom alone he looked for any blessing. (3.) The Angel of God is represented as distinct from God, in Ex. xxiii. 20, 21: "Behold, I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him." Comparing this declaration with chap. xxxii. 34; xxxiii. 2, where God threatened that, in consequence of the Israelites' idolatry, He himself no longer, but an angel, would be their guide, there is an unequivocal distinction between the angels referred to in the two cases. The one was a token of favour, and is so regarded in Isa. lxiii. 9, the other was deprecated by Moses as a judgment. Further, that the Angel, in the one case at least, was not a creature, is proved by the terms: "He will not pardon your sin," and God's "name is in him," plainly showing him to be possessed of Divine prerogatives, and to be, moreover, God's representative or revealer, by his bearing the Divine name. Yet the fact, as here declared, that he was sent by God, intimated that, though he was God, he, in some sense or other, was distinct from him,—a point, however, the full explanation of which was reserved to subsequent times.

The ascription of Divine titles and prerogatives to the Angel of God, and the assumption of the same by him, as shown above, are facts which cannot be disputed; and yet many modern expositors and critics would evade the conclusions that they indicate a distinction in the Divine personality,

and that their subject is really God, by the hypothesis that it was not personally but only as the medium of the Divine revelation, that the Angel of God was so regarded. Kurtz, who after Hengstenberg,¹ ably defended the preceding view, but who has more recently abandoned² it for that of Hofmann³ and Delitzsch,⁴ who regard the Angel of God as only an inferior or created agent, specially selected to be the Divine representative, still admits that the former view is more consonant with the teaching of the Pentateuch and the other historical books, and that the chief objection to it lies in its not being in harmony with the later books of the Old and the New Testaments. But instead of putting a forced interpretation on exceedingly plain statements in the earlier Scriptures, in order to bring them into harmony with certain intimations in the later books, it might be worthy the consideration of those critics whether the difference of doctrine may not be owing to the fact that the various statements respect entirely different subjects. That such is the case will be manifest to any one who carefully compares the general intimations of the Pentateuch respecting the promised Redeemer, particularly with regard to his person, with its intimations regarding other created intelligences besides man, whether good or bad angels. With regard to the first of these points, the intimations of the Pentateuch are numerous, and, considering the stage which the general scheme of revelation had then reached, wonderfully explicit. Not so, however, with the doctrine of angels, which, only at a much later period, comes prominently into view.

There is, indeed, some reference in the Pentateuch to the doctrine of angels, as in the account of Abraham's three angelic visitants, one of whom is spoken of and was recognised as Jehovah himself, while the other two proceeded on their journey to Sodom, where they announce themselves as sent by Jehovah to destroy the place (Gen. xix. 13.) So, also, in Jacob's visions of the "angels of God," and as God's "host" (Gen. xxviii. 12; xxxii. 1, 2); and further, in Moses' notice

¹ *Christologie des alten Testaments*, i. 124-143. 2te Ausg. Berlin 1854.

² Kurtz, *Geschichte des alten Bundes*, i. 144-159. 2te Ausg. Berlin 1853.

³ *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. 127-132. Nördling. 1841. *Der Schriftbeweis*, i. 154-159. Nordling 1852.

⁴ *Die Genesis Ausgelegt*, pp. 330-337. 2te Ausg. Leip. 1853.

of "ten thousand of saints," who accompanied Jehovah at the promulgation of the law (Deut. xxxiii. 2; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 17 [18]; Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2). Nevertheless, upon this subject there is a considerable reserve. The reason for this may be in order not to introduce any element which might disturb men's views regarding the character of him who was specially appointed to the office of Mediator, and who, at the close of the Old Testament Canon, is expressly styled the "Angel of the Covenant," and identified with Jehovah (Mal. iii. 1). When this idea, however, was thoroughly defined by various prophetic announcements, the veil drawn over the doctrine of angels was removed, as may be seen from the book of Daniel; and, as at Christ's advent, and subsequent thereto, there was no longer any danger of confounding angelic appearances with the Angel of Jehovah himself, it was no longer necessary to mark the distinction so carefully observed in the record of the earlier ages.

3. *Attributes and Perfections of God.*—The whole Pentateuch is a manifestation of the Divine character, as a record of God's acts, of his dealings with, and purposes concerning man—purposes which were seen partially accomplished within the period embraced in the Old Testament Scriptures, and even in the Pentateuch itself, but the full realisation of which awaited a distant future, viewed by the patriarchs as "the latter days," which should introduce a new economy. If creation bore testimony to its Author, and showed that he possessed in the highest perfection such attributes as power, wisdom, and even goodness, or a delight in the happiness of the creatures, by his making adequate provision for that object, according to their several capacities, and, by his special interest in all that concerned the happiness of man, of whose social condition God declared: "It is not good for man to be alone. I will make a help meet for him," the record of God's dealings with the first human transgressors of his law exhibits perfections in the Divine character which no acts of creation, no bestowal of rewards, and no exercise of punitive righteousness could have revealed. This was more especially the case, inasmuch as it was made apparent, in the very first act of mercy, as it has ever been in all the subsequent exercises of grace, that such proceedings, so far from rendering violence to law or

justice, were in perfect harmony with all the other perfections of God. His hatred of sin, and unalterable determination to punish it, are, however, the first and most prominent features in all these transactions.

The moral attributes form the basis of the Scriptural revelations of God; and of these His holiness occupies the first place. This was the fundamental element in the theocracy and the religious life of the Old Testament (Lev. xix. 2,) and that which distinguished it equally with, if not even more than, the doctrine of the Divine Unity from all other systems (Ex. xv. 11.) The great end, in fact, of the law was to produce in the covenant people a copy of God's holiness.¹ The opposition of God to every form of evil and impurity had been marked in all his dealings with man from the fall. It was particularly apparent in the cataclysm which swept, with the exception of a chosen family, a corrupt race from the earth, and again in the destruction of the cities of the Plain (2 Pet. ii. 5, 6; Jude 7.) At length this principle was expressed in words, and embodied in the symbolical rites of the Levitical dispensation. How effectually it was declared by the promulgation of the law from Sinai is shown by the consciousness of guilt as contrasted with holiness then awakened in the people, and which made them for the first time anxiously ask for a mediator between themselves and God (Ex. xx. 19.)

With God's holiness is closely connected his righteousness. "He is the Rock: his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth, and without iniquity; just and right is he." (Deut. xxxii. 4). מִשְׁפָּט, *judgment*, is the revelation or expression of יְדִיטָה, *righteousness*.² The revelation of God throughout the early history was chiefly concerned with his righteousness. He was recognised by Abraham as the

¹ Hävernicks, Vorlesungen, p. 54.—Hardwick: "The monarchy of God is ever based on righteousness; and after the selection of the Hebrew family to constitute the visible Kingdom of Jehovah, and to act as conservators of the true religion in the midst of Gentilism, it is continually proclaimed that they

are Israelites indeed who labour to be God-like; that such alone are properly the subjects of the Lord of Hosts, and are entitled to approach the seat of His peculiar presence."—Christ and other Masters, Pt. i. pp. 88, 89. Camb. 1855.

² Hävernicks, Vorlesungen, p. 57.

“Judge of all the earth;” and it was assumed by the patriarch as a settled principle, that his procedure would be right, or in accordance with justice or equity, מִשְׁפָּט (Gen. xviii. 25). God’s righteousness was a firm foundation for his people’s hopes, and an encouragement to them in their prayers, as was proved in Abraham’s remarkable intercession for Sodom. It was so, because concerned with the maintenance of that moral order which God himself had approved of and established. The highest expression of holiness is the law, and therefore the upholding of the law in its integrity is especially righteousness. By this was determined the relation of the Theocracy to the nation, and also to the individual Israelite.

An incident, apparently exceptional, and particularly so when taken in connexion with the principle subsequently announced, that the shedder of man’s blood should be put to death (Gen. ix. 6), was the pledge given by God to the fratricide Cain that his life should be spared. There was, however, in the peculiarity of the case, sufficient ground for this; while the punishment actually inflicted was such as made him feel that it was greater than he could bear. But to show that this was quite a peculiar case, and to remove all ground for expectations of similar impunity for the future, on which, judging from the sentiments expressed by Lamech (Gen. iv. 23), some reckless men might be disposed to rely, God, after the flood, expressly declared what punishment should be awarded in cases of murder. In some other instances of seeming impunity, the punishment due to the particular crime, though delayed, was eventually, in some form or other, inflicted. Thus the murder of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi (Gen. xxxiv.) had been an old affair, and apparently forgotten, when Jacob, on his death-bed, passed sentence on their crime (xlix. 5-7). Outward and temporal retributions formed, indeed, a more prominent feature of the earlier history, and the first period of the Theocracy, than in later times, and particularly under the present Dispensation, not for the reasons assigned by such writers as Spencer and Warburton, but in order to lay a proper foundation for right conceptions of the Divine character, and in a manner suitable to the state of the times.

But while holiness and righteousness are thus the fundamental features in the Divine character, and were necessarily

first manifested in dealing with fallen man, by the curse pronounced upon the Tempter as the cause of his apostasy, before any disclosures could be made of Divine grace:—for mercy, apart from, or in violation of, righteousness, is properly no mercy, inasmuch as it cannot benefit the sinner or correct the disorder introduced into the moral government; yet mercy, according to the Scripture revelation, may be, and actually was made the most illustrious manifestation of righteousness. The harmony of these attributes was fully recognised by believers under the Old Testament. This was a truth they deduced, not only from the record of primeval times, but also from their law and religious institutions. “Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall spring out of the earth, and righteousness shall look down from heaven.” (Ps. lxxxv. 10, 11). There was abundant ground for this conclusion in the revelation which God made of his name (אֱלֹהִים), or the combination of the Divine attributes, in answer to the request of Moses for a sight of the Divine “glory” (כְּבוֹד), or the totality of the Divine perfections: “And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty.” (Ex. xxxiii. 18; xxxiv. 6, 7). The terms הַסֵּדֶר וְהַאֱמֶת, “goodness and truth,” as here conjoined, frequently occur in the Old Testament, indicating God’s faithfulness to the promises which proceeded from his love. As the spiritual life, under the Old Testament, was chiefly built on hope of the realization of the Divine promises, this intimation of the Divine truthfulness and unchangeableness was therefore of the more importance. The concluding expression, נִקְיָה לֹא יִנְקֶה, “holding pure will not hold pure,” intimates that God will not treat as innocent those who are guilty, but, on the contrary, will infallibly punish them according to their demerit¹ (comp. Ex. xx. 7; Nah. i. 3); a declaration apparently at variance with the previous intimation of the pardon of every

¹ Henderson, *Minor Prophets*, p. 274. Lud. Capellus: “Omnino non absolvet nocentem, itaque malis et im-probis summe timendus.” *Nota Criticæ*, p. 97. Amst. 1689.

form of iniquity, but which in reality only shows that such pardon does not flow from any extenuating circumstances in the case, or any leniency on the part of the Judge. On the contrary, there is here an express intimation, that in the dispensing of mercy the claims of justice are fully respected.

In nothing was God's character more marked than by the covenants into which He entered with his people. His covenant with Noah had been preceded by much long-suffering towards a guilty race, which must be destroyed because proved to be incorrigible. Noah being alone faithful in his generation, provision was made for his escape from the coming catastrophe, because the Righteous Judge will not act indiscriminately, and his safety was secured by a method which, at the same time, showed that he placed implicit reliance on God's word. After his deliverance, Noah offered sacrifices to God, whereupon "the Lord smelled a sweet savour: and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake," and he made a covenant to that effect (Gen. viii. 21; ix.). The covenant with Noah gave assurance of the continued preservation of the human race, and in particular of their exemption from a destruction similar to that which the patriarch himself had escaped. The subsequent covenants, the Abrahamic (Gen. xv. 18), and that with the Israelites at Sinai, were of a more specific character and spiritual aspect; all of them, however, containing the most gracious overtures from God to man. Even in the Sinaitic covenant, and the promulgation of the law, which awakened feelings of fear in the guilty when brought to contemplate God's righteousness as declared in the law, there were kindly intimations in God's declaration, that he showed mercy unto thousands of them that loved him and kept his commandments (Ex. xx. 6).

Some notice has been already taken of the relation into which God entered with individuals, by styling himself *their* God. This was another important element in the revelation of his character, and closely connected with the idea represented in those covenants. The recognition of that relation could not be inoperative on the faith and expectations of the persons so favoured, or even upon others with whom they might be connected. The confidence which it was fitted to inspire, and which it actually did awaken in the case of Abraham, Moses,

and others, it would be difficult to over-estimate. The confidence was indeed, so to speak, mutual. God visits Abraham, and allows himself to be entertained by the patriarch. He reveals to him, not merely his purposes of mercy, regarding himself and his posterity, but also his purposes of judgment on the guilty Pentapolis: "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" (Gen. xviii. 17). Of the Divine converse with Moses, again, it is said: "The Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend" (Ex. xxxiii. 11). Compared with the access which, under the Gospel dispensation, the faithful now have to God (Eph. ii. 18), that just described was certainly limited; yet imperfect, and rudimentary as was the knowledge of the Divine character derivable from the Pentateuch and its dispensations, it must, nevertheless, have been a most blessed and benign revelation, when it could produce the results exhibited in the lives of believers from the earliest ages, as well as in the more special instances of a later period represented by Abraham, and subsequently by Moses, the founder of the Israelitish economy. These, no doubt, were exceptional cases, nevertheless they show the power of the dispensation under which they lived.

Evidence, however, of the limited character of the revelation of God in the Pentateuch is found in the manner in which his paternal relation to his people is described. In Deut. xxxii. 6, Moses addresses the Israelites: "Is he not thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee and established thee?" And God himself, in the message which He directed Moses to address to Pharaoh, admits the filial relation of his people: "Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born: and I say unto thee, let my son go that he may serve me," (Ex. iv. 22, 23). And again, Moses himself refers to this relation: "Ye are the children of the Lord your God;" which is further explained in the words: "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth." (Deut. xiv. 1, 2). It must be evident, from this description, how far the idea fell short of the *adoption* of the New Testament. The sonship of the Old economy occupied too much of a national, and therefore exter-

nal relation, adequately to represent the state of the partaker of the Spirit of adoption, who can cry "Abba, Father," and where "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. viii. 15, 16). This, however, could not be exhibited on the platform on which the Old Testament stood: it must be reserved for the manifestation of Him who was, in the proper sense, the Son of God, and who could disclose to his people the relation in which they stood to God, in consequence of their union with himself:—"My Father and your Father; my God and your God" (John xx. 17),—a declaration in which were summed up and completed all the Old Testament promises. Still it is important to observe, that the principle of this, as of the other New Testament doctrines, is found in the earliest portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, ready for development in due time.

The lower or initiatory stage of the knowledge of God in the Pentateuch was further indicated by the statement which God made to Moses: "Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live . . . thou shalt see my back parts, (אָחֲרַי), but my face shall not be seen" (Ex. xxxiii. 20-23). If any subject of the Old Economy ever stood in intimate relation to God it was Moses; yet even his views of the Divine nature and character are here expressly restricted. This action, however, evidently had reference, not so much to Moses personally as to the system which he represented, the dim shadowy character of which was thus symbolically set forth, and its inferiority to that succeeding dispensation, under which Divine things are still seen "through a glass darkly," and which is itself to be followed by a state in which the vision shall be "face to face" (1 Cor. xiii. 12); or, as it is elsewhere described, in strong contrast to the view vouchsafed to Moses, "They shall see his face" (Rev. xxii. 4).

While, however, there were successive stages in man's apprehensions of God, the development was not due, in a Gnostic sense, to mere speculation or reflection; but was dependent, in the first place, on the Divine will revealing itself in various ways, whether in words, symbolic ordinances, or providential events; and not only so, but determining the measure of that revelation in accordance with all the other arrangements of this great plan; and again, as regards the

attainments of individuals in this knowledge, on the spiritual capacity which they might severally possess. The latter part of this observation, though seemingly common-place, has an important bearing on the views which may be formed regarding the measure of light vouchsafed, and in any particular instance apprehended, under the earlier dispensation, and prior to the existence of revelation in a documentary form, inasmuch as, in those circumstances, there was some danger of particular doctrines varying with the character and capacities of the individuals who immediately received the communications, and from whose reports the character of these communications could be inferred. The placing of these various expressions of the Divine mind on record by competent authority, purged them, however, of any extraneous elements with which they might be mixed up in the first instance, through the incapacity of the individuals to whom they were originally addressed, for fully understanding their purport, especially when there was not, as afterwards, any standard of appeal, (Isa viii. 20). As regards the interpretation, therefore, the question does not turn simply on the views entertained of these communications by those to whom they were primarily made, although occasionally this will constitute an important element in the inquiry; but how they are to be understood, when viewed as parts of a system which, while progressive, must also be, if of Divine origin, consistent and symmetrical. That it is distinguished for consistency, has been to some extent evinced in the preceding observations with respect to the person and character of God; and the subsequent examination of other particulars will, it is hoped, show this more fully, and thus furnish one of the most powerful arguments that the Bible, from its commencement to its close, is the production of Him who knows the end from the beginning. On the same principle that the student of nature traces a connexion between the present denizens of the earth and creations formally exceedingly different, and long since extinct, and concludes not only that they are the productions of the same Author, but also that they form successive parts of one creative plan, may the Biblical reader also trace, and with even greater certainty, the lineaments of Christianity in the revelations and institutions of the Pentateuch.

One circumstance which, it may be remarked, has contributed much to obscure the lustre of the earlier revelation, is none other than the advanced stage into which it has now passed. The old dispensation, St. Paul states, had a glory; but, he adds, it has no longer a glory, by reason of the glory that excelleth, (2 Cor. iii. 7-11). The greater Gospel light has obscured that emitted by the law—though, by a reflex process, it has disclosed its meaning and mysteries to a degree previously unattainable. But though, in one sense, the law is superseded and taken out of the way, and is, as a system, very much neglected and forgotten, and can no longer call forth the same interest in its study, and desire to penetrate its depths, as when faith and expectations were cherished and directed by it alone, and when the prayer of believers so circumstanced was, “Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.” (Ps. exix. 18.) still, as an integral part of Divine truth, it will never be antiquated, or lose its value. To remove, however, any appearance of contradiction between the earlier and later revelations respecting the Divine character, notice must be taken of objections to certain acts and representations of God contained in the Pentateuch.

SECT. II. OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN REPRESENTATIONS OF THE DIVINE CHARACTER EXAMINED.

Chandler, Samuel, *A Vindication of the History of the Old Testament*. Lond. 1741.—Hengstenberg, *The Theology of the Pentateuch in relation to its genuineness: Authentic*, E. T., ii. 365-459.—Edwards, *Remarks on the Divine Authority and Authenticity of the Pentateuch: Biblioth. Sacra*, ii. 668-682.

In connexion with what is admitted to be profound conceptions of God's person and character, there are, it is alleged, statements in the Pentateuch derogatory to the Divine Being. Such, in general, are those which ascribe human parts and passions to the Spiritual and Unchangeable—an objection to which some reference has been already made. With regard to this it is to be remarked, that such representations, if liable to misconception, found a corrective in other declarations con-

cerning the spirituality of God, and his absolute freedom from all human mutations. Thus the prohibition to form a material image of God (Ex. xx. 4) was declared to be in accordance with the principle that He is invisible, incorporeal, spiritual, (Deut. iv. 15); and as to human passions, they are declared to be altogether foreign to him: "God is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent," (Num. xxiii. 19).

But further, the representations in question were even necessary for man's attaining true conceptions of God, and accordingly are an evidence of the wise adaptation of the revealed scheme to his capacities. Man can at best form but feeble apprehensions of the absolutely spiritual. Of an angel even, or a disembodied soul, of its dispositions or affections, what ideas can be really formed? and if only dim and shadowy conceptions can be entertained of creatures only relatively removed from man, what must be the case with regard to the Infinite, more especially in his first manifestations to his creatures? It is only as man that God can fully reveal himself to man. To lay a foundation for such a knowledge of God as would assimilate man to the Divine nature, (2 Cor. iii. 18; 2 Pet. i. 4), God created him in his own image; while the Theophanies in human form were, in fact, the preludes of the incarnation of the Son of God, who is "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person," (Heb. i. 3). Again, such expressions as the repentance of God, (Gen. vi. 6, 7,) his jealousy, (Deut. v. 24,) his wrath and vengeance, (Deut. xxxii. 35, 41, 43,) which have their exact parallel even in the New Testament, serve to show that the God of the Bible is not a cold abstraction or a philosophical idea, but a Being deeply interested in humanity; and who in this and other respects, graciously adapting his revelation to man's wants, has made provision to satisfy them.¹ There are, however, several particulars touching the Divine procedure in the Pentateuch, on which it will be necessary to enter more at large, as they are made special grounds of objections.

¹ See on this subject, Denham, *The Jour. of Sac. Lit.*, Jan. 1848, vol. i., *Philosophy of Anthropomorphism*, pp. 9-21.

§ 1. *God's Command to Sacrifice Isaac.*

In Abraham's history there are one or two incidents which give rise to objections by rationalists and others against the Divine character. One is God's sanctioning the request of Sarah for the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, (Gen. xxi. 10-12). But here the force of the objection is greatly owing to not duly considering the age of Ishmael, and the other circumstances of the case. He was not a "child," as the English version describes him, for he had reached the age of sixteen or seventeen years; and his conduct to his younger brother, which led Sarah to demand his removal with his mother, who, she may have supposed, countenanced him in it, must have been some wanton teasing calculated to irritate or injure, and not, as is sometimes reckoned, mere childish sport, as by Origen and Augustine, apparently from not observing that the gloss of the LXX. and the Vulgate, "playing with her son Isaac," forms no part of the original. It is in Gal. iv. 24, characterised as *persecution*. It is easy to suppose that the birth of Isaac made such a change in the prospects of Hagar and her son, as would occasion jealousy and bitterness to a degree which made separation unavoidable; while, again, the separation itself, and extrusion from the household, was not such a hardship as is usually supposed, when judged according to artificial habits and an inhospitable climate. But more particularly, and the only point to be noticed is, that when God, to whom Abraham, grieved at Sarah's request, committed the matter, required him to acquiesce in the proposal, it was not because He approved of the demand simply in itself, or of the temper from which it sprung, but because it accorded with His own purposes of limiting the covenant blessings to the child of promise, (Gen. xxi. 12,) and also because necessary on Abraham's own account. The principles embodied in this incident may be seen from Gal. iv. 20-30.

But more difficult of explanation is the Divine command given to Abraham to offer up Isaac as a burnt-offering, (Gen. xxii.) which, is regarded by Morgan and other deistical writers as

absolutely unhinging and dissolving the whole law of nature.¹ The difficulty, it must be admitted, is not greatly diminished by the fact evolved in the sequel, that God did not intend that the deed should be consummated, and that his purpose was only to test the patriarch's faith; for this very circumstance gives rise to other objections.

Hengstenberg² would explain the matter by supposing that the command was not to be understood literally, and that it was an error on Abraham's part so to regard it—an assumption than which nothing can be more opposed to the tenor of the narrative. Others, again, resort to the doctrine of the Divine sovereignty for an explanation.³ But seeing that it is the great object of revelation to make known God's moral character by an appeal to man's own conscience, it is evident that, in a case of this kind, there is something more than a display of sovereignty. God has undoubtedly a claim on the lives of all his creatures. He bestows life, continues it, or takes it away at the time or in the way which approves itself to his Omniscience; and he has like claims to the highest acts of self-sacrifice, involving the abnegation of the dearest affections, paternal or filial; but this matter assumes an entirely different aspect as a command addressed to a father to slay his son, and by One whose law is, in the most express terms: "Thou shalt not kill."

In considering, however, this transaction, two points are to be carefully distinguished—the propriety of giving the command, and that of obeying it. Of the first of these, Abraham or any other creature was incompetent to judge, because unable to fathom the counsels of the Infinite. Certainly it is an unwarrantable assumption that this is a command which it was impossible for God to give, or for man to have any proof that it was given.⁴ With respect to this, it is enough to know that the law which declares, "Thou shalt not kill," is not of that absolute character which distinguishes some others in the moral code; for both the law and human instincts enjoin, and justify in certain circumstances, the taking

¹ See Leland, *Deistical Writers*, i. Heidelb. 1844. 151, 156. Lond. 1798.

² Horne, *Introduction*, i. 563.

³ *Authentic*, ii. 145. E. T., ii. 114. ⁴ See Leland, *Deistical Writers*, i. 157. So also Lange, *Leben Jesu*, i. 120.

away of another's life. Of course the present is not such a case; but this consideration shows that there is a law paramount to that which commands, "Thou shalt not kill," and which was manifested in the great fact of the Gospel—God's giving up his Son to die in the room of sinners. Though the principles of this Divine arrangement lie beyond the comprehension of man, this much may with certainty be affirmed, that what was not incompatible with, or unworthy of the Divine character, for God himself to do, He could, without any prejudice to his perfections, require of another.

This consideration alone should go far to repel the objections advanced on this subject, more especially if it can be shown that the design of the transaction had an important bearing on the scheme of revelation. One object, at least, which God proposed with respect to Abraham himself, is clearly announced at the outset of the narrative: "God tempted Abraham;" it was a trial of his faith, and a means for its development. But it was certainly intended to answer more than this; for the patriarch's faith and unreserved obedience might have been evinced in a way less liable to be perverted at a time when human sacrifices were practised in his very neighbourhood. Indeed, it was to correct the perverted idea from which such horrid rites arose, as will be more fully shown when treating of the intimations respecting the plan of redemption, that this transaction was intended, by directing attention to the true principle of substitution. Abraham's conviction, as expressed on this occasion, "God will provide a lamb for a burnt-offering," however he himself may have understood it, was in due time to be realised; but in the meantime, it was indispensable that faith should recognise the principle, that this was entirely God's own provision, and not any human device. And as regards Isaac himself, this act was a symbolic dedication of him as the first-born to the Lord, and which in another form was to be afterwards required in respect to all the Israelitish first-born.¹ God having entered into a covenant with Abraham which affected his posterity no less than himself, it was necessary that, in this disposal of Isaac, there should be a basis for the idea so

¹ Hävernick, Einleitung, I., ii. 339. E. T., p. 174. Kurtz, Geschichte d. alten Bundes, i. 209.

prominent in the subsequent legislation (Ex. xiii. 2 ; xxii. 28). The effect of the transaction on Abraham's mind appears from ver. 14 : " And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh ; as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen," or rather, " he shall be seen ;" the language pointing back to the statement in ver. 8 : " God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt-offering," and prophetically forward to the manifestation of Him who, as the Lamb of God (John i. 29), should put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. It fully accords with this reference, that after the offering substituted for Isaac was presented, the Divine promises regarding the Seed of blessing were renewed.

As regards, again, the propriety on the part of Abraham of yielding obedience to such a command, a few remarks will suffice. The first question for his consideration would be, Did the command really come from God ? That Abraham was satisfied on this point there can be no doubt. He was no stranger to God ; nor was God a stranger to him. At an earlier period, and when his intercourse with this Divine Friend began, Abraham knew that it was God who called him when he received the summons to leave his country and his father's house for a land to be afterwards pointed out to him, and since that call he had much intercourse with the covenant God. He knew God's character so well, that on another solemn occasion he could with confidence ask, " Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right ?" and so, too, in the present trying emergency, he could feel assured that, however perplexing the command might appear, it contained nothing contrary to the express rule of duty laid down for the guidance of the moral creation. Wherever a command is absolutely immoral, no external evidence, it may be admitted, can outweigh the internal presumption against its proceeding from a Divine source. But it cannot be shown that such was the character of the charge given to Abraham ; while, on the other hand, there were various considerations which, it may be supposed, would place the matter before him in a more favourable light than may at once appear to those who have not given much attention to, or are otherwise unfamiliar with, the circumstances. First. Abraham was conversant with the practice of sacrifice : he knew that it had the approval of God, and that under a new

form, or with the addition of some peculiarities, it had on an important occasion been enjoined on himself, for the purpose of assuring him of the fulfilment of the promises (Gen. xv. 8). Further, Isaac, whom he was commanded to devote in this extraordinary manner to Jehovah, was not, with respect either to his birth or destinies, an ordinary object of Divine Providence. His birth was through a remarkable interposition of power and grace, while there was also an assurance that great blessings awaited him, and that he was called to fulfil a high destiny. Now, in these very circumstances the patriarch might possibly discern some grounds for this trial; nor could he be certain that the act here required of him might be not only the condition on which depended the realization of these blessings, but also the very medium through which they should be imparted. (See Heb. xi. 17-19). It is usual to regard the promises of the special destiny of Isaac as fitted only to add to the father's difficulties, because standing in direct opposition to the command with which he was now charged; and such would, undoubtedly, have been their effect on a faith less firm than that of Abraham; but, in his case, these may, on the contrary, have served rather as encouragements to obedience.

§ 2. *The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart.*

The determined and long continued refusal of Pharaoh to comply with the demands of Moses for the release of the Israelites, is repeatedly ascribed to a Divine causality, hardening his heart. This circumstance is, as might be supposed, a frequent ground of complaint against the Pentateuch, as intimating that "the God of Moses hardens the hearts of wicked men, that he may take more flagrant vengeance on them."¹ This, indeed, is a subject which occasions no little difficulty, even to many who do not, of course, regard it in the false and

¹ Geddes, Translation of the Bible, Pref., vol. i. p. 12. Lond. 1792. So also Mackay: "The notion of blinding or hardening the hearts of men, in order to furnish a conspicuous example of God's glory by punishing them, is common throughout the Old Test., and con-

tinues even in the New. Pharaoh's heart is hardened, for the purpose of displaying the signs and wonders of an unknown God, and at the end of each plague the same process is repeated, in order to justify the infliction of a new one."—*Progress of the Intellect*, ii. 431.

odious light in which it is thus generally represented by rationalists, and other enemies of revelation.

With respect, however, to this doctrine being made a ground of objection to the Pentateuch, it should be remarked, that the same would apply equally to the New Testament. This very case of Pharaoh is referred to in Rom. ix. 17; and it is worthy of note, that St. Paul purposely deviates from the rendering of וַיִּצַדְקֵנִי by $\delta\iota\epsilon\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\varsigma$ (Ex. ix. 16), which is that of the LXX., and uses instead $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\zeta\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$, "I have raised thee up," which strictly corresponds with the original; whereas the other translation, "Thou wast preserved to this day," in reference apparently to Pharaoh's being preserved through the plagues, was a manifest attempt to soften down the term.¹ No such considerations weighed with the sacred writers; and, by the apostolic teaching, this special case is even generalized into a principle of the Divine government: "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. ix. 18). The doctrine was evidently not viewed by the sacred writers as at all derogatory to the Divine character, or incompatible with the moral agency and consequent responsibility of the sinner, or with the distinct testimonies of Scripture on this point, nowhere more explicit than in the Pentateuch itself.

It has been often otherwise, however, with expositors of Scripture. Matters, about which the sacred writers felt no difficulty, have been a source of much concern to many of their interpreters, both ancient and modern, who have shown great anxiety to smooth down difficulties such as the present. Thus, one class of interpreters would explain God's hardening of Pharaoh as merely permissive;² so that it was in no proper sense God's act, but only his own. This view is not only inadequate, but in fact aggravates the difficulty, by making the Divine will dependent on the human; whereas the Mosaic narrative, as viewed by St. Paul, represents most expressly the will of God as absolute in the matter. "The idea of permission," says Hengstenberg, "perverts the relation of God to his creatures, and consequently destroys the idea of God."³

¹ See Alford, Greek Testament, ii. History connected, B. ix. 3, vol. i. p. 384. Lond. 1855. Olshausen, Com. 399. Lond. 1858. Horne, Introduction to Romans, E. T., p. 333. Edin. 1849. tation, i. 564, 565, and ii. 568.

² Shuckford, Sacred and Profane ³ Authentice, E. T. ii. 382.

It is undoubtedly true, that in several instances, as in chap. viii. 11, 27 ; ix. 34, the act is ascribed to Pharaoh himself ; and in others, as ch. vii. 13, 22 ; viii. 15 ; ix. 35, the agent is not expressed, but in the great majority of passages it is expressly ascribed to God. And it is to be further noted with Hengstenberg, that while, as just remarked, the hardening is sometimes ascribed to Pharaoh himself, it is attributed to God in the announcement (iv. 21), and in the summing up, previous to the final issue of the controversy (xiv. 4) ; and that the hardening at the beginning of the plagues is attributed, in a preponderating degree, to Pharaoh, and towards the end to God, so that the higher the plagues rise, the more does Pharaoh's obduracy assume a supernatural aspect. There was thus a strongly marked development in the case, attention to which, if it do not fully explain—which is not at all to be expected in a matter of this kind, where the Infinite and finite stand in a most mysterious relation—yet may tend to obviate some of the difficulties.

Every wicked man, like Pharaoh, is under the dominion of sin : he is so voluntarily ; but while under its power, the forms and the occasions of sin's showing itself in action are not under the sinner's control, but are as the sinner himself, at God's disposal, and in subserviency to the ends of his moral government. The fact of a moral agent being a sinner, or the enemy of God, and so not willing to render the service due, cannot exempt him from it ; and if he will not serve God in one capacity, he must be made to serve Him in another. Now, the hardening of a sinner, either total or partial, is not the beginning of his sin, or the inducement of an evil state or disposition. God did not sinfully dispose any of his creatures, but they being so, He, nevertheless, employs them to carry out his purposes ; while this hardening itself may be viewed as a punitive retribution,—a manifestation of righteous judgment. In the present instance such a manifestation was specially needed. A counteraction was required, both for the despondency of the Israelites, and the arrogance of their oppressor. The opposition of Pharaoh, not less than his destruction, tended to glorify God ; and his very obduracy called into action the Divine power, justice and grace (Ex. vii. 4, 5 ; ix. 15, 16). This same transaction, as Hengstenberg observes,

gives an enlarged view of the history of the world. It shows God everywhere, and in circumstances where, to natural reason, He is least discernible, in the fury of a God-forgetting tyrant, in a case of decided moral hardening.¹

§ 3. *Visiting the Sins of the Fathers upon the Children.*

In the second precept of the law, God declares: "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." (Ex. xx. 5). This statement is often represented as not only wanting in equity, but opposed to an express provision of the Israelitish law: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children; neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin" (Deut. xxiv. 10; comp. 2 Kings xiv. 6; 2 Chron. xxv. 4), and especially to the Divine procedure, as declared in Ezek. xviii. The same principle, however, is repeated in a connexion which shows it to be a feature of the Divine character in its most gracious aspect (Ex. xxxiv. 7); and even when that character was urged by Moses in a plea for pardon, this feature is introduced in a way which shows that it was not deemed to be contrary to equity, or even hostile to grace (Num. xiv. 18).

Various explanations have been offered; such as that this statement applies only to temporal punishments;² but as temporal and eternal are only relative terms, what would be wrong with regard to the one would be so also with regard to the other. Nor is it sufficient to view it as intimating merely that, under the present constitution of things, including civil government, the good or bad behaviour of parents necessarily affects the position of their posterity, for that does not involve anything of a punitive character, such as is intimated in the present case, where the idea is that of punishment—*בְּקֶרֶב עֵינָם*. Nor does it answer the requirements, to assume with Hengstenberg, that the declaration holds true only when supplemented, as by Onkelos, "the children follow the

¹ Authentie, E. T. ii. 358.

1846. Horne, Introduction, i. 565, 566.

² Warburton, Divine Legation of Moses, B. v., § 5., vol. iii., p. 5. Lond.,

Graves, Lectures, ii. 172-185.

iniquities of the fathers;” for if thus every one is treated as an isolated individual, according to his own merits or demerits, what need is there of the mention of the relation of fathers and children?¹

The principle is far deeper than is allowed by any such explanation. It lies at the foundation of God’s moral government over man, where fathers and children are regarded as a special unity—children being represented in their parents, and parents again continued in their children. Though to finite minds inexplicable, such has been the method of the Divine procedure from the time of Adam in whom all died. It is the principle, too, on which is to be explained the apparent contradiction between the Divine grant of the land to Abraham and the fact that he never received personal possession of it (Gen. xiii. 15, 17; comp. Acts vii. 5). And more particularly, it is represented in Scripture as consistent with Divine justice to punish children for the sins of their parents, although they have not participated in them; as in the case of Canaan, the son of Ham (Gen. ix. 25); the death of the first-born of the Egyptians, and of the children of Achan, who perished with him (Josh. vii. 24). With this procedure accords the testimony of Jeremiah: “Thou showest loving-kindness unto thousands, and recompensest the iniquity of the fathers into the bosoms of their children after them” (Jer. xxxii. 18). To this is subjoined: “Thine eyes are open upon all the ways of the sons of men, to give every one according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings,” intimating that God visits the iniquity of the fathers especially on the children who pursue similar courses. (See Matt. xxiii. 29, &c.)

§ 4. *The Mutability of God in the Case of Balaam.*

God’s refusal to permit Balaam to accompany the messengers of Balak (Num. xxii. 12), while subsequently allowing him to go (ver. 20), though even then manifesting displeasure at his journey (ver. 22) has been made the ground of a charge of mutability in the Divine purposes. It is important, however, to remark at the outset that the matter presented no such

¹ Baumgarten, *Theologischer Commentar*, ii. 7.

aspect to Balaam himself, the party most directly concerned: for he is found soon after uttering one of the strongest testimonies in Scripture to the unchangeableness of the Divine mind. "God is not a man that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent: hath he said it, and shall he not do it? Or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" (Num. xxiii. 10). The entire difficulty, if there be such, arises simply from overlooking the distinction between an absolute refusal or permission, and the same accompanied with restrictions. Balaam's journey cannot be viewed apart from the purpose it was designed to serve. This purpose is continually referred to in the narrative: in the message of Balak, "Come now, therefore, curse me this people" (xxii. 6), and in God's charge, "Thou shalt not go with them; thou shalt not curse the people" (ver. 12). Upon the execution of that purpose God laid an absolute interdict; and so on his next appearance to Balaam, it is said: "And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up and go with them; but yet the word that I shall say unto thee, that shalt thou do" (ver. 20). Keeping in view the relation of the journey to the object which alone made it desirable to Balaam, nothing was now really allowed to him which had formerly been refused. The reserving clause, in fact, only confirmed the former prohibition.¹

Notwithstanding this express reservation, Balaam proceeded on his way, cherishing evidently some secret hope of somehow relieving himself from its power. On this account, "God's anger was kindled because he went." But when God's views had been sufficiently declared by the incidents in the way; and when this man, who so "loved the wages of unrighteousness" (2 Pet. ii. 15) as to brave all danger, notwithstanding the evident displeasure of the Almighty, had, for his own sake, been fully warned, he was permitted to prosecute his journey, and so far to engage in the purpose which no admonition could induce him to abandon. The Divine restraints were withdrawn, and the prophet was allowed to proceed with the purpose which he was fully assured was contrary to the will of God, and which he therefore must have known could

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, E. T. ii. 386.

only terminate in his own discomfiture, as it eventually proved, being slain by the people whom he had vainly endeavoured to curse. Indeed, it may be remarked with Hengstenberg,¹ that as a punishment to Balaam, he was now not merely permitted to proceed on his journey but commanded to do so (ver. 35). The work which he commenced for the furtherance of his own purposes, he must, after all hope of succeeding in that respect had disappeared, complete solely for God (Num. xxxi. 8).

It is not without significance that a place is given in the sacred record to this and the incident regarding the hardening of Pharaoh, as affording a deep insight into some of the secret things of God and the principles on which his moral government is conducted. Between the case of Balaam, who had some knowledge of and intercourse with Jehovah, and that of Pharaoh, who stood in an entirely antagonistic relation to the God of Israel, there is, indeed, much dissimilarity, and yet there are several features which they possess in common. In both the inclination was in strong opposition to the convictions, showing how exceedingly wayward is the human will when not restrained by the Divine. Without entering, however, into questions of this kind, it may be remarked that the very fact that representations regarding the Divine character and operations so liable to misconception as those referred to, form part of the Bible, is itself a strong confirmation of its Divine origin. Had the work issued from any other than an inspired source, these views would unquestionably be kept in the background, or their apparent harshness would be explained away. But the facts recorded, with respect both to Pharaoh and Balaam, are of the utmost importance, as contributing to right conceptions of the character of God, and of his government in the affairs of men. They show that the God of revelation is far removed from the ideas which men would naturally form of him; but they afford no warrant for the distinction which some would institute between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New. On the contrary, the most careful examination will show, as has been already partially indicated, that the representations with respect to the Divine cha-

¹ History of Balaam and his Prophecies, E. T. p. 373.

rafter in the earlier part of the Bible, are essentially identical with those in the later. Nothing shows this more plainly than the fact that the true worshippers of God under the Old Testament showed no less confidence in Him than the more privileged worshippers under the New, and that the principle by which this feeling was elicited was identical in every dispensation. Throughout the Pentateuch, especially in Deuteronomy, there is an evident purpose, by an exhibition of God's love, to draw out love to him in return. It is this, indeed, which forms the real foundation for its oft-repeated command, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," which is represented as the fulfilment of the law and the sum of all God's requirements (Deut. x, 12; comp. Matt. xxii. 37, 38).

§ 5. *The Israelites' Borrowing the Property of the Egyptians.*

The circumstances under which the Israelites, at the time of the exodus, obtained possession of various articles of Egyptian property, early gave rise to objections. This appears from Philo's apology for this incident in his life of Moses, and also from notices regarding the Gnostics and the Manichæans,¹ who made it one of their grounds of opposition to the Old Testament. Since that time, these objections have been frequently repeated; they formed a chief argument with the English deistical writers of the seventeenth century, from whom they were directly adopted by the German rationalists. The explanations or vindications of the transaction have, on the other hand, been numerous, but, in general, unsatisfactory, because conceding that it was really a matter of borrowing and lending, and then attempting a justification of it under that aspect. This was sometimes done by denying that the act had a Divine sanction,² or by resting it on God's sovereign right to transfer his property from one people to another;³ or regarding it in the light of reprisals⁴ for the wages unjustly withheld by the Egyptians from the Israelites for their ser-

¹ See Epiphanius, Adv. haereses, L. ii. 70. Op. i. 690. Colon. 1682.

² Grotius, De Jure belli et pacis, L. ii. cap. 7, § 2. Bush, Notes on Exodus, i. 131.

³ Pfeiffer, Op. i. 119. Buddens, Hist. Eccles. i. 418.

⁴ Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. L. i. 23. Op. i. 415. Venet. 1757. Irenæus, Contra haereses, L. iv. 3. Op. i. 267. Venet. 1734.

vices. None of these suppositions, however, is admissible. With regard to the first, it is enough to remark that, although in one passage (Ex. iii. 20-22) God's part in the transaction is only promissory, in another He expressly enjoins it (Ex. xi. 1-3). The other views are equally untenable, for they ascribe to the Divine Being a recourse to expedients for enriching his people utterly alien to his character. There is no need, however, of such questionable assumptions to explain this transaction, for the main difficulties are due to the supposition that it was an act of borrowing and lending—a view not at all required by the terms in which it is described, and which originated only in a mistranslation by the LXX., which substituted *lending* for *giving*, adopted by the Vulgate, by Luther, and the English version.

Hengstenberg,¹ after Rosenmüller, Winer, and others, has conclusively shown that לָשׁוּב, and its Hiphil form, לִישׁוּבָה, mean “asking” and “obtaining,” simply as a gift, the terms themselves determining nothing as to the nature of the request, or the compliance therewith, whether conditional or absolute, for a permanent possession, or only for a temporary use; all which must be learned from the context and the nature of the transaction. There is one passage (2 Kings vi. 5), where לָשׁוּב unquestionably means to “borrow”:—one of the sons of the prophets is concerned for an axe which fell into the water, because it *was borrowed* (לָשׁוּב), and consequently the property of another; but that the primary and usual sense of the term is “to ask” or “request,” is evident from Ps. ii. 8; 1 Sam. xii. 13; Deut. xiv. 26, and numerous other passages. The verb לִישׁוּבָה, again, in 1 Sam. i. 28, the only place where it occurs besides Exod. xii. 36, cannot mean “to lend,” as improperly rendered in the Eng. ver., but denotes an absolute, unconditional surrender or dedication of the child Samuel to the Lord, his mother Hannah renouncing all claim to him, on the ground that he had been a special gift to her, the subject of a request preferred to the Lord (הִיהָוָה לִישׁוּבָה).

A consideration of some importance for determining the precise character of the present transaction is, Did the Egyp-

¹ Authentie, E. T. ii. 430, 431; see also Reinke, Beiträge, iii. 240-269. Münt. 1855. Kurtz, Geschichte, ii. 136. 137.

tians, at the time when the Israelites, preparing to take their departure, preferred this request, expect their return, or were they justified by any express or implied promise in expecting it? Should this question be answered in the affirmative, as it is by Bush,¹ Kitto,² and others, it would not necessarily follow that the property given to the Israelites was only a loan; but if it must be concluded, as plainly required by the circumstances of the case, that the Egyptians had no such expectations, any other idea than that of an absolute gift is utterly excluded. It is true Moses' request to Pharaoh at first only embraced an absence of three days (Ex. v. 5); afterwards, however, the affair assumed an entirely new aspect. The Egyptians, or at least the government, even from the first, regarded Moses' request as a mere pretext. "So much relating to the promises made to the patriarchs had been circulated among them, that before Moses was born they had been moved with the apprehension that the people would remove out of the land (Ex. i. 10). After Pharaoh had been severely punished, on account of his total denial of the request, he desired first to keep back the children, and afterwards the cattle, as pledges; and when the Israelites would not consent, he regarded it as a practical admission that they designed something different from what they alleged. But after the last and heaviest judgment, how could a thought be entertained of the return of the Israelites? This was no longer promised by Moses, and the Egyptians desired it so little, that they rather wished to be free for ever from their dangerous guests at any price (xii. 32). That Pharaoh afterwards pursued the Israelites, shows that when he could not keep them back he thought them lost for ever; and the remark, that after their departure 'the heart of Pharaoh and of his servants was turned against the people' (xiv. 5), leads us to conclude that before this change in their disposition, they were disposed to let Israel depart for ever from their borders."³

In all the passages relating to this transaction the willingness of the Egyptians to accede to the request of the Israelites is ascribed to a Divine influence. "God gave the people

¹ Notes on Exodus, vol. i. 148.

³ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, E. T. ii. 428.

² *Cyc. Bib. Lit., Art. Borrowing*, i. 345.

favour in the eyes of the Egyptians." The intimation in Ex. iii. 21: "I will give the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians: and it shall come to pass that, when ye go, ye shall not go empty," which was to be the accomplishment of the prior notice in Gen. xv. 14: "And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance,"—shows that the articles asked by the Israelites were designed to become their own property, and that this was to be effected, not through the impossibility of making restitution, owing to their not returning to Egypt, but by a Divine impulse on the hearts of the Egyptians themselves. This outwardly free act of the Egyptians was the result of an inward constraint, which they could not withstand. Hence it is said: "They spoiled the Egyptians" (Ex. xii. 36). The term לָבַס denotes robbing, spoiling, or taking away with violence, but never the appropriating anything through secrecy or deceit, which would certainly have been the case had the Israelites obtained, or the Egyptians parted with, the articles in question through a misconception. It thus has no connexion with the idea of borrowing; for a loan, accepted with the purpose of not restoring it, is an act, not of force but of fraud. In reference, it may be to this event, it is said: "And they shall spoil those that spoiled them, and rob them that robbed them, saith the Lord God" (Ezek. xxxix. 10; see also Zech. xiv. 14). What now occurred in Egypt was a type of all the future contests of Israel with the world and heathenism, Egypt being in opposition to the kingdom of God, the representative of these hostile powers.

§ 6. *The Injunction to Exterminate the Canaanites.*

The invasion of Canaan by the Israelites, and the war of extermination against the inhabitants, with which they were expressly charged by God himself, and the neglect of which duty would, they were told, expose them to the Divine displeasure, are subjects which have, from an early period, furnished the opponents of revelation with ample materials for objections. To suppose that such proceedings had really a Divine sanction, would, these parties allege, be in direct opposition to the first principles of morality. The inevitable result, it is

said, of a command of this kind would be, to excite, and, so far as any authority could be ascribed to it, to justify the worst passions of the human heart, especially rapine and violence; in short, that it would furnish an excuse, if not a warrant, to every kind of fanaticism.

This subject, like the majority of those already considered, is, no doubt, surrounded with difficulties, which are, it must certainly be remarked, nowise diminished by some of the attempts made to explain them. Thus some writers¹ would vindicate the Israelites' invasion of Canaan on the ground that they had some prior or natural right to the land, owing to an early occupancy of it by the patriarchs. Others² would obviate the objections attaching to the orders for the extermination of the possessors of the land, by restricting them to such of the Canaanites as rejected the terms of peace which the Israelites were directed, in the first instance, to offer (Deut. xx. 10). Such suppositions are entirely destitute of authority, and at the same time afford no adequate explanation of the proceedings as expressly commanded by God.

With regard to the first, were it even admitted that the patriarchs had acquired a natural right to the land, such must, undoubtedly, have lapsed during the centuries passed by their posterity in Egypt. It is certainly not on any foundation of this kind that Scripture puts the matter. Israel's right to the land is there invariably made to depend on a Divine grant (Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 14-17), and the dispossession of the Canaanites is represented as an act of Divine justice, to be executed whenever their iniquities were full (Gen. xv. 16), before which time Israel could not be put into possession of their territories. This alone excludes all questions as to any natural right. With respect to the other supposition, it is enough to remark, that the terms of peace referred to in Deut. xx. 10. respected only foreign enemies, and that the submission of the Canaanites could not be accepted on any terms whatever. It was expressly required that they should be utterly rooted out

¹ Michaelis, Mosaisches Recht, § 31. Buddens, Hist. Eccles. i. 609. Shuckford, Sacred and Prof. Hist. connected. i. 175. Frank. 1775.

² Cunaeus, De Republica Hebraeorum, L. ii. 20, p. 342. Lugd. 1703. B. xii. 3, vol. ii. 179. Graves, Lectures, ii. 8-10.

of the land which they had defiled (Ex. xxiii. 32, 33 ; xxxvi. 12-16 ; Deut. vii. 1-5 ; xx. 15-18).

For the proper elucidation of this subject, notice must be taken of the term נָחַם , which describes the disposal of the Canaanites. This is applied both to persons and things. When used of the former it denotes the forcible dedication to God of such as had obstinately refused to dedicate themselves, or render him due glory.¹ The idea is clearly brought out in Deut. xiii. 16-18, a passage which ordered the destruction of every Israelitish city which should lapse into idolatry ; and also in Num. xxi. 1-3, which describes the destruction of the king of Arad. It was not an act of human wilfulness or ferocity, but a sacred duty enjoined by God on his subjects, which, if they failed to perform, they themselves were devoted to destruction.² (See 1 Kings xx. 42). Accordingly it was announced to the Israelites that if, when they came into possession of the land, they should practise any of the abominations on account of which God's judgment fell upon the earlier inhabitants, they also would be dealt with in like manner. (See Lev. xviii. 24, 28 ; Deut. vii. 28 ; viii. 19, 20 ; xii. 29-31 ; xxviii. 63, 64).

The object of the war of extermination is thus seen, from the idea presented by the CHEREM, to be the vindication of Divine justice in the destruction of the wicked. As it is, however, not so much against the exercise of God's punitive justice that the objections in this case are directed, as to his making, by an express injunction, sinful men the instruments of his will for the destruction of their fellows, the remarks now made only partially touch the points at issue. The character of the nations to be extirpated furnishes the reason of the Divine procedure towards them ; and that the total extirpation of a pre-eminently wicked race is in no respect more opposed to Divine justice than was the destruction of the world by a deluge, and of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire from heaven, will hardly be questioned. Other instances of the destruction of tribes and nations, however different the agency by which it has been effected from that in the present case, and the

¹ Carpzov, Apparatus Antiquitatum, Frank. a. M. 1858.
p. 556. Francof. 1748. Keil, Bib-

² Hengstenberg, Authentice, E. T. ii

lische Archäologie, § 70, i. 332, 333. 406.

others adverted to, are of frequent occurrence in the world's history. Further, and more particularly, experience abundantly confirms the testimony of Scripture, that God employs men, as well as inferior agencies, for the accomplishment of his purposes, whether of good or evil. Individuals have a mission, and so also have nations, and God employs them often, unconsciously to themselves, and even contrary to their intentions, as the instruments of his wrath, and when they have fulfilled their destiny, arms in turn other powers against them. This is the voice of universal history, and of Scripture history in particular, which discovers the most hidden springs of actions, and the will which directs all affairs (see Isa. x. 5-12). In these matters God not merely permits—for this were to take a low view of the Divine government, and utterly inadequate to explain the various, and to human apprehensions, the perplexing phenomena of Providence—He arranges all events, and regulates all their issues. If, then, God does employ men as the unconscious ministers of His will, can He not also legitimate a people as righteous instruments of punishment? If God can, and does, employ an instrumentality of destruction, acting from its own will, and for the accomplishment of its own ends, without any respect to the Divine will, and which on that account is guilty, can He not also employ an instrumentality which, acting under his sole and supreme authority, shall be guiltless of wrong? This is the precise point to which the present question is reduced; and it is with this, rather than with the assumed injurious consequences to the conscious instruments so employed, that the objector has to deal.

If God can make known his will to man only by reason and conscience, as rationalists maintain, to the exclusion of direct revelation or miracle, duties, or supposed duties of this kind left to mere natural impulses, would, unquestionably, conduce to the most monstrous fanaticism.¹ Assuming, however, that the mode of the Divine communication is not so limited but that He can speak to man from without, and give infallible assurance of his will, objections of this kind can have no place, nor can this example afford any warrant to similar acts,

¹ Newman, *Phases of Faith*, p. 93. Lond. 1854.

except where the commission is equally attested.¹ That God did so speak to the Israelites will not be questioned by any believer in the Bible, and with others, this is not the place to discuss such questions. Their whole history, from the commission given to Moses for their deliverance, until under Joshua they entered the Promised Land, was a sufficient token to the Israelites that they had not mistaken a fancy of their own for a Divine command. That such was the feeling of the nation appears from the language of the Psalmist: "We have heard with our ears, O God; our fathers have told us what work thou didst in their days, in the times of old: How thou didst drive out the heathen with thy hand, and plantedst them; how thou didst afflict the people, and cast them out. For they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them; but thy right hand, and thine arm, and the light of thy countenance, because thou hadst a favour unto them" (Ps. xlv. 1-3). Here is a confession that the conquest was entirely the Lord's work, and that the people had properly no part, and no merit in it, — a disposition utterly alien to fanaticism.

A special warrant, for the employment of the Israelites in the capacity of ministers of Divine justice, is found in the Theocratic constitution. God was in every sense their King; and as it is the royal prerogative to make peace and to declare war, He could charge his subjects with carrying out these purposes. If the war itself was legitimate, no less so, from the peculiar standing of the Covenant People, was the instrumentality by which it was waged. There was, in fact, a special fitness in intrusting this duty to the Israelites, both as it respected themselves and the nations they were appointed to punish.

The work to which the Israelites were thus specially summoned was in various respects a school, in which they were taught their dependence upon God, who went before them to direct all their way, and to prepare a place for them. Had God at once put them into possession of a land cleared of its inhabitants, they would soon have forgotten that He had so prepared it; they would have ascribed its clearance to natural causes. And further, since He did not at once cast out the Canaanites,

¹ See Lowman, *Dissertation on the* 229, 230. Lond. 1745. Leland, *Deistical* Civil Government of the Hebrews, pp. Writers, ii. 137, 138.

but made their conquest dependent on the faith of the Israelites, He thus secured an instrument for the punishment of their own unbelief and disobedience, and so proved that his favour for them was not inconsiderate, but that they would be treated as the heathen if they resembled them in their character: "But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land before you, then it shall come to pass that those which ye let remain shall be pricks in your eyes and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell" (Num. xxxiii. 55). And finally, by thus acting as the executioners of the sentence on the enemies of God, the Israelites formally and solemnly declared that they would merit the same punishment themselves if they incurred similar guilt, and so justified beforehand the judgments which it was intimated would in that case overtake them. They acknowledged that the land was held by them only in trust for God, and that He could righteously dispossess them of it, failing their performance of the conditions on which its possession was alone dependent.¹

Nor, again, with respect to the nations destroyed, and all others, was the course here pursued without deep significance. Had the Supreme Judge adopted any of his ordinary methods of punishment, the ground of his procedure would certainly not have been so apparent, or it might have been altogether misunderstood. Even the complete destruction of the Canaanites by famine, pestilence, or some physical convulsion, might be regarded as a fortuitous calamity, due perhaps to some natural causes, rather than as the direct punishment of sin; just as at present similar views are entertained by many who suppose that if they can assign a second cause for any phenomenon, they thereby exclude the First Cause altogether. Thus, for instance, it is not unusual to regard the destruction of the cities of the Plain, represented in Scripture as a direct judgment of heaven, as due to volcanic agencies; as if such a supposition, even admitting it to be a satisfactory explanation of the physical phenomena of the case, precluded a moral agency, or was in any way opposed to the account given in Scripture. To remove every ground for scepticism of this kind,

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic, E. T. ii.* Recht der Israeliten an Canaan. Beiträge, i. 351. See also Reinke, *Ueber das*

it was needful, at this particular stage of Divine revelation, not only to give full intimation of the cause of the punishment, but also to entrust its execution to a special agency, and thus to exhibit, in a very palpable form, a principle of the Divine administration, which, if not equally apparent, is yet operative at all times, and which, in the New Testament, is represented as the victories of the Captain of Salvation—the true Joshua (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, Ἰησοῦς, Num. xiii. 16; Heb. iv. 8; comp. Matt. i. 21), “Jehovah the Saviour,”¹ and his redeemed people, over the enemies of God, and which had been typified of old in the wars with the Canaanites.²

It is only when seen to embrace the whole future economy of God's kingdom that the moral necessity, no less than the propriety of the course adopted with respect to the Canaanites, becomes fully apparent. It is the same also in other cases, with regard to which exceptions have been taken, or difficulties may be felt, as presenting something anomalous in the Divine administration, simply, however, because viewed apart from the great scheme of redemption, and in another than the broad Scriptural light in which it has pleased the Divine Being to present his character to his moral creatures, and where all its features will be found to be in utmost harmony with one another, however much, in some respects, they may appear unworthy to man's prejudiced and perverted judgment, as they are in all respects above his finite comprehension (Job xi. 7).

¹ Witsius, *Symbolum Apostolorum*, pp. 145, 146. Pearson on the Creed, p. 89. Lond. 1843. ² See Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, ii. 439.

CHAPTER II.

MAN, THE OBJECT AND CHIEF MEDIUM OF DIVINE REVELATION—HIS CONDITION AND PROSPECTS AS PRESENTED IN THE PENTATEUCH.

FOLLOWING the consideration of the general intimations furnished with respect to God, His person and character, attention must be directed, properly in continuation of the same subject, to the creation—His workmanship represented by man, its delegated head. The points to be here chiefly noticed are the doctrines which respect man's place in the world, and his relation to his Maker; after which will come under review, in subsequent chapters, the Divine purposes entertained towards him, and the provision made for effecting them.

SECT. I.—MAN'S ORIGINAL STATE, HIS FALL, AND RESTORATION.

Harris, *Man Primeval; or, the Constitution and Primitive Condition of the Human Being.* Lond. 1849.—Barry, *The State of Man in Paradise, and the Fall: Introduction to Old Testament,* pp. 72-110. Lond. 1856.—Krabbe, *Die Lehre von der Sünde u. vom Tode,* pp. 30-82. Hamb. 1836.

Although Scripture is chiefly occupied, so far as regards man, with his present state as preparatory to a future, there are various intimations, nevertheless, of the position which he originally held, physically and morally, in the scheme of creation. As the great object of these notices, however, is to explain man's present condition, and his relation to God, and not to supply general information on the subject to which they incidentally refer, it is not to be wondered that, apart from the essential difficulties of the subject itself, there are

others, which are due in a great measure to the form and brevity of the communications, and the place which they occupy in the first disclosures of Divine revelation. Still the information conveyed is sufficiently full and explicit for all practical purposes, and such alone are contemplated in the Scriptures.

It is, however, observable, that the intimations made at the very commencement of the Hebrew Scriptures with regard to man, are not less distinct than those which, as already noticed, refer to the character of the Creator. The anthropology of the Pentateuch is as complete and explicit as its theology. Indeed, the one doctrine is viewed as the proper correlate of the other; and this is in entire harmony with the idea expressed in the very first notice regarding man, as to his being created in the image of God, or in other words, as to his constituting, not only the object, but likewise the chief medium of Divine revelation. The revelation of man is thus the revelation of Him whose workmanship he is, both as respects the old or Adamic, and that new creation of which the New Testament gives more explicit information.

Thus it has been well remarked: "The doctrine of one personal, holy God, was not the only truth on which the law insisted. It unfolded, also, the true *doctrine of man*; his *dignity* and *wretchedness*. It urged not one of these great verities, but both; for only where the origin and grandeur of the human species are fully apprehended, can we hope to understand the turpitude of moral evil, and the real nature of the fall of man. The Bible tells us that there is in him a high and God-like element, that, instead of having been fashioned in the lower model of the brute creation, he came forth into the world erect in stature, and impressed with the Divine similitude; that in virtue of this kinship human life is sacred (Gen. ix. 6), and that human spirits, on the dissolution of the body, return to God who gave them (Eccles. xii. 7)."¹

§ 1. *The Original State of Man.*

The opening pages of Genesis furnish ample evidence of man's original relation to the creatures around him, and also

¹ Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, Pt. i., pp. 94, 95. Camb. 1855.

more particularly to the Creator himself. The orderly advance which, according to the Scripture narrative, (corroborated in this respect by the clearest testimonies of creation itself), marked the creative processes, as act after act successively followed, in obedience to the Divine mandate,—light, the arrangement of the atmosphere, and of the earth's surface by the distribution of land and water; life, vegetable and animal, rising from lower to higher forms, until in due time it was represented by the more perfect mammalian types,—clearly indicated the Creator's purpose, to carry on to its proper consummation the work in which He was thus engaged. The vastness of the plan, and especially the nature of the preparations, furnished antecedent evidence, had there been intelligent spectators of the scene, that the world was designed for the abode of a higher order of creatures than any which preceded man. Every new arrangement, every link added to the advancing chain of existence, was an additional prophecy of the future, until towards the close of the sixth day a being was introduced, in whom the work of creation was destined to terminate, by raising the physical to the moral.

The preparations made for man's appearance on the earth, and the terminal place which it was expressly intimated in the Creator's Sabbath rest, and otherwise, he occupied in the scheme of creation, at once pointed him out as of a distinct order from all the creatures which preceded him. Yet not so much in his physical constitution or bodily organization, although that was of a nobler type than any that had hitherto appeared on earth, as in his intellectual and moral endowments, did man hold a place peculiarly his own. An intimation of the distinguished position which he was destined to occupy in the creation was first given in the notice of the Divine counsel which preceded his formation: "And God said, Let us make man." Hitherto there was no reference to anything beyond the Divine fiat, which directly summoned all things into existence, and assigned to them severally their appropriate place and end. Now, however, there is, so to speak, a deliberate counsel, indicative of the importance attached by the Creator to the work to be accomplished; and after man was created he was addressed directly by the Author of his being, and accordingly was not left to discover from his own deductions the end of

his creation, or carry out that purpose by mere natural instincts.¹ It further comports with the conclusions deducible from these notices, that when the Creator purposed to provide a suitable companion for man, *עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ*, *a help corresponding to him*, it could only be accomplished by a new creative act, for the antecedent creations contained no such being² (Gen. ii. 18-22).

An additional testimony on the same subject occurs in the notice of the Creator's Sabbath rest, which followed the creation of man, and the review of the whole work, of which man was declared the head. The whole arrangements, as they passed under the survey of Omniscience, were found to be very good,—all answering their respective purposes as designed by the Creator, who now accordingly ceased adding to his works, and so blessed and sanctified the seventh day, which ushered in his own and the creation's rest (Gen. ii. 2, 3). It is a New Testament doctrine, that "the Sabbath was made for man" (Mark ii. 27); but there are also indubitable indications of the same truth discernible in the order of the creative week, and the character of man, with whom the work was concluded.

More especially does man's peculiar place in creation appear from the statement, that he was fashioned after a specific archetype, proper to the Creator himself. "God created man in his own image: in the image of God created he him" (Gen. i. 27). According to a subsequent notice, which treats more fully of the physiological constitution of man, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became *נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה*, an animated being" (Gen. ii. 7). By his organic structure man is related to earth, and the creatures around him; but besides the body, which, although of a higher type, is yet common to him with the lower animals, there was another principle with which he was endowed when the Creator directly communicated to him life.³ Still, however, it is the notice respecting

¹ "The first record of our race shows how great an error it is to assume the existence of a 'natural religion,' as independent of revelation."—Barry, *Intro. to Old Testament*, p. 76.

² Stendel, *Vorlesungen üb. die Theologie d. alten Testaments*, p. 82. Berlin, 1840.

³ "From hence we learn, not only the origin of those admirable faculties of man, especially in the light of his understanding and the liberty of his will, whereby he resembles his Maker; but also from whence he had that intellectual soul, not out of the matter whereof his corporeal and animal na-

his creation after the Divine image that chiefly demands consideration.

Of the nature of the Divine image in or after which man was formed, or the particular features of the Divine character he was designed to represent, no definition is given in the narrative of the creation. Indeed, it is not difficult to apprehend that such a definition, even if given, would, at that particular stage in the history of providence and revelation, be altogether unintelligible. The idea, it will be found, was intended to receive its explanation only through the gradual evolution of the scheme of Divine providence, as recorded in the volume of inspiration, and therefore could not properly be comprised in its opening chapter. There is, however, one statement belonging to the primeval period of an explanatory character on the subject, to the effect that Adam, who had been created "in the likeness of God," begat Seth "in his own likeness, after his image" (Gen. v. 1, 3). There was no notice of this kind, it is observable, with respect either to Cain or Abel, but the reason of this omission is obvious. Cain had plainly declared himself to be of a totally different character. The mother even who had expressed herself so hopefully at his birth at length discerned that he was not properly to be reckoned with *her seed*, but with an alien race (Gen. iv. 1, 25). And the death of Abel without issue rendered any description of this kind in his case unnecessary, even if his character had not been otherwise sufficiently stamped by his acts. Seth, through whom the seed of blessing was to be propagated, is the only one singled out in the manner referred to. This itself shows that the image of God has respect chiefly to the moral condition of man. Had it consisted merely, as frequently alleged by Socinians and others, in the dominion granted to him over the creation, it would be more applicable to the Cainites than to Seth and his posterity, for it was the former who chiefly distinguished themselves by the invention of the arts and the subjugation of the soil. True mastery over nature is a result undoubtedly of the Divine image, although forming no part of the image itself.

ture was constituted, but of a higher and nobler extraction, namely, by creation. He breathed into him the breath of life."—Sir Matthew Hale, *The Primitive Origination of Mankind*, p. 352. Lond. 1687.

Man, as bearing the image of God, was made capable of knowing God, and further, of making Him known to others. He was so constituted as to be an embodiment of certain Divine ideas affecting primarily himself, and, ultimately, other intelligent beings. He was thus to be not only the object, but also through, or in consequence of, God's purposes concerning him, the chief medium of Divine revelation. The fundamental idea involved in this Divine image would seem to be that man, of all the creatures of God, was especially set apart for sustaining in the highest form a representative character and some peculiar relation to God, in connexion with which the whole of the Divine perfections, or the glory of God, should be wonderfully and universally manifested. It thus corresponded entirely with the "intent," to which St. Paul refers in Eph. iii. 9, 10, as the ultimate end of redemption: "To make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the *intent* that now, unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God."

Now, in order that man might attain to the knowledge of God, and his relation to Him as his moral Governor, he must first be shown his place in the creation. This was accordingly taught to him by that symbolical transaction indicative of his mastery over nature, which consisted in bestowing names on the various animals around him, and discovering from this survey that there was no creature among them bearing any resemblance to himself, and that he consequently occupied a place distinct from them all. His relation to the Creator was shown in the prohibition with respect to one particular tree in the garden which had been assigned for his residence. The words, "Thou shalt not eat of it," plainly declared that not his own will but the Creator's must be the rule of his conduct, and that thus he was a creature under moral government. But if this prohibition proved the existence of law, and that God was no less the Ruler than the Creator of the world, the abundant and considerate provision made for all his wants, especially those of a social character, evinced no less clearly the kindly disposition of the Ruler towards his creatures.

While, however, the Divine image in man has special reference to his moral constitution, it must not be exclusively confined to any particular aspect of that character as determined by a moral rule, seeing that it is predicated of man after the fall had effected an entire revolution in his original relation to God, and without any special reference to moral excellency (Gen. v. 3; ix. 6). The fall greatly dimmed the original lustre of the image, but it did not destroy it; it did not, as has been remarked by an old writer, "alter the essential constituents of mankind, or wholly raze out the engravings of those common notions, sentiments, and rational instincts that were in them."¹ In one point of view that moral catastrophe which God overruled for his own glory, served only to raise this image to a higher pedestal than ever, where it presented features of the Divine character which man's persistence in a course of rectitude could never reveal. It may be in reference to this that God declares of man, restored to Divine favour through faith in the appointed remedy, "Behold, the man is become as one of us" (Gen. iii. 22). But however this may be, it would appear that the image of God had respect not so much to man individually, or to any particular character, as to his personality, and that part of the creation in his dealings with which the Creator purposed fully to reveal Himself, both as regards his person, and perfections.

Nor is the idea to be confined to the spiritual and intellectual part of man. It extends to the bodily frame and its wonderful organisation. The body not less than the soul is a constituent part of man (Gen. ii. 7), and both alike must have entered into the conception of the Divine exemplar after which he was fashioned.² The body, indeed, may be said to be a sort of image of the soul, as the two combined are the image of God. From the connexion subsisting between the Divine image in man and the dominion over nature which was delegated to him by the Creator, it will appear how important an element in the realisation of the former idea is the physical organisation of the human being. If this be not a part of the image itself, it may be styled, at least, the pedestal on which

¹ Sir M. Hale, *Origination of Mankind*, p. 355.

² Owen, *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*: Works iii. 417. Edin., 1851.

the image stands; for on this organisation, not much less than on his mental endowments, it depends that man is the creature which he is. Nor is it at all unreasonable to suppose, without indulging in aught that is materialistic regarding the Divine personality, that this embodiment in the highest physical type of a Divine idea, stands in some mysterious relation to what Scripture designates the form of God (Num. xii. 8; comp. Exod. xxiv. 10; Ps. xvii. 15)—a conception, after which there is an irresistible longing in the human heart, as if it were something of a conatural principle.

Nevertheless, however distinguished may have been the place originally occupied by man, as compared with the creatures which were made subject to him, it was not that state of perfection to which the Creator ultimately designed him. His original condition is represented as capable of, and indeed needing, development. Without attaching much importance to the distinction of Hävernäck,¹ that man is not the image of God, but created only *in* the image and *after* the likeness of God—a nicety for which there is little countenance in the text; still it is true that his resemblance to the Author of his being was not immediate, and that he stood only in a very remote relation to the proper ideal of the Divine image. The relative imperfection of the Protoplast was clearly pointed out by the fact that he was created not singly but as forming one of a pair charged to multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it. His partner, the woman, is expressly designated a help for him, the duality plainly implying defect and imperfection in each of the two related parties.² The notice, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; *male and female* created he them,” (Gen. i. 27; comp. v. 1, 2) deserves special attention, not only as exhibiting a unity in this duality, but more particularly because of the contrast which the relation here described presents with that of which it is said, “There is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus,” (Gal. iii. 28; comp. Matt. xxii. 30). The one is the initial stage, the undeveloped state of human nature; the other points to the grand consummation of its history.³

¹ Vorlesungen, p. 83.

² Hävernäck, Vorlesungen, p. 83.

³ The language of Gal. iii. 28 has certainly a wider bearing than that as-

signed to it by Bengel: In circumcissione erat *masculus*; nam sexus sequitur. per quem transgressio incipit, ex pers erat. --Gnomon Nov. Test. *in loc.*

In the New Testament Adam is called ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος, "the first man" (1 Cor. xv. 45, 47). He is so designated not so much certainly because he was the first created, and the father of the human race, but on account of the relation which he is represented as sustaining to one of his posterity, to whose coming uninterrupted reference is made throughout the Old Testament, beginning with Gen. iii. 15, and who is styled by St. Paul, in connexion with the title just quoted, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ, "the last Adam," and ὁ δεῦτερος ἄνθρωπος, "the second man," and of whom the first is expressly said by the same apostle (Rom. v. 14) to have been a "type." This is not the place to enter upon a discussion of the great truths involved in these expressions; they will form the subject of after consideration. It will be enough for the present purpose to refer to the idea expressed in 1 Cor. xv. 46, that the laws of development concerned in man's formation required that the lower should precede the higher: "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual; but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual." Some notice must also be taken of the relation set forth in ver. 49, by the term εἰκὼν, in reference to Gen. i. 27; v. 3: "And as we have borne (ἐφορέσαμεν) the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," "the second man, the Lord from heaven," who, throughout the New Testament, is set forth as the true image and representative of God. It was, at best, only the germ of the idea that was exhibited in Adam. Its full realisation was reserved for him who is "the brightness of the father's glory and the express image of his person" (Heb. i. 3; see also Col. i. 15); and, so far as creature capacities can reveal the invisible and the infinite, also for those whom God hath predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son (Rom. viii. 29).

The marriage relation instituted by God in the state of innocence through the creation of the woman, the second human being, represented to Adam several important truths. It indicated to him, in the first place, that this was the most intimate relation possible among mankind; that it constituted a unity, in fact, to which there was no parallel in creation (Gen. ii. 24; comp. Matt. xix. 6). Secondly, the medium whereby man's wants, as recognised by the Creator himself, should be supplied, and that defect in creation described as

“not good for him” (Gen. ii. 18) remedied, and the noblest of God’s creatures raised to the sphere to which he was designed (Gen. i. 26), so that there might be no obstacle to the Divine approval pronouncing the entire work “very good.” This point was more fully brought out in the promises which succeeded the fall, and the bearing of which, in this respect, was recognised by Adam when “he called his wife’s name Eve, because she was the mother of all living” (ch. iii. 20). At the same time he was conscious of his own divinely determined and declared superiority, not only as the head of creation in general, but also of the woman (1 Cor. xi. 3). This appears from the fact that he bestowed upon her a name as he had previously on the inferior creatures around him.

§ 2. *The Fall of Man.*

Man’s fall from his original uprightness is the next subject on which the Pentateuch throws light. The author of the Book of Ecclesiastes intimates as the result of all his investigations into the character and condition of mankind, “Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions,” (Eccles. vii. 29.) He does not mean to represent this as a new discovery of his own, or one requiring minute research; for it was fully known long before his day, and recognised as a fundamental truth in the sacred books of his nation. All that is plainly meant by this announcement is, that the author’s own experience and intimate acquaintance with the human heart in its various phases, only conducted him to the same conclusions as had been already reached on other and independent testimony. Man’s condition in the world is so mixed, but upon the whole so miserable, and his own conscience is so declaratory of the fact, that the evils to which he is exposed are of a penal character, as to present a state of things utterly perplexing in the government of God, save for the indications that he is intimately linked with a past and a future, and that the present is an intermediate dispensation. That man, both in character and condition, is now another being from what he was when formed by God, is a truth than which none is more plainly taught in Scripture or confirmed by reason. It is

also no less expressly taught, the first intimations being contained in the very narrative of the fall, that from his present sunken condition provision has been made for his extrication.

Man's place in the creation as the last of the works of God, and the pre-eminence expressly assigned him over all the other creatures, but above all, the Divine determination which preceded his birth, resulting in his being made in the image and after the likeness of God, pointed out, as already noticed, the high intellectual and moral rank to which he had been designed. With this correspond all the intimations of the more special narrative which concerns the condition of the first human pair ere they yielded to the seductions of the tempter. Briefly recapitulating some of the particulars already considered, the chief points bearing on the character of the primeval man and the provision made for him, as more fully presented in Gen. ii., are the following:—

(1.) In the chosen residence selected and prepared by God for his new made creature, there was abundant and suitable provision for all his physical wants. "And the Lord God commandeth the man, saying, Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat," (ver. 16.) That this was deemed by the Creator a suitable provision for man's wants is an evidence of the simple and unartificial state of primeval things. His life, however, was not to be one of idleness. Although not subjected to that wasting labour which was afterwards his lot, he was still charged with the cultivation of the soil which had been appointed to afford him sustenance, (ver. 15.)

(2.) In man's intercourse with nature, and with the animal world in particular subordinated to him, room was afforded for the exercise of his intellectual powers. Reason would deduce many useful lessons from the observation of the various habits and instincts there presented; "Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air," &c., (ver. 20.) This certainly implies that he possessed some acquaintance with the character of the several classes, more particularly it shows that he was conscious of his own supremacy over them.¹

(3.) By the creation of the woman intended to supply a want in man's solitary condition, there was, in addition to

¹ Harris, *Man Primeval*, pp. 176, 177.

the various truths taught to man, as already remarked, by this new relation, practical scope given to the social tendencies now called into exercise, (ver. 24.)

(4.) Further, and above all, in the command to abstain from the forbidden fruit, (ver. 17,) there was given both to the man and to the woman, for that the latter was aware of that prohibition, however she may have been informed, appears from Gen. iii. 3, besides an intimation of their dependent state as creatures, a conviction of which was so essential to their safety and happiness, an opportunity for the exercise of those moral powers with which they had been endowed, and on the proper direction of which depended how far the idea of the Divine image should be realized. To the command to abstain from the one tree in the garden there was added an intimation: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," (ver. 17.) This was a premonition of the misery necessarily incurred by a moral creature transgressing the law of its being, breaking loose from God, the centre of life and blessedness, and proceeding in an erratic, and so a destructive course of its own. It was also and more directly the penalty necessarily attached to law, and which, as here under the name of *death* appears throughout the whole earthly history of man, and the various dispensations, until in the universal consummation, death is declared to be destroyed, (1 Cor. xv. 54; Rev. xxi. 4.)

(5.) The description of the primeval condition of mankind closes with this suggestive notice, "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed," (ver. 25.) The whole account, particularly this concluding statement, is declaratory of the truth, "God made man upright," in a state and with dispositions different from those which he possesses under the present system. Of the extent of the change it is difficult to form a right conception, though man's original state may have been about equally removed from the representations which, on the one hand, would have it to be one of creature perfection, and those which, on the contrary, pronounce it infantile simplicity.¹

It is, however, by the immediately succeeding narrative (Gen. iii.) that the contrast is distinctly brought out between

¹ See Harris, *Man Primeval*, pp. 174, 175.

the creation, which its Author had pronounced to be very good, and the present condition of mankind, consisting, it is declared, of two antagonistic parties. The leading features of this narrative may be thus briefly exhibited, with the light which subsequent revelation sheds on the several transactions.

1. The parties who had just been described as unconscious of guilt and shame, or innocent—for the physical here was chiefly emblematic of the moral—shortly appear in open rebellion against the law of their Creator. They transgressed the positive precept by which their obedience was to be tested, and their moral powers exercised; and though the first overt act respected what many would, no less erroneously than presumptuously, term a trivial matter, it yet sufficiently showed that the transgressors preferred their own way rather than submit to the Divine will. The one act was a violation of the whole law, (James ii. 10)—a rejection of the authority of God; and their conduct, instead of being less culpable owing to the unimportance of the special act prohibited, as rationalists would represent, was on that very account only the more aggravated. It reduced the actual transgressors, and, as the subsequent history proves, all their posterity, into the condition of sinners. Sin, indeed, is not here mentioned by name, but taking it according to the Scriptural definition as “the transgression of the law,” (1 John iii. 4,) it certainly appears in a form which justifies the Pauline statement: “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,” (Rom. v. 12). The confidence which the parents of mankind had previously reposed in God, and the mutual love which they cherished, all at once gave way to distrust, and to recriminations of God, and of one another. Shame, fear of God, and mutual estrangement, were the feelings which predominated immediately after their transgression, and these plainly declared that they had incurred the penalty against which they had been warned. They were fully conscious that they had forfeited God’s favour, in which is life, (Ps. xxx. 5,) and had become obnoxious to his displeasure—a state which Scripture designates as “death.”

2. They were, however, brought into this position by external solicitation; they were seduced from their allegiance to God by an inimical power. It may be difficult to understand

how any solicitation could be so successfully plied as to induce creatures so constituted as the first human pair to disown their Creator's authority, and no less difficult to understand by what dark and subtle agency such a result was effected, but it would have been far more difficult to conceive of man's apostasy, had no mention been made of a tempter in the case. The participation of such an agency in man's transgression, and of the existence of which some premonition had been given to him in the charge to "keep" the garden, (Gen. ii. 15,)—that is, to protect or defend it from some hostile attack, is in entire consistency with the preceding intimations respecting man's original character, while the fact that the temptation came from without, supplied a basis whereon to rear the work of redemption.

Of the antecedents of the tempter, little is communicated in this narrative—such information being reserved for subsequent revelations. Enough, however, of his character appears to proclaim him the adversary of God and man—the Satan of the later Scriptures, (Zech. iii. 1, 2,) also denominated from his misrepresentations of truth—a notable instance of which is furnished in this very case—"a liar, and the father of lies," (John viii. 44). But whatever obscurity rested on this subject—and it seems to have been purposely veiled by the writer of the Pentateuch—it was shown to the first man that there existed other moral creatures besides himself, and that a portion of them, at least, was in rebellion against God; but, as was soon intimated, to be subdued through that humanity whose fall they had just accomplished. This announcement forms a grand feature in the history of the entrance of sin, and it is the principle which gives consistency to, and explains all God's subsequent dealings with man, until the closing scene of prophecy shows the absolute exclusion of the tempter and his party—"whosoever loveth and maketh a lie" (Rev. xxii. 15)—from the paradise to which at first they somehow had access.

3. The announcement of redemption for fallen man (Gen. iii. 15) disclosed, more fully than any previous discovery, the character and perfections of God. It manifested attributes of Godhead which must have remained undisclosed, had the whole moral creation continued unfallen, or, if otherwise, had all

the fallen been left under the dominion of sin, and given over to the exercise of punitive righteousness. The purposed redemption of man, however, brought to view those perfections, and presented them in entire harmony with God's previous declarations of himself, and of the consequences of sin. The first announcement of grace showed how fully belonged to God the name which, at a later period, He expressly declared as his: "The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious," &c., (Ex. xxxiv. 6,) while the manner in which the announcement was made no less clearly established the fundamental principle of the scheme of grace, that "He is just, while justifying the ungodly." But not only did the promise of a representative of man, and an avenger of the injury done him by the adversary, illustrate the character of God; it also showed the true nature of sin in its guilt and in its power. Such is the mastery of sin over the sinner, that it is utterly impossible by any self-effort to release himself from its grasp; and hence the necessity, at least in one aspect, of an interposition of God on his behalf; while, in another point of view, the same interposition is required to render due satisfaction to the claims of the violated law.

4. Another truth disclosed in this narrative is, that the infliction of temporal chastisement on man in his fallen condition is not inconsistent with his eternal redemption—nay, is a necessary discipline for it, and a constituent of the remedial dispensation. After God had announced his gracious purpose respecting the first transgressors of his law, and the provision made for breaking off their connexion with the tempter, and for the final overthrow of that adversary, He intimated to them the sorrows, terminating only in death, which should constitute their earthly portion. The woman, who had exercised an independence opposed alike to the law of her creation and the ordinance of marriage, must, as a wife, carry with her a constant feeling of weakness, dependence, and subordination to her husband; and as a mother, now constituted by Divine grace the medium of redemption to the race whose fall she had so directly occasioned, she must in her person submit to sufferings at every step made towards the realisation of the promise, and the completion of the human family. The man to whom the prohibitory command had

been directly given, and who was properly the representative party, is sentenced to a life of toil. To make his lot more grievous to the flesh, but, on the other hand, to call into exercise all the energies of his nature, the ground from which he must derive the necessary supply for his bodily wants is cursed for his sake, and its spontaneous productions reduced to thorns and thistles—articles utterly unsuited for human sustenance, and which must be laboriously eradicated from the soil where it is desired such should grow. Further, the fallen pair are excluded from the garden where hitherto all their wants were supplied, and where they held immediate communion with their Maker. Their expulsion from the scene of their former blessedness was intended, among other purposes, to be emblematic of their altered moral condition, and to impress upon them the truth that they were now aliens and exiles. Intimation, however, was given, as will presently be seen, that the exclusion from Eden was not for ever, and that there should be again a return to paradise, and access to the tree of life.

The trials to which fallen humanity, in the persons of our first parents, was thus subjected, partook more of the character of a fatherly chastisement than of punitive retribution. As such, they properly come after the announcement of grace, and with the view of making it more precious to those on whom it was bestowed. That this was regarded by the parties immediately concerned as the primary object of the discipline, and that it was so far effectual both in themselves and many of their posterity, would appear from the subsequent history. Thus the tarrying of the parents of mankind in the neighbourhood of the garden, and the wistful looks which, judging from the feelings evinced even by Cain, as he contemplated the prospect of his being driven from the hallowed scene, (Gen. iv. 14,) they must have been directing towards the cherubic forms which occupied man's original place, and the displays of the Divine majesty by which these objects were accompanied, afford some indication how the exiles of Eden appreciated the forfeited blessings. An incident in the history of Lamech brings, however, more fully to view the disciplinary effects of the curse pronounced upon the ground. At the birth of his son Noah, Lamech observed: "This

[child] shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands from the ground which the Lord hath cursed," (Gen. v. 29,)—showing not only the expectations cherished of the advent of a Comforter and Deliverer, but also how much these longings were influenced by the labours to which man had been condemned.

So far, in general, regarding the lapsed condition of the parents of mankind, and the prospects held out to and entertained by them of a restoration to the Divine favour, and their former blessedness, as gathered from the history of their temptation and fall; but before proceeding to examine more precisely the promise respecting their recovery from a state of guilt and wretchedness, it may be well to inquire into the views here presented of the nature of sin.

The primal threatening denounced against disobedience, proved, in the experience of the first transgressors, to have been a reality, must have fully convinced them that "the wages of sin is death." Nay more, viewed in connexion with the state which presented itself to them when "their eyes were opened," they must have felt that death was not an uncertain or arbitrary penalty overtaking transgression, it may be, at some future or remote period, but was an essential element of it, or that sin is in itself *death*, so far as moral creatures are concerned.¹ That death was, in this instance, so regarded, appears from the fact, to be afterwards more fully considered, that after the promise of a victory over the destroyer through "the seed of the woman," and notwithstanding that the promise had been immediately followed by a sentence which intimated a dissolution of the human body, or physical death, Adam clearly entertained the idea of life, after it had been restored by the Divine promise, as a blessing not liable to be affected by that sentence.

A question here arises, Did our first parents conceive of sin or their now fallen condition as something merely personal, and terminating with themselves, or could they have looked upon it as extending its baneful influences to that posterity of which, as informed in the first Divine blessing which an-

¹ See Alexander, *Connexion*, pp. 100-105, where this point is ably discussed, and where it is also shown that temporal death formed no part of the primal threatening. See also *Creation and the Fall*, pp. 421-426.

nounced the law of their creation, (reaffirmed in the promise regarding the woman's seed), they should be constituted progenitors? Whatever their immediate convictions may have been with regard to these points, there were certainly intimations given that the effects of sin would extend beyond the persons of the primary transgressors. The enmity which God declared He should interpose between the Tempter and the woman, was intended to have a far wider range than these parties themselves. It was to reach into the future, and embrace "the seed" of the one and of the other; while the intimation of the bruising of the victor's heel showed that he should in some way, not then clearly expressed, be related to sin and its consequences.

These intimations, obscure though they may have been at the time, were not, there is every reason to conclude, long or altogether unnoticed; and it only needed observation and experience to exhibit something of their true import. Admitting that it is doubtful whether the mother of mankind was acquainted with the truth that sin is hereditary at the time of giving birth to Cain, whom, in the first exuberance of maternal joy, she hailed as the promised deliverer himself, there can be little question that the conviction must have been painfully impressed upon her by her earliest converse with the infant mind. And it is strongly confirmatory of this supposition, that she called her second son Abel, that is, "vanity," or "nothingness,"—a designation not so much prospectively corresponding to his untimely end, as many would limit it, but descriptive of the condition of humanity, as viewed long afterwards by the Psalmist: "Only for utter vanity (אֵיפֶהוּ כָּל-הָאָדָם) was every man ordained" (Ps. xxxix. 5), Abel being thus, in his designation, a representative of the race.¹

Still further must the convictions of our first parents with regard to this sad truth have been deepened by the unhappy contentions waged in the bosom of their family,—only too real a representation of the controversy announced and instituted in the promise, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed;" and which must have conveyed an insight into the meaning of this de-

¹ Lud. Capellus, *Notæ Criticæ*, p. 329.

claration, possibly unsuspected before. The death of the one brother by the other's murderous hand, taken in connexion with the prior difference of dispositions, from which this lamentable act proceeded, must have proved, as is evident from the remark of the mother at the birth of Seth: "God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew" (Gen. v. 25), that however incredulous maternal feelings might have been with respect to such a matter, she recognised the fact that "Cain was of that wicked one" (*ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*, 1 John iii. 12), and that thus the Serpent of the temptation had a seed among mankind, and exercised authority over them.

The whole subsequent history is but a confirmation of the same melancholy truths. So universal, indeed, was the contagion of sin, and so strong its power, that notwithstanding the external separation between the Cainites and the descendants of Seth, which might induce a hope that the latter, who were called by way of distinction "the sons of God"¹ (Gen. vi. 2), would not so readily forget their high vocation, in the course of nine generations from Adam there was found but one righteous man on the earth (Gen. vii. 1), and even he, after his preservation from a deluge, which swept away the guilty and corrupt race, proved not to be altogether exempt from the influences of evil (chap. ix. 21). Than the sinful act of Noah nothing, perhaps, in the circumstances could have furnished a more decisive proof of the moral weakness of human nature and the universality of corruption. But still further to declare and illustrate this truth, it is expressly stated, in connexion with the immediately preceding epoch in the history of mankind, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart" (*בְּלִיַּצַר מְהִיטֶבֶת לְבוֹ*), a combination of synonyms intended to give intensity to the idea) "was only evil continually" (*בְּלִי־טוֹב*), all the day, and every day (chap. vi. 5). And again, "the imagination of man's heart is evil from

¹ This has been a fruitful source of controversy. The old Rabbinical view, held also by many of the early Fathers, which regarded the designation as applying to the angels, has been recently

revived by Hofmann, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, and Kurtz. By the last named it is propounded in a separate treatise — *Die Ehen der Söhne Gottes mit den Töchtern der Menschen*. Berlin, 1857

his youth" (chap. viii. 21). These statements respecting the corruptness of the heart (אָר), which, in Biblical language, denotes the whole man, with all his powers and functions, whence the evil works and perverse ways proceed, show how deeply seated was the moral contagion, according to the views then entertained and expressed. Sin, it was thus expressly taught, was propagated from within, and not merely communicated from without.

It would obviously be out of place, as only anticipating the discussion of the subject in its proper connexion, under an advanced stage in the economy of revealed truth, to advert here to various rites and ordinances of the Pentateuch, whether of patriarchal or Levitical times, such as circumcision, and several purifying requirements, especially in the case of women after child-birth, various ablutions and blood-sprinklings of the law, all of which were designed to show generally that sin is of a nature to defile the whole man; and more specifically that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh" (John iii. 6; comp. Ps. li. 5). In the meantime, it is sufficient to remark, that there are numerous indications, more or less direct, in the Pentateuch as to the nature of sin, and the views entertained from the very first regarding it.

Looking back to the very earliest times, something, indeed, of this kind is apparent in the very names of some of the antediluvian patriarchs. These, in many instances, express the deep-felt convictions of the heart respecting the guilt and misery of human nature, as if the parents, even when gladdened with the birth of children, still looked back on the entrance of sin, and ever kept in view its deserved punishment, or at least the wretchedness in which it involved man. To the name of Abel reference has been already made; but Seth also, his representative, and whose own name, as declaratory of the conviction entertained with respect to another truth, denoted "settlement," or "stability," gave a name to his son, which was a memorial of man in his fallen character: "He called his name Enosh,"—a term which denotes man as miserable, sick, and dying,¹ (comp. Ps. viii. 5; ix. 20). An idea somewhat similar occurs in the name of

¹ Delitzsch, *Die Genesis*, p. 212.

Methusaleh,¹ although the longest lived of the human race. But into the examination of particulars such as these it were superfluous to enter at any length. It is sufficiently plain that a strong conviction as to the nature and demerits of sin was deeply engraven on the hearts of all who were in any degree eminent for godliness. Such felt that by nature they were wretched, miserable, and vile; and at no time were these convictions so vivid, as when they were admitted into the most friendly intercourse with God. Witness the feelings of Abraham when, after so much kindness and condescension had been shown to him by the Almighty, who had honoured him with his presence as a guest, and made him privy, as it were, of his council, he interceded with the Judge of all the earth in behalf of the doomed cities. Though repeatedly encouraged in his intercession, the patriarch felt deeply the presumption which his procedure involved. "Abraham answered and said, Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, who am but dust and ashes," (Gen. xviii. 27). By this expression he plainly showed how he felt himself included in the primal sentence pronounced upon humanity: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," (chap. iii. 19). It was reserved, however, for the law fully to educe those feelings.

While sin was thus declared to be universal and hereditary, it was, at the same time, no less distinctly shown to be a product of the will, and so rendered the individual guilty in the sight of the law. This truth was first expressly stated in God's expostulation with Cain,² who had given way to certain sinful feelings on the rejection of his offering: "If thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And to thee is its desire, but do thou rule over it," (Gen. iv. 7). Sin, by a strong figure, is here represented as a savage animal crouching before the door, ready to invade the dwelling or seize the inmates, if they unwarily issued abroad. In the language which follows, God forcibly depicts sin's natural and inmost disposition towards the sinner, as it seeks to enter into such a union with him, as finds its analogy only in the marriage relation—the terms here employed being parallel with those in Gen. iii.

¹ Heidegger: "Capellus interpretatur hominem missum, vel mortalem missum. Alii mortis missile. . . . Utrum eligamus, id putem ex nomine ejus colligi

posse, quod corruptissima ætate cum natus esset."—*Historia Patriarcharum*, i. 228. Amstel. 1688.

² Stuedel, *Vorlesungen*, p. 91.

16, while he, if considerate of his safety, should not suffer it to obtain an ascendancy, but should check its first risings. The exhortation addressed to Cain thus corresponds to that of the New Testament: "Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof," (Rom. vi. 12).

The whole course of sin, as contemplated in the history of the fall, from its rise in temptation to its issue in death, is in entire harmony with the representations of the New Testament on the same subject. Thus, in particular, James i. 13-15: "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

Here it is expressly intimated, in accordance with the whole tenor of Scripture regarding the Divine character, that no temptation or enticement to sin can come to the creature from God. The same truth had been historically illustrated in the narrative of the temptation of the first Adam in the beginning of the Old Testament Scriptures, and of the second Adam at the commencement of the New. Both cases are characterised, besides other strong analogies, particularly by this, that the temptation proceeded from the enemy of God. When, therefore, it is here added, "every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed," this can only be in reference to fallen man, in whom there is an inherent principle of evil, and is not meant to apply to man unfallen. But however enticed, whether by an external agency, as in the case of the first transgression, or subsequently by the sinful desires of the heart itself, the course of sin, and its consequences, are invariably the same, and such as are described in the narrative of the fall.

It also deserves notice that there is a remarkable analogy between the germ of sin presented in this narrative, and its highest development, as indicated in the New Testament, with this significant difference, that what in the germ is held out by the tempter as the inducement to transgression, "Ye shall be as God" (Gen. iii. 5), appears, when sin has attained its maturity, as an actual claim on the part of the creature to the

prerogative of Deity. Thus St. Paul, in describing the completely developed form in which, in the person of Antichrist, sin shall appear towards the conclusion of the world's present history, sets forth "the man of sin" as presenting claims to the place and the power which belong only to God: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. ii. 4).¹

§ 3. *The Restoration of Fallen Man.*

Some references have been made in the preceding remarks to the fact that the same narrative which recounts man's fall, contains also the first intimation of the Divine purposes respecting his recovery. But some of the particulars connected with this intimation deserve to be separately considered. The effects of sin, as formerly remarked, were not long in manifesting themselves. These, as described in the simple language of the history, were shame and fear—shame, as respects the transgressors themselves in one another's presence, and fear as regards God their Sovereign Judge. Everything betokened an entire change of character in the previously happy and guileless pair, and likewise the full triumph which the Tempter had apparently secured, as well over the Creator as over the creatures which He had formed in his own image, and invested with authority over the work, which, as thus subordinated to man, He had immediately before pronounced to be very good. This triumph was destined, however, to be of short duration.

When God summoned the first human transgressors into his presence from the concealment whither in their confusion they had betaken themselves, his purpose, it was soon apparent, was not to execute the sentence which his law had denounced against disobedience. This appears from the mode adopted to bring the guilty to an acknowledgment of their sin. There was no such dealing with the Tempter; no questions were addressed to him touching his conduct, or his complicity in man's transgression. The whole case is, so far as he was concerned, assumed as already proved, and no room

¹ See the Author's *Creation and the Fall*, pp. 185, 186.

was given him for a denial or extenuation of the charge preferred by his victims as to his being their instigator to sin. It was far otherwise, however, with regard to those whom he had seduced.¹ In their case, it was God's object, through an intimation of mercy following on a confession of guilt, to reverse the condemnation which they had incurred.

While, however, announcing mercy, God nevertheless appears as the righteous Avenger and Judge. The words in which mercy was announced were directly spoken to the Tempter, and to him they conveyed only a judgment and a curse (Gen. iii. 14,) which however communicated indirectly most gracious promises to those on whom he had just trampled. The condemnation pronounced embraced an act of sovereign grace to man, more glorious because unmasked, and even unexpected. The peculiar phrasology employed takes its form from the character sustained by the Tempter in the transaction; but stripped of figure, it announced the perpetual degradation and final overthrow of the enemy who had just succeeded in introducing confusion into the works of God. It intimated that while the curse to be pronounced upon the rest of the creation should be removed, there was to be no reversal of the doom of the serpent. This, on the contrary, would be perpetual, and fitted to distinguish its subject from every other creature, "from (*מִן* *separate* or *apart from*) all cattle, and from every beast of the field." The completeness of the Tempter's degradation is indicated by his being condemned to the lowest form of locomotion and the meanest form of food, (comp. Ps. xlv. 25; Mic. vii. 17,) and moreover, this debasement was destined to be continuous, "all the days of thy life." There is allusion to this in Isa. lxxv. 25, where in a prediction of the blessed future of the earth and its inhabitants, it is remarked, "and dust shall be the serpent's meat," thus intimating that the serpent of the fall shall not participate in the immunities designed for the rest of the creation, but, on the contrary, that his curse is permanent and his condition irremediable. Further, the confidence reposed

¹ Heidegger: Serpentem inauditum damnavit Chrysostomus notat: In eo conspicuam voluisse Deum imparem hominis et serpentis condi-

tionem; hominem interrogat, indolentis patris more, *quid fecisti?* Non interrogat, sed ultione statim exequitur serpentem.—Hist. Patriar. i. 155.

in him by his victims shall be succeeded, not merely by distrust, but by an enmity, to be continued until it result in the defeat and destruction of this enemy of man.

The destruction here predicated also takes its form from the character of the being immediately addressed, but it is obvious that the benefits to be recovered for man in consequence of the victory through the seed of the woman, must correspond to those forfeited on his disobedience, and as these were of a moral and spiritual nature, so also must the blessings to be recovered, and the redemption from which they flow. Whatever may have been the views entertained by the parents of mankind, either as to the time or the precise manner of the realization of the Divine purposes announced in Eden, there can be little doubt that they viewed the promise as concerned with spiritual interests, and as intimating a restoration to their original state and relation to God. It is also probable that to their posterity again, who viewed the promise at a greater distance, and in different circumstances, particularly as having no experience of the original blessedness of the parents of the race, the subject would present itself in various other aspects, corresponding not only to the development of the purpose of mercy and the faith of individuals, but also to their several temperaments and necessities.

This is not a mere conjectural inference, but is supported by evidence. Thus, while Adam, as appears from the new name given to his wife after the announcement of mercy, and more particularly after a sentence had been passed upon them both which condemned them to temporal death, viewed the promise, notwithstanding, as conveying an assurance of *life*, forfeited in his transgression, Lamech, at a subsequent period, borne down by the wearisome toil required, in accordance with the Divine appointment after the fall, for the subjugation of nature, and for extorting necessary sustenance from a reluctant soil, saw in it a mitigation or removal of the curse laid upon the ground in consequence of sin (Gen. v. 29). Jacob again, at a still greater distance from the associations of Eden, regarded the provision purposed by God for his people under the designation of salvation (יְשׁוּעָה) or deliverance¹ from all

¹ See Venema, *Dissertations in Genesis*, pp. 433, 434. Leovard. 1747.

troubles, dangers, and fears (Gen. xlix. 18). In the same manner, it has somewhere been remarked, believers under the New Testament look forward to the blessedness of the world to come with views diversified according to their several temperaments—one, it may be, desiring it as the “Saints’ Rest” to weary, burdened souls,¹ and another contemplating it as a prospect of the unveiled “Glory of Christ”² The faith and expectations of primeval times thus bore a stamp corresponding even in the diversity of its aspects with that exhibited by similar exercises under the later dispensation of the Gospel.

Exceedingly striking, indeed, and not less accordant with their varied experience and their place in the successive dispensations are the respective testimonies of those early believers. Adam had known what “life” was in a way unexperienced by any of his posterity. It had been his privilege to partake freely of the ample provision which a bountiful Creator had made for his wants. He had seen, too, the tree of life, to which, before his fall, he had full access, put completely beyond his reach, and its keeping committed to other beings. He, moreover, was able to set a higher estimate upon all these blessings, just because of their forfeiture when he came under the sentence of condemnation and death, and it is therefore not only quite conceivable, but at the same time exceedingly natural, that he should look upon the promise which intimated to him a reversal of his calamities as “life” from the dead. The precise idea which he thus expressed will be considered under the next section.

With Lamech, again, the case was in various respects immeasurably different. He had no experience of those joys of innocence to which the hopes of Adam would directly recur, while from the accumulated history of centuries, nearly two of which were then concurrent with his own experience, he was deeply impressed with a sense of the magnitude of the earthly evils to which man is heir. More particularly, his own lot had fallen among evil days; he was conversant with a period in the world’s history, marked by constantly increasing corruption and violence, which threatened to bring down

¹ See Orme’s *Life of Baxter*, p. 735. Lond. 1830.

² See Goold’s *Life of Owen*, prefixed to his works, vol. i., p. ciii. Edin. 1850.

a severer curse upon the earth than that by which it was already burdened, as it actually did in the days of his son Noah, at whose birth the father promised himself comfort in the prospect of a mitigation of or support under the primal judgment. This anticipation, though otherwise probably than was expected by Lamech, was so far realised when after the flood God intimated to Noah his purpose not to curse the ground any more for man's sake (Gen. viii. 21).

Jacob, too, in that salvation which he expected, called to mind the various deliverances of his own eventful and checkered history. He remembered how he was preserved from his pursuer Laban, who had been directly restrained by God from offering him any harm (Gen. xxxi. 29), and, still more, that night of agonising prayer to God for deliverance from the hands of his brother Esau, and the gracious answer to his request, "Deliver me, I pray thee, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau, for I fear him, lest he will come and smite me, and the mother with the children" (chap. xxxii. 11). He had also no doubt in view various other evils, from all of which he felt he had been redeemed (chap. xlviii. 16). To Jacob the matter thus presented a more comprehensive character, while, at the same time, it gained in depth and spirituality. It was not any of those outward deliverances of which the patriarch had such large experience, that he designated by the name of "salvation," though unquestionably he recognised in all of them the hand of God as well as a type and pledge of his deliverance from all evil. The outward trials and fears had been mastered long before the patriarch breathed this, one of his last prayers, "I have waited for thy salvation, O Jehovah." He looked for a salvation which should be in every sense worthy of its author, Jehovah, and also suitable to himself, now arrived at the close of his earthly pilgrimage (chap. xlvii. 9).

Another instance, additional to that of Jacob, in which salvation is ascribed to Jehovah, and which serves accordingly to illustrate the views of the dying patriarch, is the exhortation of Moses to the Israelites when in a state of utter perplexity on the shore of the Red Sea: "Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of Jehovah" (Ex. xiv. 13). No doubt, it was a temporal deliverance from their Egyptian pur-

suers that was here directly referred to; still it was no less typical of a spiritual deliverance. Jehovah himself, now by his interposition on their behalf, had thus become his people's "salvation" (Ex. xv. 2). Indeed, before the exodus the idea of "salvation" was taking deep root among the Israelites, under the form of a deliverance from the oppression and bondage to which they had been subjected by their Pharaonic taskmasters. These very sufferings were incentive of hope, by calling to remembrance the promises made to the patriarchs: and it is easy to see how parents influenced, like Lamech of the antediluvian world, should recognise in connexion with their sons a prospect of escape from their oppressions—a deliverance or redemption—to be effected in the days of these younger members of the family, if not by their instrumentality; and so with a view of comforting themselves under their distresses, conferred names on their children indicative of such expectations. The original name of Joshua, the attendant and subsequently the successor of Moses, is traceable to this circumstance; and, to add to its significance, Moses changed it from Hoshea (*salvation*) to Joshua, or Jehoshua (Num. xiii. 16), "the salvation of Jehovah;"¹ or, perhaps, more properly, "Jehovah the Saviour"²—a term, in either of these acceptations, indicating the place which the idea had now attained, as a salvation to be effected only by the God of Israel.

SECT. II.—THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE AND A RESURRECTION.

Menasseh Ben Israel, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, L. i. cap. i. pp. 1-13; cap. x. pp. 64-74. Amstel. 1636.—Faber, *Treatise on the Genius and Object of the Patriarchal, the Levitical, and the Christian Dispensations*. vol. ii. pp. 11-194. Lond. 1823.—Lancaster, *Harmony of the Law and the Gospel with regard to the Doctrine of a Future State*. Oxford, 1825.

On no subject connected with the Pentateuch has more opposite opinions been entertained than that which respects its references to a future state, and the retributions therewith connected. Some maintain that upon these doctrines the

¹ Simonis: "Domini liberatio, seu 1741. Gesenius: "Cujus auxilium salus, *i.e.* salus a Domino præstita." Jehovah est."—*Thesaurus*, p. 581. Onomasticum, pp. 4 27, 516. Halæ, ² See above, p. 66.

Mosaic writings observe a complete silence, while others, without going to this extreme length, hold that such references are exceedingly obscure. The enemies of revelation have, indeed, on this ground attempted to degrade the Pentateuch even below the level of heathenism,¹ while, strange to say, some inconsiderate advocates of the Mosaic system at one time agreed with its opponents in excluding this doctrine from it altogether, on their part, however, for the purpose of deducing from that omission a proof of the Divine legation of its author. It is unnecessary to revert to the theory, now almost forgotten, maintained on this subject by Warburton,² or to discuss even those more recent views³ which, in the assumed interest of the Gospel in which "life and immortality have been brought to light," would seek to obscure the earlier revelations. It is only a careful examination of the facts of the case, apart from antecedent theories, that will set the question in its proper light; and yet, knowing the place which the doctrine of a future state held in the Israelitish creed as early as the time of the oldest Psalmic compositions, it were strange, indeed, on any theory, if no trace of it be discoverable in those writings which constituted the only authentic record of faith and experience for some thousands of years, and that it should spring up all at once so fully developed as it does in almost the next succeeding compositions.

In fact, however, it will be found that such an entire or even partial silence with regard to a future state, as is generally alleged, is entirely opposed to the whole tenor of the Pentateuch, both in its history and legislation.

To advert in the first place to general considerations, it must be apparent that the fact presented in the brief narrative of the antediluvian patriarchs in the line of Seth (Gen. v.), which, in every instance, save that of Enoch (ver. 24), closes with the identical expression, "And he died," must have given rise to doubts as to the value of the Edenic promise, and the realisation of the intimated triumph of good, had there been no ground for cherishing expectations beyond the present life, or if it were felt to be a necessary, or even a possible con-

¹ See Leland, *Deistical Writers*, vol. ii. pp. 165, 166.

² See above, vol. i. pp. 20, 21.

³ Whatley, *Essays on the Peculiarities of the Christian Revelation*. pp. 16-152. Lond. 1837.

clusion that that dismal refrain described the absolute termination of all that concerned and constituted the individual. The whole history demonstrates the truth of the apostolic statement that "death reigned from Adam to Moses" (Rom. v. 14), not unaccompanied, however, there is reason to believe, with some intimations, whatever may have been their character, that it was only a relative change, and not the termination of man's existence. Without some assurance of this kind, it is easy to perceive that there was nothing to sustain the faith of primeval believers amid their daily rounds of sorrow; and it would accordingly have been felt, as one after another of his descendants succumbed to the power of death, that the father of mankind cherished too fond an expectation, and indeed was grossly mistaken when he discerned in the promise of Eden an intimation of "life." And, as if to make the matter, considered from such a point of view, still more hopeless, if not deceptive, and even give occasion for arraigning the inequality of Providence, as indifferent to, or unable to reward piety, Abel, the recognised friend of heaven, whose case will be more fully treated of presently, was permitted, but for a very brief period, to taste the fruits of earthly enjoyment, while Cain, the fratricide, and the rejected of God, was not only permitted to live on, but was even protected by an express Divine interposition from the hand of violence.

These considerations alone afford antecedently ground to conclude that the doctrine of life and immortality must have been an element in the primeval faith, if of the character described in Genesis, and noticed in various passages of the New Testament, particularly in Heb. xi., and consequently that it must be a decidedly erroneous view of the Mosaic history, and widely opposed to the impression it was fitted and designed to convey to its Hebrew readers, to assume that it teaches no such doctrine. Neither the narrative of man's creation, which pointed him out as different from all the other creatures on the earth, and endowed with properties and capacities which brought him into a peculiar relationship to the Creator, nor the account of his apostasy, with the Divine interposition for his recovery from the power of evil, admitted of being so construed as to afford the least countenance to the supposition that his earthly life was to be his only existence, and that the

effects of his obedience to his Maker's law, or his rebellion against it, were to be entirely compassed by a few years of earthly sojourn. On the contrary, the very nature of the government under which, according to that history, man was placed—a moral law, superior to, and independent of, merely physical arrangements, clearly demonstrated that he was endowed with capacities for eternity, and that he was accordingly destined for immortality, unless it could be supposed that those powers had been bestowed in vain.

Such conclusions the readers of the primeval history must have doubtless formed, for they are so obvious, and, indeed, so necessary, that it was in a manner impossible to escape them. Without insisting too much, however, on such general considerations as these for the establishment and elucidation of the point under consideration, notice will now be taken of the testimonies of the Pentateuch, with reference to a future state, and the indications which it furnishes that such a belief was really entertained.

§ 1. *The Tree of Life and the Cherubim.*—
Adam's Idea of Life.

Of the vegetable productions, with which the Creator stored the residence in Eden, which he had specially provided for the first human pair, two are expressly distinguished by name—"the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," and "the tree of life." Corresponding with this distinction, they occupied a commanding position—"in the midst of the garden." (Gen. ii. 9)—the same place which the tree of life holds in the heavenly Paradise, (Rev. ii. 7.) From the fruit of the first of these trees man was expressly interdicted. This was, in fact, made the test of his obedience to the law of God, and he was assured that the violation of the command would entail upon him immediate death: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This result would, it was plainly intimated, be as sudden as it was certain. This object, then, in consequence of the prohibition attached to it, exhibited to Adam the authority of God as his governor, and so was designed to serve as an index of his own moral character. Hence the name, probably, by which it was designated—"the tree of

the knowledge of good and evil." Of the other tree, Adam, before the fall, was evidently allowed to partake; but after the fall that permission was withdrawn, and special provision made by the transgressors' exclusion from the garden to prevent the violation of the interdiction now laid upon it; while of the tree previously interdicted, no further mention is made in Scripture. It had evidently fully answered its purpose, and therefore, disappears from the record of revelation. It is otherwise, however, with its companion, the tree of life, now associated with other creatures, and the way to it guarded by a flaming sword; and so reference to it occurs again frequently in Scripture, showing that it had a purpose still to subserve.

There is no reason to suppose, as frequently maintained, that the tree of life was fitted or designed, more than any other in the garden, to prolong the physical existence of those who partook of it, or, on the other hand, that the fruit of the forbidden tree had in itself any deadly or deleterious quality. Adam was already endowed with life, physical and spiritual, and this would have been continued to him had he proved obedient to the law of his Creator; otherwise, it would, so far as life consists in the enjoyment of God, inevitably terminate, and no efforts, it must be evident, on his own part, whether by eating of the tree of life or otherwise, could possibly avert that consequence. Nor could the result be other in respect even to a physical existence, after the sentence which condemned the transgressors to an organic dissolution or return to the dust, and which plainly formed no part of the primal threatening. This observation is rendered necessary, because of the erroneous conclusions sometimes formed from the terms in which God intimates the reason of man's exclusion from the garden, (Gen. iii. 22),—that if he partook of the tree of life he would live for ever.¹ The tree of life was a token and a pledge of the continuance of life on the terms, but not otherwise, so fully though indirectly intimated by God, when announcing the penalty of disobedience. This pledge was, however, in consequence of man's transgression suspended, and as regards the mode of securing life, according to the first economy, completely annulled. Not so, however, God's purposes with respect to

¹ Graves' Lectures, ii. 202.

man and the blessings to be conferred upon him. The tree of life was accordingly preserved as a type of the blessings again to be enjoyed through redemption. It henceforth, however, assumes a new character, whenever mention is made of it in Scripture. Its symbolic efficacy is no longer confined to the maintaining of life through its abundant fruit, it has also the power to impart it and to correct the diseases of man's moral nature. This is distinctly brought out in Ezek. xlvii. 12, "The fruit thereof shall be for food, and the leaf thereof for medicine," and in Rev. xxii. 2, "The leaves of the tree for the healing of the nations."¹

Not only was the tree of life preserved, but it was associated with a still higher form of life than before. Adam had been thrust out of the garden, and whatever hopes, if any, he himself may have entertained respecting an immediate readmission to that blessed region, in the neighbourhood of which he and his early Sethite posterity settled, and from which even Cain lamented to be driven, the historian regarded the matter as a complete exclusion. The term *שָׁרַף*² "sent him out," denotes that, for this world at least, Paradise was utterly lost, and man precluded from attempting to return thither. At the same time intimations were afforded that this exclusion was not absolute and for ever. The most important intimation of this kind was probably that afforded in the arrangement with respect to the Cherubim introduced into the garden after man's expulsion.

The Cherubim are referred to both here and in the specifications for the Levitical tabernacle where they are next mentioned, and of the symbolic furniture of which they formed a special part, in a manner which assumes that they were familiar to the Hebrew readers; and that their form at least was so well known to the artificers engaged in the construction of the tabernacle as to render any description superfluous. The first description of them occurs in the visions of Ezekiel; from which it appears that they were compound figures, made

¹ See Hävernick Commentar üb. Ezechiel, p. 735, Hengstenberg, Com. on Revelation, E. T., ii. 356, 357. Edin., 1852.

notes a complete and final expulsion, the term being often used to denote the divorcing of a wife, Dent. xxi. 14; xxii. 19, 29; Jer. iii. 8.

² The *Piel* is intensive; it here de-

up of the parts of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, but variable as to their form (Ezek. i., x.); although the predominating appearance was that of a man (Ezek. i. 5.) Recent antiquarian investigations have shown that composite animal forms found in various systems of heathenism, in all probability traditional imitations of the Cherubim of Scripture, were intended as symbolic representations of a state of being in which were concentrated the peculiar qualities which distinguished the several creatures which entered into the particular combination.¹ It was the same to all appearance with respect to the idea represented by the Cherubim. The creatures which composed these mysterious figures were the highest forms of animal life, and so ideally included and represented everything on the earth most characteristic of *life*, as properly recognisable by man. This is confirmed by the designation חַיִּים, "living ones," given to the Cherubim in Ezek. i. 5, 13, &c.; x. 15, 17—a designation which, as rendered by the LXX. ζῶα, is given in the Apocalypse to creatures plainly identical in character (Rev. iv. 6-8), with those described by Ezekiel.² The identity between the creatures seen in the visions of Chebar and of Patmos, will be apparent from the following considerations. With some slight differences, the same number and kind of animal forms are seen on the two occasions. The names are the same; the idea of life is further shown by their alike incessant activity, and the place which they occupy is in close proximity to the throne of God, the very place also of the Cherubic figures in the Tabernacle (comp. Ps. lxxx. 1).

The ideal life represented by these mysterious figures, while raised to a far higher elevation than it had ever been embodied in any of the creatures of earth, was, at the same time, from the human type predominating,³ seen to be a life or state of being with which man was somehow intimately concerned, or in which, indeed, in some mysterious manner

¹ Creuzer, *Symbolik u. Mythologie*, i. 218, 219. Leip. 1836.

² Bähr, *Symbolik*, i. 341; Hengstenberg, *Com. on Revelation*, i. 212.

³ The cherubic form was variable, (Ezek. i. 6, comp. with xli. 18, 19,) but the preponderating appearance was

that of a man. "This was their appearance; they had the likeness of a man," (Ezek. i. 5). See Hävernick. *Com. üb. Ezechiel*, p. 18. Hengstenberg. (*Com. on Rev. i. 2, 17*): "The human form belonged to them all."

he participated. How far Adam's acquaintance with the truths symbolized by the Cherubim may have extended, it is impossible to determine. He certainly regarded the intimation with respect to the benefits to be secured to the race through the seed of the woman as comprehending "life," the nature of which he must have learned, in all probability, from the purposes connected with, and represented by the arrangement with respect to the tree of life. But, however the knowledge may have been acquired, Adam, it is evident, distinguished life from the mere animal or organic existence. This is placed beyond doubt, by the very circumstance that it was subsequent to the sentence which announced to him the certain dissolution of the body, that he gave expression to the idea. "And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living," (Gen. iii. 20). On her creation Adam intimated that "she should be called woman, because she was taken out of man,"—thus pointing to the character and origin of the companion provided for him by God; but now a new name is given to indicate a new relation, introduced by the recent Divine promise of a reversal of the evils due to transgression. The idea of life already expressed in various acts of creation, particularly in the formation of man himself, (Gen. ii. 7.) is here presented in a form altogether new and peculiar. The name EVE, (חַוְוָה *i. q.*, חַוְוָה,) "Life," was given to the first woman, "because she was the mother of all living," though as yet she was actually no mother, and was, besides, with her husband, lying under a sentence of death. The universal terms, חַיִּים, *all living*, show that in this case *life* was regarded as something distinct and peculiar. Everything else was seen to be dead, the woman only as the source of life, not, however, in virtue of the original law of creation, (Gen. i. 28,) to which there is evidently here no reference, but of the new arrangement subsequent to the fall.

Further, in the Cherubim Adam witnessed life in a higher aspect than anything of which he could hitherto have had a conception, apart from the uncreated life which pertained to God; while he could, at the same time, perceive that beings partaking of a form and nature like his own, were the most prominent objects in those wonderful combinations. Add to this, that he saw them occupying the very place from

which himself, for his unfaithfulness, had been excluded, and the supposition is rendered highly probable that the father of mankind connected this arrangement with the intimated victory of the Seed of the Woman, who was herself recognised as the source of Life, and that he discerned therein an emblem of the life thus restored, and with it access to the Tree of Life. "The planting of the cherub," it has been well remarked, "on the ground which man had once inherited but failed ere long to cherish for his best possession, was suggestive of the truth that he, and all whose fortunes had been linked with his, had still, in virtue of some gracious mystery, a part and interest in Eden."¹ For the Cherubim had, it was plain, such access afforded to them; indeed, this privilege was exclusively theirs. The flaming sword, which turned every way to keep the way of the Tree of Life, precluded the approach of all others. This igneous appearance was, doubtless, the Divine glory manifested with the Cherubim on other occasions, and although in one aspect terrible, in another, it must have been of a benignant character, attaching the exiles of Eden still more to that locality, and to "the presence of Jehovah" there manifested.²

That the ideas thus described, whether fully apprehended or not during the primeval age, to the close of which by the Deluge the symbolism of Eden probably continued, or amid the fuller disclosures of the patriarchal period, were such as the arrangements in question were meant to convey, is evident from the light which subsequent Scripture sheds upon the subject, and to which reference must here be made, inasmuch as the Cherubim appear again at later stages under the Mosaic dispensation.

From the information conveyed in nearly the concluding chapters of the sacred volume regarding the nature and functions of those mysterious creatures first introduced at the very commencement of the economy of redemption, and its

¹ Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, Pt. iv., p. 114.

² There is no foundation whatever in Scripture for the notion that the cherubim were emblems only of exclusive and prohibitory power; or, as ex-

pressed by the writer of the article *Cherubim*, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i., p. 301, that they "had no dealings with men, save to awe and repel." See Hardwick, *loc. cit.*, p. 112.

authentic record, the following facts may be deduced:—1. They occupy the immediate neighbourhood of God's throne, (Rev. iv. 6 ; v. 6 ; vii. 11). 2. The throne which they thus encompass is closely related to the throne of grace, and the atonement through the sacrifice of the Lamb, (Rev. iv. 3 ; v. 6). 3. They take the lead in the acts of adoration and praise, (Rev. v. 8). And 4. It is expressly stated that they were redeemed. In unison with the elders, the four living ones declare, in praise of the Lamb: "Thou art worthy . . . for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth,"¹ (Rev. v. 9, 10). Without adverting to all the important points here brought together, forming so many connecting links in the successive forms of the one Divine dispensation, notice may be taken of the regal and priestly rank of these living ones—the former of which functions was pre-eminently assigned to, and discharged by Adam before the fall, when invested with lordship over the creation, while the two, as here, were ascribed to the Israelites as the peculiar people of Jehovah, and types of the redeemed. Notice also may be taken of the fact, that the kingdom of these living ones is the earth, in reference, it may be, to the charge given to man at the first, "subdue" the earth, which certainly had respect to a moral and spiritual dominion no less than a physical one—the latter being only a symbol of the former.

In addition to these notices of the Cherubim, or Apocalyptic living creatures with which the representations in the visions of Ezekiel, though not so explicit, yet generally correspond, it further appears that access to the tree of life, from which fallen man had been excluded, and which, by the new Edenic constitution, was, as above stated, the peculiar privilege of the Cherubim, seen to have been the representatives of man redeemed, is declared to be a final end of redemption—a blessing awarded to the conqueror over evil. "To him that

¹ This passage greatly perplexes such as deny that the cherubim, who they allow, were identical with the living creatures of the Apocalypse, represented the redeemed. Bähr takes no notice of it; while Hengstenberg's exposition is exceedingly forced. On Revelation, vol. i., p. 239.

overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God," (Rev. ii. 7); and to those who have obeyed the commands of God: "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. xxii. 14). It is here plainly intimated that the blessed immunities forfeited in Adam are restored by Christ; and so the almost initial announcements of revelation are thus brought into a most remarkable connexion with those afforded at the very close of the scheme.¹

With these later representations, both of the place and the character of the Cherubim, the ideas antecedently deducible from the purpose which, it would seem, they accomplished in the Levitical tabernacle, fully correspond. Occupying a place in that apartment of the sacred tent which was the peculiar residence of the covenant God of Israel, and standing upon the mercy-seat or propitiatory, which covered the Ark of the Covenant, they formed the support of the shekinah, or cloud of glory, in which Jehovah was symbolically present. The place which they thus held was one where everything spoke of grace and redemption, but whither there was access only through blood. Accordingly, if these figures were, as above shown, symbolical of the redeemed from among men through the blood of the Lamb, (Rev. v. 9,) their place in the immediate presence of God was a type and a pledge of the efficacy of that blood as an atoning medium.

Viewed thus, the Cherubim occupy an identical place in the successive stages of that one dispensation of grace, at the commencement of which they first made their appearance. They linked together the several portions of Divine revelation into one harmonious whole, by giving expression, though with continually increasing fulness and explicitness, to the same truths relative to the Divine purposes concerning man, and particularly the issues of that interposition first announced in the promise of the Seed of the Woman, and in which from the very first the eye of faith, as already remarked, discerned life amid the death and disorder introduced by sin. Again, these mysterious creatures of the earthly paradise appear pro-

¹ Fairbairn, *Typology*, i. 219.

minently also in the heavenly, where grace has issued into glory, and from which death and the curse have been for ever excluded, (Rev. xxi. 4 ; xxii. 3.) and where all is life, even the river which watered the garden of old being here raised to the character of "a pure river of water of life," (Rev. xxii. 1).¹

§ 2. *The Death of Abel, and the Translation of Enoch.*

The first birth and the first death in the primeval family were events which must have been productive of deep, but exceedingly varied impressions. The impression made on the first mother by the former of these incidents, is fully indicated by the terms—"I have gotten a man"—in which she regarded her "acquisition," and exulted that "a man" was born into the world. It needed, on the other hand, no statement to convey the poignancy of sorrow which the first breach in their family must, in any circumstances, have occasioned to the parents of mankind, but particularly under the very trying dispensation in which the sad event occurred. If the birth of Cain was calculated to confirm the faith of the first parents in the blessings to be conveyed through the promise of the woman's seed, by affording a visible and substantial token of the idea which Adam entertained with respect to his wife, as "the mother of all living;" the death of Abel, on the contrary, must have recalled most powerfully that sentence, now for the first time presented as a reality, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Nevertheless, there were undoubted elements in this case, exceedingly painful though it was, fitted to show more vividly than ever that the life concerning which Adam cherished such expectations, was not dependent on outward or accidental circumstances, but continued, notwithstanding an apparent interruption, essentially undisturbed.

With death and organic dissolution, so far as regarded the lower creation, whether as the result of natural disease or of violence, the men of the primeval world must have been

¹ See further, on the subject of the cherubim, Bähr, *Symbolik*, i. 340-361; Fairbairn, *Typology*, i. 222-248; and for the earlier views, Vitringa, *Observationes Sacræ*, Lib. iv., cap. 1, 2, pp. 873-908. Jenæ, 1723.

early familiar. Instances of death under the latter circumstances they must have witnessed, were it only in the sacrifices which they were wont to present; and an organic dissolution equally complete, they must have been aware, also awaited man. There were, however, various considerations connected with the return of man to the dust, of which, antecedent to any case of the kind, little note would most likely be taken, and which, indeed, the mind may have been willing to postpone, until forced upon the attention by the unexpected and premature death of Abel. Now, for the first time, the thoughts would be fully concentrated on the grave, and whatever prospects might be opened up beyond it. These things would unquestionably form the subject of meditation, to be constantly renewed whenever one object after another called up the memory of the departed. As with the birth of Cain a new social relation originated, and one which, by the parental offices and affections which it called into exercise, served, in a manner, to link the mind to earth and things present, so through the death of Abel an idea entered in, powerfully fitted to associate man with the relations and realities of the unseen world, and to produce, accordingly, more correct conceptions with respect to any revelations regarding that scene of existence. This cruel severance of the closest of earthly ties did undoubtedly cast a darker shadow than any hitherto felt on the allotted path of toil, (Gen. iii. 19,) by verifying most painfully its accompanying and terminating sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." It showed how pitiable was the end of all the labour which a man taketh under the sun, (Eccles. i. 3,) or which his fallen condition has imposed upon him; but it must also have shown that there was some good beyond, else alike pitiable was the end of a religion where faith and hope were only illusory, and equally so the foundation on which they rested.

There was this special peculiarity in the case of Abel, which must have made its lessons all the more striking. Had the first victim of death been Cain, who, according to the history, cherished anything but proper feelings either towards God or to his brother, after God had shown that He did not approve of the service which he proffered; or had it been any of Cain's God-denying and God-forgetting descendants, it

might be regarded as the proper retribution of their sins, and accordingly death would present only its dark aspect. Not so, however, when the very first who passed under its dismal shadow was one of an entirely opposite character, and who had only shortly before been recognised in some special, unmistakeable manner, as a man to whom, and to whose religious services, Jehovah had respect. And not only so, but there was this additional circumstance, already adverted to, that while the accepted of God is taken away in the very morning of his days, the rejected and fratricide is allowed to live on, propagating the race and building cities.

These considerations must have been suggestive of correct ideas, both of the nature of death, and of the state beyond it. This particular dispensation of Divine Providence, if it did not open up views of an hereafter, and its concomitant retributions, must, it is easy to conceive, have powerfully undermined all faith in the equity of the Divine administration, or the value to be attached to the Divine favour, as exhibiting either an indifference or an impotency in God to secure happiness for such as he had acknowledged as his people. There is ample evidence, however, from the manner in which the parents of the human race regarded the death of Abel, at the time of Seth's birth, that they had no misgiving on these points. So far from manifesting any weakness of faith, or cherishing doubts as to the Divine character and administration, there was every indication that their reliance on God's faithfulness was more implicit than before.¹ It is, therefore, only reasonable to conclude that they must have discerned a bright side in that trying dispensation, which made it still compatible with the idea of life which they had so strongly cherished, and which now assured them of a victory not only over the Serpent, the author of evil, but also over death and the grave.

Moreover, any questions which might arise in connexion with the early and violent death of Abel, would in all probability find a solution in the subsequent remarkable history of Enoch. Of this patriarch it is said: "And Enoch walked with God . . . and all the days of Enoch were three hundred

¹ See below, Chap. iv., Sect. i., § 1.

sixty and five years." With the exception of Abel, he was the most short-lived of the fathers of the old world; but then the usual formula, "and he died," which invariably accompanies their several histories, is wanting in this case, and instead of it, is added, "And Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him" (Gen. v. 22, 24).

The life of faith which Enoch led, described as "walking with God," was obviously of a far higher form than usual; an approximation in a greater degree to the communion of heaven than to the ordinary and frequently marred fellowship with God upon the earth. It was a renewal of the interrupted converse which originally subsisted between heaven and earth, when, according to the very term (הִלְכָה) here employed, God "*walked*," according to His custom, in the garden of Eden (chap. iii. 8). Still it was not peculiar to Enoch; for Noah also, who "found grace in the eyes of Jehovah," is said to have "walked with God" (chap. vi. 8, 9). And although the language does not indicate the same closeness of fellowship and community of feeling as the terms employed respecting Enoch, Abraham too was directed to "walk before" God, and he himself refers to this as a characteristic of his life; and Jacob afterwards mentions it as distinguishing his fathers Abraham and Isaac (Gen. xvii. 1; xxiv. 40; xlviii. 15). From all that is stated of Enoch, it would, however, appear that he lived even more than any of these under the power of the world to come. Still the peculiarity in his case is, that in some remarkable manner he passed away from among his contemporaries without being subjected to the common fate of the race. "He was not," (לֹא הָיָה, comp. Gen. xlii. 13, 36; Job vii. 8); he suddenly disappeared, as Delitzsch¹ observes, without sickness, death, or burial; "for God took him." The God with whom he walked took him to himself.²

Whatever obscurity may be supposed to attach to the terms in which this incident is described, the reader cannot fail to notice that the narrative purported that Enoch's removal from the earth was in a manner quite different from that of the other antediluvian patriarchs. Whatever may have been the precise circumstances, the sudden disappearance of a man so eminent

¹ Die Genesis ausgelegt, p. 220.

² Heidegger, Hist. Patriar. i. 259.

for piety must have made a deep impression on his contemporaries. If, as the Mosaic statement is interpreted in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Enoch was translated, that he should not see death" (Heb. xi. 5), the fact of his translation must in all probability have been known at the time, just as in the subsequent case of Elijah, of which certain pre-intimations had been given (2 Kings ii. 3). If so, there was thus furnished to men's senses a visible proof of another state of existence awaiting the pious. It has been remarked: "As the fate of Abel was an argument addressd to the reason of mankind, so the translation of Enoch was a proof to their senses, as it were, of another state of life."¹ Or it may have been that his departure was unobserved by human eye; possibly it was as unseen as it was sudden, still the very absence of so remarkable a man in a manner so mysterious that the only admissible conclusion which could be come to was, that "God had taken him," must have acted far more potently in conveying instructions regarding a future state, and even a resurrection of the body, as also other important truths,² than any mere dogmatical statements on these subjects, however clear or expressive.

§ 3. *Other Indications of a Future State, and of Belief in that Doctrine.*

Following the historical order, the next intimation bearing on this subject is an expression of Abraham on the occasion of his proceeding to carry out the sacrifice of Isaac. This, it will be found, indicates the patriarch's belief in the possibility at least of a resurrection in general, and its certainty in the case of the heir of promise, whom he had already given up as dead: "And Abraham said unto his young men, Abide ye here with the ass, and I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you" (Gen. xxii. 5). Isaac's return is here as confidently promised by the patriarch as his own. Was this statement made merely with the view of quieting any uneasiness of the servants, while the speaker

¹ Peters, Critical Dissertation on the Book of Job, p. 272. Lond. 1754.

² See Heidegger, Hist. Patriar. i. 263; and also Pareus, In Genesim Commentarius, pp. 680-684. Francof. 1604.

knew that he gave a promise which could not be realized,¹ or was he cherishing any secret expectations that the sacrifice would be countermanded? Neither of these suppositions can for a moment be entertained. The only explanation possible in the circumstances is that given in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Abraham "accounted that God was able to raise up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure" (Heb. xi. 19); the first part of the statement is general,² and is not to be limited to Isaac, as in the Eng. version, by the supplement *him*—"to raise *him* up." This, and various other incidents in the lives of the Israelitish patriarchs, fully warranted the notices contained in the same Epistle as to their belief in a future and heavenly state. The whole course of their lives, as narrated in Genesis, showed how much they lived under the influence of the future; and in particular, that "they desired" a better country, that is, a heavenly,"—a country better than that of Abraham's nativity, which he abandoned at the call of God; better than Canaan, the promised home of his posterity; in short, better than any earthly territory; for they confessed that they were "strangers and pilgrims" on the earth.

An expression of frequent occurrence, in reference to the death of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, (Gen. xxv. 8; xxxv. 29; xlix. 33.) and others, is, "He was gathered to his people." This, also, is an indubitable testimony that the doctrine of a future state was taught in the Pentateuch. That this phraseology is not to be interpreted as merely intimating, as frequently alleged, the disposal of the body of the deceased in the family sepulchre, will be evident from various considerations. First, this other fact is also distinctly stated in the various passages just quoted, and the difference of the terms is very marked. In the case of Jacob the two ideas are especially distinct, as a considerable interval elapsed between his death and burial; yet, immediately on his "giving up the ghost," it is added, "and he was gathered to his people." In

¹ Pareus: "Videtur simulatione et mendacio non carere ejus sermo."—Com. in Genesisin, p. 1284. So also Calvin. How much better Baumgarten: "It is the expression of the hope which Abra-

ham could not abandon."—Theol. Com. i. 227. Compare Heidegger, Hist. Pat. ii. 290. ² Delitzsch, Der Brief an die Hebräer, p. 558. Leip. 1857.

the case of Abraham, again, whose bones never mingled with those of his ancestors, having been preceded in the cave of Machpelah only by his wife, the expression, if limited to the mere disposal of the body, would be exceedingly inappropriate. And still more so as applied to Aaron (Num. xx. 24) and to Moses, (Deut. xxxii. 50.) both of whom were buried where none of their kindred ever reposed.¹ Further, in cases where the historian refers merely to the fact of interment, he simply states, they died and were buried, (see Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6, and Gen. l. 24-26, compared with Josh. xxiv. 29, 30). The two ideas are combined in the notice of the death of David, (1 Kings ii. 10,) although the expression is different from that used in the Pentateuch: וַיִּשָׁבב עִם־אֲבוֹתָיו, "*He lay with his fathers,* and was buried in the city of David." The former expression may refer subsequently more to the disposal of the body; it being afterwards a matter of great consideration for the Israelitish monarchs to be laid in the sepulchres of the kings, but it evidently cannot be so understood here.

With this idea of an assemblage of the departed was closely connected the term "Sheol," the place of the departed, often but erroneously rendered the *grave*.² The first occurrence of this term is in Gen. xxxvii. 35, where Jacob, refusing to be comforted for the loss of Joseph, declared, "I will go down into Sheol unto my son mourning." The patriarch here expresses his expectation of a union with Joseph, of being associated with him in place and condition. That he did not allude to the grave as answering to this expectation, must be evident from the fact, that he considered Joseph had been devoured by wild beasts—a circumstance in itself which precluded the thought of his being joined with him in burial. In another instance reference is made to persons, by a Divine judgment, going down *alive* into Sheol, (Num. xvi. 30, 33). These, and numerous other instances, prove that Sheol designated a place where it was supposed the dead were congre-

¹ Boettcher, De Inferis, vol. i., p. 56. Dresden. 1846.

² Psalm cxli. 7 has been adduced as an instance where such is its signification, (Jour. Sac. Lit. Ap., 1857, p. 178).

This is doubtful. According to Hengstenberg, "the bones are scattered, as it were, at the mouth of Sheol, into which the souls have descended."—Com. on Psalms, iii. 514.

gated in a state of consciousness,¹ the character of which, as respected happiness or misery, depended on the previous conduct of the individuals. This is plainly intimated in the prayer of Balaam: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my latter end be like his," (Num. xxiii. 10). This language expressed the conviction, that while death was, in itself, an event common to all, there was yet an important distinction in the death of those of whom God approved, (נִפְתָּר, comp. Deut. xii. 24,) which made it desirable to participate in such a lot.² The truth to which Balaam here gave utterance, had been already not obscurely intimated in the history of Enoch, for that patriarch's walking with God is placed so designedly and emphatically in connexion with his translation to God, as to declare that for the pious there is an everlasting life and walk with God—an enjoyment arising from communion with him.

Indeed, in all his dealings with his people as recorded in the Pentateuch, God revealed himself so full of grace, entered into such intimate relations with them, that the connexion could not be regarded as of a temporary character. On the contrary, there was here a pledge that He would preserve them to eternal life, so that with the doctrine of a future state, so far as it was revealed, there was always connected that of retributions. The former is nowhere conceived of as a bare immortality. Its character was determined not only by the considerations already adverted to, but also by the doctrine of temporal retributions, which none will question is largely declared in the Pentateuch; so much, indeed, that many have concluded that this is the only kind of retributions held forth in the law. The doctrine of temporal retributions constitutes a foundation for immortality, and the retributions therewith connected. It does so from the obvious fact, that retribution is only imperfectly carried out in this world, as

¹ Boettcher, *De Inferis*, vol. i., p. 72. *Sheol. Jour. Sac. Lit.*, Oct. 1856, p. 118.

² Menasseh Ben Israel, *De Resur. Mort.*, pp. 69, 70. See also Alexander, *Connexion*, p. 116. Warburton's paraphrase of this passage is a notable specimen of jejune criticism: "Let me

die in a mature old age, after a life of health and peace, with all my posterity flourishing about me; as was the lot of the righteous observers of the law."—*Divine Leg. of Moses*, B. vi. 3, vol. iii., 140. Lond. 1846.

was strikingly exemplified in the history of Cain and Abel, already noticed, as well as in numerous other instances occurring in the Pentateuch, and therefore requires another scene for its completion, and for correcting those apparent irregularities which may attend its exercise here.

As further bearing on the subject of a future state may be noticed the charge prohibiting the Israelites from making cuttings in their flesh for the dead,—a prohibition deemed of so much importance that it is thrice repeated in the law (Lev. xix. 28; xxi. 5; Deut. xiv. 1, 2). In the last passage it is given most fully: “Ye are the children of the Lord your God; ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead.” Then follows the reason for this injunction: “For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth.”

Among various nations of antiquity, it was customary to give expression to grief for the dead in the most passionate form, plucking out the hair of the head and the beard, and even lacerating the person.¹ And notwithstanding the charge to the contrary, similar customs prevailed extensively among the Hebrews themselves during the decline of the monarchy (Jer. xvi. 6). Laceration of the person marked the worship of Moloch and Baal (1 Kings xviii. 28); but there seems to be no connexion between these practices and the extravagant expressions of grief for the dead referred to in the law. The former were, doubtless, connected with false apprehensions of the Supreme Being; while the latter, in all likelihood, sprung from mistaken views of a future state. If so, the purpose of the law on this subject may have been to admonish the Israelites that their peculiar relation to God was not limited to this life, or liable to interruption by death; and they were therefore called upon to avoid a practice which ill accorded with such convictions. Such is the view entertained of this precept by some of the Jewish writers themselves;² and it is worthy of

¹ Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum*, Lib. II., cap. xiii., p. 322. Hagæ, 1686.

² Manasseh Ben-Israel: “Nolite eum in modum lugere ac plangere mortuorum, qui in vita sua vobis cari fuere,

quasi plane interiissent, uti vas aliquod figulinum, quod confractum, redintegrari non potest.”—*De Resur. Mortuorum*, pp. 70, 71.

remark, that even Spencer, who will not be charged with entertaining extravagant conceptions of the spirituality of the law, admits that there is here reference to a future life.¹ It may be some confirmation of this view, that the Roman laws of the Twelve Tables enjoined the moderation of grief at funerals, and in particular forbade lacerating the flesh for the dead,—a prohibition supposed to be grounded on the hopes entertained by the Romans of a future though natural life. The Mosaic admonition may thus correspond to that of the New Testament: “Now I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope” (1 Thess. iv. 13). The characteristic which is here required to mark the Christian believer is only a higher form of what was formerly expected of God’s ancient covenant people.

It was an abuse of the belief of an existence after death that led to the practice of necromancy, which, judging from the express prohibitions on that subject occurring in the Mosaic law (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, 27; Deut. xviii. 9-12; comp. 1 Sam. xxviii. 7-11) must have been very prevalent. Such an abuse of the truth, however, plainly assumed that the Israelites, during the Mosaic age, held that the human soul, after death, existed in a state of consciousness, and in the possession of various powers. It thus adds to the other evidence, already adduced, that the doctrine in question is not only taught in the Mosaic writings, but that it was also received by the Israelites from the earliest times.

True, the doctrine may not be directly or dogmatically stated, but that is only in accordance with the general method of the Pentateuch, which usually conveys its doctrinal truths in the historical notices, or through the religious institutions with which it is concerned. Nor does it in the least disprove the existence of the doctrine in that work, if, as alleged by Whitby,² Warburton,³ and others, the Israelites deduced it

¹ Spencer: “Curavit Deus, ut populus ejus leges aliquas dolori suo figeret, et sic amissos defferet, ut ipsa luctus sui in moderatione testatum daret, se vitæ futuræ spem et providentiæ divinæ

fidem retinere.”—*Leg. Heb.*, lib. i. 13, § 2, p. 326.

² Com. on New Testament; note on 2 Tim. i. 10.

³ Divine Legation, vol. iii. 153.

more as an inference from other truths than from any direct statements, for if the inference was correct, there certainly must have been some ground for it in their Scriptures. The doctrine was thus, anyhow, there; and there need be no controversy as to the manner in which it was communicated. Still this, with the complementary doctrine of the resurrection, was not at all doubtfully expressed by the intimations afforded of man's original and prospective relation to God, some of which have been already considered, and on others a few remarks will here be subjoined.

Thus, for conveying to the readers of the Pentateuch the doctrine of a future state, no representation could be more expressive than the statement that man was created "in the image of God," with the further notice, that his person was constituted of a body formed from "the dust of the ground," and an animating principle derived from the "breath" or "spirit" of the Creator, and which in its totality formed the Divine image. Now, if the argument deducible from this statement have any value as a proof of the permanency of one part of this complex structure, it must apply equally to the other, for the idea of the image of God does not consist in either of the parts singly, or in a state of segregation, but only in the two in a state of union and activity.

The same truth is further affirmed by the character of God, as exhibited in the Pentateuch, and especially by the relation which, it was represented, He sustained to his people as their God. This is the argument employed by our Lord with the Sadducees for proving not merely the doctrine of immortality, but also the resurrection of the dead. In this argument it was intimated, in the first place, to those Jewish sceptics, that the ground of their unbelief consisted in their not duly recognising the Divine Omnipotence in its bearing on this Scriptural doctrine. "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God," (Matt. xxii. 29). But this omnipotence appears there not as a mere abstract energy, but as the power of a personal God, as He is revealed from the very commencement of the Pentateuch, which is the earliest record of his dealings with his people, and of the origin of his relation to them as their God. And next, our Lord argues: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have

ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," (ver. 31, 32). The arguments and illustrations are here taken entirely from the Pentateuch. As recorded by Mark, (chap. xii. 26) there is brought out more distinctly the fact of the reference to "the book of Moses;" and in Luke xx. 38, to the notice of God's relation to his people, is added: "for all live unto him," showing more clearly its mutual character.

The relation of God to these patriarchs, it is intimated, had not ceased on their departure hence; it was not temporary, but permanent. On this account, long after their decease, God still designated himself their God; and conversely, it is implied, that the very use of such a designation required the continued existence of those to whom God thus stood related. The expressions, Θεός νεκρῶν, and ζώντων, are not to be referred to the *mass* of the dead and of the living respectively, but to the patriarchs mentioned; and the whole should be rendered, "God is not a God of dead persons—since he calls himself the God of Abraham, after Abraham's death—but of those who are living." Then the idea added by Luke is strikingly appropriate: "for all live to him." For, after the relation of God to his people has been pointed out as expressed in his name, attention is directed to *their* relation to Him; and in this union they enjoy the "immortality" of Him who alone essentially possesses it. (1 Tim. vi. 16).¹

From the argument of our Lord on this occasion, an important light is shed on the first announcement in the decalogue, "I am the Lord thy God," (Ex. xx. 2). This declaration obviously embraces the same fundamental principle as that just considered, with this addition, that it is here presented under peculiar circumstances, and with a wider application. The relation into which God entered with the patriarchs, when He was "not ashamed to be called their God," (Heb. xi. 16), is here extended to the several members of their posterity; and it is of the more importance from the very place which its announcement occupies, introductory to, and constituting the very foundation of the law in its covenant form, and of

¹ Olshausen, Gospels, E. T., vol. iii., p. 196. Edin. 1849.

the whole Mosaic economy. The very law, which in one aspect was "found to be unto death," (Rom. vii. 10,) contained in it, as announced from Sinai, the seed of immortality, and the assurance of a resurrection. The Mosaic economy was thus seen presenting a promise and a pledge of everlasting blessedness to all who stood in a covenant relation to God.¹

How this truth, thus variously presented, operated in ages long prior to that of Moses, has been already seen, in regard both to the death of Abel, and the trial of Abraham when called to offer Isaac. The latter was a particularly notable case. And it is important to observe how the very difficulty to reconcile the object of his journey to the land of Moriah with the expectations cherished regarding Isaac, not unwarrantably, but upon God's own word, may have itself supplied the ground of assurance which was expressed in the terms, "We will come again to you." These, as already remarked, were not mere words used to quiet the minds of the attendants, or to stop further inquiry. They were the expression of the patriarch's firm conviction, though he might not venture, perhaps, to suggest even to himself the precise mode whereby his expectations should be verified. He had evidently no thought when he said to his son, "God will provide a lamb for a burnt-offering," that the victim should be any other than Isaac himself; and yet he cherished the conviction that he should be restored even from the ashes of the altar. The expiration of "the breath of life," the pouring out of the life-blood by the sacrificial knife, or even the dissipation of the elements of the body by the fire of the altar—a dissipation more marked and complete than that arising from mingling with its original dust, presented, it would appear, no insuperable obstacle to Abraham's faith in a resurrection. This was his support in the discharge of the trying duty imposed upon him, and a solution of the difficulties suggested by the very promises antecedently made to him regarding Isaac. He accounted "that God was able to raise from the dead;" and so

¹ Witsius: "Quando Deus hominis peccatoris Deus sit, tunc sit illi quod sibi ipsi est. Quid autem est sibi ipsi? Sine dubio fons aeternae et consummatae beatitudinis. Deus quum se ipsum

ex gratia homini donat, donat ei omnia. Nam ipse est omnia."—*Œconomia Fœderum*, Lib. iii. 2, § 5, p. 200. Leovard. 1677.

he avoided the error with respect to Divine Omnipotence, which was seen to lie at the root of the Sadducean scepticism touching the resurrection.

In the promise of the land of Canaan made to Abraham, in the words, "All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed," and "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee," &c. (Gen. xiii. 15 ; xvii. 8) ; and repeated in similar terms to Isaac and Jacob (xxvi. 3 ; xxxv. 12), some writers find an additional intimation of a future life. A personal possession being promised to each of the patriarchs successively, while actually they never obtained any inheritance in the land, it is therefore argued that this "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."¹ That the patriarchs entertained such convictions, and that they recognised Canaan as the type of "a better country, that is, an heavenly" (Heb. xi. 16), can admit of no question ; and for such a belief sufficient ground was given in the considerations already adverted to. It is, however, very problematical whether it was at all promoted by any distinction discernible between the expressions "to thee," and "to thy seed." For, in the first place, the terms of the promise vary ; the reference being sometimes only to Abraham's seed (Gen. xii. 7), and at other times only to himself (chap. xv. 7) ; and yet, on the ratification of the covenant which followed the latter announcement, it is added, "In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land" (ver. 18). But it is of more importance to observe, that it is not to be supposed that any of the patriarchs entertained the idea that they should personally possess Canaan, as expressed in the promise. Indeed, Abraham was distinctly informed that it was not until the fourth generation that his posterity should be put into possession of it (Gen. xv. 13, &c.), and therefore no incongruity, such as has been suggested from not obtaining a personal possession, was likely to be felt. The explanation of the promises of the land to the patriarchs them-

¹ Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. i. p. 351.

selves is found in the relation which, as remarked in another case, subsists, according to the teaching of the Pentateuch, between parents and children.

It is unnecessary to pursue the subject further, for sufficient evidence has been adduced to prove that the doctrines of a future state and a resurrection are taught in the Pentateuch, and were believed from the earliest times. It may, however, be noticed in conclusion, that the considerations on which it is chiefly attempted to establish an opposite view are : 1. That the primary and more prominent sanction of the Mosaic legislation was temporal rewards and punishments ; and 2. That it is expressly stated in the New Testament, as a distinguishing feature of the new dispensation, that Christ "brought life and immortality to light in the gospel" (2 Tim. i. 10).

With regard to the first of these arguments, it may be well to remark, 1. That as applied to the prejudice of the law, it proceeds somehow on the assumption that temporal retribution is antagonistic to or excludes future retribution. So far from there being any antagonism of this kind, the two are quite compatible, and temporal retribution is as explicitly presented in the New Testament as in any passage of the Old, and in conjunction with future retribution (1 Tim. iv. 8). Indeed, the former is the necessary foundation of the latter. Without belief in the one there can be no faith in the other.¹ It was of the utmost importance, then, at the very first stages of revelation, firmly to establish the doctrine of outward retribution, preparatory to the fuller disclosures reserved for an after period. As has been remarked, "It was the primary aim of the religion of the Hebrews to plant deeply in man's heart, and that by painful and protracted discipline, the grand conception of God's perfect truthfulness, and the unswerving justice of His rule; and never till this object was attained could faith in immortality, as now unveiled to us by Christ and the Apostles, have been fostered in the church of God to any salutary purpose."² 2. It is also to be noticed that the fact of the Mosaic code being intended for the regulation of the national, no less than the individual life, necessarily gave

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, E. T. ii. 487.

² Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, Pt. iv. p. 141.

a prominence to the doctrine of temporal retribution, especially in such passages as Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii., for communities as such can be affected in no other way. 3. While, however, temporal retribution constituted a very prominent feature in the law, it is an entire mistake to assume that such formed its primary sanction. The teaching of the Pentateuch on that point was to be gathered from the notice of the original establishment of the law in Eden, and which, presented afresh in the several intimations above considered of the doctrine of immortality, was assumed throughout, and is found, indeed, to be identical under the successive dispensations, including equally that of the Gospel.¹

The second argument, again, is even less conclusive. For if the statement be taken absolutely it proves too much; for it would then apply to the Psalms and the prophetic writings, as well as to the Pentateuch, and thus deny that there was any acquaintance with the truths to which it refers up to the time of Christ's ministry,—a view refuted by the Gospel history itself, which shows that, with the exception of the Sadducees, the doctrines of a future state and a resurrection were fully entertained by the Jewish community. It is evident that the statement in 2 Tim. i. 10 must be taken with the same limitation as John i. 17: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," where the contrast points only to the larger exhibition of grace and truth under the Gospel, as the development or embodiment of what the Mosaic economy merely shadowed forth, without at all denying the existence of such under that older dispensation. Indeed all the truths of the New Testament have their root or germ in the Old, and even in the Pentateuch; and it is only from overlooking the harmony which exists between the two parts of the sacred volume that the notion could originate, that any *new* doctrine, strictly speaking, has emanated from our Lord or his Apostles.

¹ See below, Chap. v., Sect. 3.

CHAPTER III.

GOD'S REMEDY FOR FALLEN MAN—i. THE PLAN OF REDEMPTION.

THE preceding chapter had respect chiefly to the general intimations of what man is in his present fallen condition, so different from that in which he was created, and also from that which awaits him in the future, although upon this latter point the Pentateuch afforded comparatively little light. Still the expectations cherished from the earliest period, of the blessings to result from God's promised interposition, were not inoperative. Some, it was seen, recognised in that promise life, or a restoration to the original communion with God; others, a mitigation of those wearisome labours to which the curse laid upon the ground subjected them; while others, again, as the truth gradually unfolded itself, discerned in it a deliverance from all troubles, and in that expectation, "waited for the salvation of Jehovah." This, however viewed, was the great foundation on which hope rested, and which, while it supported the pious amid their trials and difficulties, directed their longings to the future as that which should witness its realization. It thus constituted the most distinguishing characteristic of that revelation which God was pleased to make of Himself; the centre from which all the other purposes revealed in the Pentateuch issued, or towards which all its truths converged, for the whole economy, both in its history and legislation, was engaged in effecting this purpose.

The announcement of redemption, or the deliverance of man from the state to which his transgression of God's law reduced him, was, as already shown, made immediately after

the fall, so that both the ruin and the recovery are embraced in the same Scriptural narrative. Questions, however, would immediately arise in connexion with this subject as regards the time, and also the manner of the realization of the promised results, on which, particularly the latter, some information, it may be presumed, would, from the first, be indispensable.

With regard to the time, the earlier announcements, it is apparent, gave no intimation, and when revelation began to shed its light on this particular, it was only to show that it was distant, and that previous to its advent there must be various protracted preparations. On the mode of redemption, the early prophecies may be said to be almost equally silent. The person by whom the work should be accomplished was clearly set forth in his relation to the transgressors, when he was described as the seed of the woman; but, with regard to the mode of action, which it was seen needed to be of a nature to harmonize God's declarations and acts, his threatening against sin, and his dispensing mercy to sinners, nothing further is stated than that, while inflicting a deadly wound on the serpent, the Redeemer and representative of mankind must himself submit to suffering. The information wanting in the prophecy is, however, supplied through those ordinances by which sinners were permitted and enabled to draw near to, and maintain communion with God. Without anticipating the remarks necessary to set this truth in its proper light, it must be obvious that what was required in man's peculiar circumstances, feeling he had to do with law and a moral Governor, was not so much, or at least exclusively, an assurance of the overthrow of the Power of evil, as the knowledge of the way of reconciliation with an offended God, through satisfaction to His righteous claims.

Accordingly, the very next point to be examined in connexion with the evolution of the Divine purposes respecting man is the light which the Pentateuch affords as to the method or plan of redemption, in the historical order in which this and other truths were presented from time to time; first prior to the law, and then under it, when the doctrine was at once raised to a far higher position than before.

SECT. I. INTIMATIONS OF THE PLAN OF REDEMPTION PRIOR TO
THE LAW.

Cloppenburg, *Schola Sacrificiorum Patriarchalium*, Opera i., pp. 7-68. Amstel. 1684.—Deyling, *De Sacrificiis Habelis atque Caini*; *Observationes Sacre*, vol. ii. pp. 53-70. Lips. 1737.—Faber, *Treatise on the Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice*. Lond. 1827.

The Hebrew ceremonial law was exceedingly complicated; its ordinances were so numerous, diversified, and exacting, as to render it an intolerable yoke to those who were subjected to it, (Acts xv. 10). Nor is it a matter of surprise that, from ignorance or misapprehension of its purposes in the economy of redemption, many should deem such an institution unworthy of God, and undeserving the prominence given to it in what purports to be a revelation of his will. It certainly does at first sight appear strange that a larger space is devoted to such details as those which relate to the construction of the Levitical sanctuary, and the arrangement of its various appendages, than to the creation of the world, and its history for several thousand years.¹ Yet this itself is suggestive of the inquiry, Whether this seeming disproportion may not find a satisfactory explanation in the fact that those, in themselves trivial matters, have a more intimate bearing on the object of revelation than the most extended history of the universe, with its merely physical and political revolutions. It is also strongly felt by many that the Hebrew ritual, with which the ceremonial ordinances were all more or less connected, contrasts unfavourably with the simplicity and liberty of the gospel, and, as some maintain, even with the greater freedom of patriarchal times; but then, to be estimated aright, it must be viewed not simply in itself, but as part of a system. To consider the Mosaic institutions as entirely new or isolated, would be wholly to miss their purpose; but when viewed as the connecting link between the earlier intimations of Divine grace, and the larger announcements reserved for a time then

¹ See Witsius, *Miscel. Sac.*, Lib. ii., Dis. i., § i., pp. 394, 305. Bähr, *Symbolik*, i. 75, 76.

future, this ritual will be found to vindicate the peculiar form given to it, and its place in the record of redemption.

The central principle in the Mosaic ritual was the ordinance of sacrifice, for on that depended the institution of the priesthood, with everything pertaining to their functions, and their relation to the community. But sacrifice did not originate with the law. It was practised with Divine approbation from the earliest times, although in a simpler form than was afterwards prescribed. It was, however, at all times the great element in the worship of God under the Old Testament, as well prior to as under the law.

§ 1. *The Offerings of Cain and Abel.*

Upon the intimation of the birth of the first two brothers—the sons of Adam—follows a notice of the respective callings to which, on reaching manhood, they betook themselves. Nothing is recorded of their childhood or youth, of the parental instructions, and other matters whereby, as appears from the sequel, their characters were so differently moulded; and even this is mentioned, it would appear, only for its bearing on the account of the offerings which they brought to the Lord, (Gen. iv. 1, 2). Next is a notice of their mode of worship. Their views upon this point are not presented in formal statements regarding the identity or diversity of their belief, but are set forth, according to the usual Scripture method, by a record of certain acts which they performed, the import of which, it was assumed by the writer of Genesis, was perfectly well understood by his Hebrew readers familiar with the laws of sacrifice.

What chiefly deserves attention, in this first notice of primeval worship, is—1. The fact that there was some stated place of public worship. That there was a specific recognised locality where God manifested his presence, is proved by the expression, “*brought an offering to Jehovah,*” (ver. 3); הֵבִיאָה, or its equivalent הֵבִיאָהּ, being the usual Levitical form,¹ (Lev. iv. 5; Isa. xliii. 23). Yet undue stress must not be laid on this; הֵבִיאָהּ may refer as well to a person (1 Sam. ix. 7;

¹ Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii., 305, 306.

xxv. 27) as to a place. But that it is here to be taken locally is evident, when viewed in connexion with Cain's feelings at the prospect of exile, as driven from the face of the earth, and hid from the face of Jehovah, (ver. 14), and the notice: "Cain went out from the presence of Jehovah," מִלְפָּנֵי יְהוָה, compared with לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, (Lev. iv. 15,) the place whither offerings required to be brought. 2. There were stated seasons of public worship. So much is implied in the expression: "It came to pass at the end of days," (מֵאַחַר יָמִים); although it is not easy to determine the precise period thus indicated. The words point to the expiration of a certain time, of longer or shorter duration, (Gen. viii. 6; see also 1 Kings xvii. 7, comp. with xviii. 1,) rendered more definite in Jer. xiii. 6, by the addition of רַבִּים, *many*. In the present instance, some take the reference to be to the week, a cycle which the history of the creation and of the flood shows to have been early in use; but it is more probable that it applies to the year;¹ for such seems to be the import of the expression in 2 Sam. xiv. 26. And 3. There were prescribed rites as to the way of approach to God. This may be inferred with far more certainty than is attainable with regard to either of the preceding conclusions; but as this leads to that debatable subject—the origin of animal sacrifice—such observations as it may be necessary to offer had better be postponed, until the nature of the first recorded offerings be considered, and the Divine judgment passed upon them.

It may, however, be premised, that admitting religion to be in a sense natural to man, springing out of his necessities, intellectual and moral, so that he must worship, it is, nevertheless, a first principle in revelation, that such service only is acceptable to God as accords with his own prescribed rule (Matt. xv. 9). It is therefore antecedently improbable that man was ever left to his own devices in this important matter. The divine origin of sacrifice is certainly not expressly stated in Scripture; nor is this strange considering the place it held in patriarchal worship, and in the ritual of those to whom the Bible was primarily addressed; but it may be concluded from considerations to be presently adduced, that sacrifice was an

¹ L. Capellus, *Notæ Criticæ*. p. 331.

institution of Paradise, and so from the fall a part of primeval worship. It is no valid objection to this view that no mention is made of any sacrifice offered by Adam; for there is no notice whatever of any act of worship by the parents of mankind, and yet it would be unwarrantable to conclude that they never engaged in such. The practice is mentioned only in the history of Cain and Abel, probably because the principle involved in such acts was more distinctly brought to view by the diversity of the offerings. Even here it is only incidentally noticed, and because of the important consequences to which on this occasion it led. The Divine precept, if such there was, did not, it may be presumed, so much enjoin animal oblations as point out the import of the rite, leaving it to the sinner's own convictions to avail himself of it, as he deemed needful. If so, Cain's procedure was less the violation of a command than the disparagement of a proffered remedy. However this may be, this was probably the first time that the sons of Adam presented offerings in their own persons. The offerings were evidently contemporaneous, and were, doubtless, presented directly by the brothers themselves; the occasion being some epoch or anniversary in their history.

The offerings of the two brothers are indifferently named *מִנְחָה*, a term which primarily signifies *a present* brought to secure the favour of a superior (Gen. xxxii. 14 [13]; 1 Sam. x. 27; Ps. xlv. 13), here used as the common name of offerings presented to the Lord, though under the law more strictly applicable to the unbloody offerings as contrasted with animal oblations, similar to the distinction in *δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι* (Heb. v. 1). Cain's offering consisted of "the fruits of the ground," the product of his industry and skill as a husbandman. It was thus strictly a *מִנְחָה*; it was one which, in particular cases, was sanctioned under the law; but it is of importance to observe, that it never appears again in the primeval or patriarchal worship; and even the unbloody offerings of the law were really connected with the shedding of blood, the only case, that of extreme poverty, where an animal sacrifice was dispensed with (Lev. v. 11) finding its complement in the acts of the great day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 34). Abel's offering, on the contrary, was an animal sacrifice, consisting of *מִבְּרֹת צֹאנוּ וּמִחֶלְבֵהוּן*, a selection from (*מן*, *partitive*), the first-

lings of his flock, and from (or, namely, 1, *explicative*), the fat of them,¹ that is, the fattest or best of the firstlings;² and which, although not so stated, must obviously have been slaughtered.

With this great, and, as shall appear, fundamental difference, these acts presented one or two features in common, of which some notice must be taken in order to judge correctly of what constituted their distinctive characters. First, these tokens of religious homage, however different in expression, or in the principles from which they sprung, were preferred to the One adorable Being, who had made himself known as the Author of creation, and also of redemption, and whom the historian names Jehovah. In neither case was there idolatry to provoke the jealousy of Him who will not give his glory to another; nor, so far as yet appears, irreverent profanity. Again, the gifts presented were in both cases the offerer's own property. This is plainly stated as regards Abel; but it is no less implied that Cain's offering of the fruits of the ground was the product of his labour; and so both alike manifested an interest and earnestness in the matter,—indispensable elements in all sacrifice. Like David, they did not offer to the Lord that which cost them nothing (2 Sam. xxiv. 24). And certain it is, that if the history broke off here, or if it did not otherwise harmonize with the scheme of revealed truth, there would be little to warrant the drawing of a broad demarkation between the devotional sentiments of the brothers. If any preference were to be evinced, it would probably be in favour of Cain as the first to engage in this pious exercise, and withal presenting an offering more rational than that of Abel, and more likely to find acceptance with the Deity. But it does not stop here; on the contrary, it carries out these first principles consistently to their legitimate conclusions, and so enables the reader to recognise, at the outset of man's history, the difference between nature and grace as respectively related to the plan of redemption, or the way of a sinner's reconciliation with God.

The origin and import of Cain's offering is explicable on natural principles. Nature teaches that there is a God; that

¹ Gesenius, Grammar, § 155.

² Magee, Atonement, note lx., Works, i. 440. Lond. 1842.

He is to be honoured with our substance, and the first-fruits of our increase (Prov. iii. 9); and Cain's oblation may have been intended as an expression of thanks to a bountiful and beneficent Providence for crowning with blessings his agricultural labours. This reasoning may be readily admitted; but how will it apply to Abel? It is a superficial and unsatisfactory explanation, which maintains that the brothers naturally brought of that which constituted their respective properties: for however that may account for Cain's offering, it entirely fails with regard to Abel, whose sacrifice, it were easy to show, from the unsophisticated perceptions of the human mind, and the primitive simplicity of the period, could not have been suggested by reason, being contrary to the very instincts of a society, as yet unaccustomed to slaughter animals even for food.¹

Admitting, however, that the one case is as explicable on natural grounds as the other, still the fact remains that Abel's offering only was accepted. That the diversity of the offerings sprung from a deeper source than the accidental occupations of the worshippers, and betokened a different state of mind, is shown, apart from other considerations, by the Divine judgment declared regarding them. "And Jehovah had respect to Abel and to his offering; but to Cain and to his offering he had not respect," (ver. 4, 5.) רָאָה "to look," followed as here by לְפָנָיו is to look favourably at, to approve of. From anything apparent in the history, there is nothing to indicate that Cain was at this time what might be called a wicked man, or that his character differed externally from that of his brother. There is nothing to insinuate that he was deficient in his filial and fraternal duties, or in any other moral relation, and should it be assumed that no difference of view is indicated by the different modes of worship, such certainly is marked by the difference of reception. This, it cannot be too emphatically stated, was not through the exercise of mere arbitrary power, or by a display of sovereignty. God's

¹ Grotius, who held that sacrifice was of human origin, found it so difficult to account for animal oblations prior to the deluge, that he denied that the offering of Abel was such; maintaining

that only the milk and the wool of the flock were offered (Annot. in Gen. iv. 4), contrary to the most explicit terms of the narrative. See Heidegger, Hist. Patriar. i. 180, 181.

procedure here presents no anomaly ; but is in strict harmony with the principles which, on the showing of Scripture, uniformly regulate his treatment of sinners, and in accordance with which there has been ever since the fall only one way of acceptable worship.

This, however, reconduets to the point already adverted to, the method of primeval worship, and whether it was prescribed by God. The question, "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God?" (Mic. vi. 6), would have been one of the earliest which pressed on the sinner's convictions, as imperatively demanding a reply, especially after the exclusion from Paradise and the Tree of Life. It is a question, too, on which his own reasonings could throw no satisfactory light. If answered, it must be by God Himself ; and He did so by furnishing both in word and ordinance the needed instruction. He assured man of mercy and of victory over the enemy through whom his ruin had been wrought, and so convincingly that our fallen progenitors relied with implicit confidence on the promise. The victory, it was intimated to them, was to be achieved not by themselves, but by a representative closely related to them, who was himself in some way to suffer in the undertaking (Gen. iii. 15). But with this assurance of a final triumph there was in the promise little or no provision for relief from present guilt, which must have pressed as a heavy burden on the conscience, especially in connexion with the circumstances of the expulsion from Paradise and the location of the Cherubim in the room of the transgressors. But as these measures themselves were certainly designed primarily at least to keep up the remembrance of sin as death and estrangement from God, it was obviously necessary in a revelation of grace that there should be some discovery of the method whereby the attainder could be removed. There is, accordingly, a very probable ground for expecting some such intimation.

Now, mention is made in Gen. iii. 21, of an incident of which no tolerable explanation can be given, if not designed to contribute light as to the way of acceptance and salvation. This is the notice of "coats of skin," as the clothing provided by God for the fallen pair. This it cannot be doubted was a symbolical act. The clothing of our first parents by the hand

of God had respect to more than the investiture of the body ; it was symbolical of spiritual things and a provision for that guilt felt as nakedness or exposure to Divine wrath,¹ (Gen. iii. 7, comp. ii. 25.) Were it merely to supply a physical want, there was no reason why it might not be left to man's own contrivance, or why a suitable vegetable production should not be selected in preference to the skins of animals which necessitated the taking away of life at a time when animal food was not allowed as an article of human diet. Another circumstance is, that no probable account can be given of the way in which the bodies of the animals, the skins of which were thus appropriated, were disposed of, if not offered in sacrifice and consumed upon the altar.² This conclusion is greatly confirmed by various considerations touching the design of sacrifice.

From its very nature and design, as unfolded in Scripture, sacrifice must have been contemporaneous, or nearly so with the first announcement of redemption. Two great principles had been established through man's fall, and God's promise with respect to his restoration : first, that the wages of sin is death. This had been announced in the primal threatening, and its truth had been now fully attested by the sinner's experience. Secondly, that God designed mercy for the fallen. This was expressed in the promise relative to the seed of the woman, and symbolically exhibited in the preservation of the tree of life now associated with the Cherubim. In the Divine purposes thus announced, Adam, as already shown, recognised "life," notwithstanding the condemnation in which he had been involved. He had been somehow enabled to harmonize two directly opposite principles. To contribute to this recognition of the harmony of redemption with the Divine character so necessary a support to faith, there was nothing in the symbolism of Eden prior to or after the fall, if the incident connected with the coats of skin be excepted, and but little direct intimation in the promise itself. The latter indeed announced vengeance to be taken on the Adversary, and also

¹ Cloppenburg, *Schola Sacrificiorum*, cap. ii., § 4. Op. i. p. 11.

² Witsius, *Miscel. Sacr. Lib. ii. 2.* § 12, pp. 462, 463. Magee, *Atonement Works*, i. 454-457.

pointed to the person and the representative character of the Redeemer, and in that view gave an indication of substitution and suffering. The Divine purposes of mercy were fully announced, but it was important to show that this did not violate the other principle already established.

This was no doubt early effected, for some knowledge of this kind was indispensable for the very exercise of mercy. For this purpose there was needed, it may be supposed, a special institution to embody and combine those two ideas, and so to harmonize two principles in themselves antagonistic. This combination was effected by sacrifice, which more than any other ordinance expressly, and by its frequent repetition, continuously exhibited the complex idea or relation of the sinner's desert of death and his deliverance from it, through a substitutionary arrangement which, on the first express mention of it, was so distinctly marked by God's approval, as gives every reason to conclude that it could be no other than his own special institution. The idea it expressed is so important, and of so fundamental a nature in the scheme of Divine grace, that the existence of faith, or at least, its lively exercise, is scarcely compatible with a total ignorance of it. The life of another substituted in the room of that which had been righteously forfeited, testified from the commencement of the dispensation of grace that redemption must be through death, or, as expressed in the language of the New Testament, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission," (Heb. ix. 22). How explicit and convincing this testimony was, appears from the fact, that throughout the whole patriarchal history there is no recurrence of an offering resembling Cain's; while even more striking is the impression which, notwithstanding the great corruption of the original truth, it made on the large portion of mankind left to the influences of heathenism, as witnessed by the universal prevalence, from the remotest period, of sacrificial rites, as a mode of obtaining acceptance with the gods.¹

These deductions from the general tenor of Scripture, and from the nature of the case, are expressly confirmed by the

¹ Pye Smith: "The practice of offering sacrifices to the true God, or to fictitious divinities, is known to have been a custom, in the most complete sense,

universal and ancient."—Discourses on the Sac. and Priesthood of Christ, p. 4. Lond. 1847.

testimony of the New Testament with regard to the first recorded sacrifice. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he, being dead, yet speaketh," (Heb. xi. 4). Abel's offering was more excellent, greater as to importance and worth, than Cain's, *πλεῖστον θυσίαν παρὰ Κάιν*. That it was so characterised, because more valuable in itself, or because selected with greater care, is a supposition utterly unwarranted. It was something not of a relative but absolute character, which distinguished it from Cain's offering. This was nothing else than the fact of its being an animal oblation, (*θυσία*), and not the fruits of the ground, and that it was thus offered by faith. Now faith must have for its object some expression of the mind of God;¹ otherwise, however strong the conviction, it is, as regards spiritual things and relations, not faith but fancy. Now, any such expression prior to that time as to the plan of reconciliation, must be sought in the promise of the woman's seed, or the remarkable provision made for clothing with coats of skin the first guilty pair. In the promise, our first parents undoubtedly discerned a deliverance from the state into which they had been brought by sin; but nothing can with any certainty be learned from their statements as to the precise manner in which they conceived the deliverance should be procured. Only they had intimation, as already remarked, that it should be effected through, or be somehow accompanied with, suffering. But now, besides the general ideas of life restored to a condemned and perishing race, and of a human Conqueror through whose sufferings the lost blessings should be recovered, there was expressed in the action of Abel the more definite idea of substitution and of atonement made through death—the first elements, indeed, of the life of faith.

Although the doctrine of sacrifice comes thus suddenly into view, developed to an extent which the silence observed as to the origin of the rite or its practice, previous to this occasion, gave little reason to anticipate, yet this only makes it the more imperative to connect it with the institu-

¹ See Cloppenburg, *Schola Sacr.*, pp. 26, 27.

tions of Eden, from which Adam had deduced his idea of life, to which sacrifice furnished an additional support as well as exemplification. By his sacrifice, it is said, Abel still speaks, *ἔτι λαλεῖ*; (*δι' ἀντῆς*, referring to *θυσία*, and not to *πίστις*); it continues still to proclaim that salvation is through blood, as it had, in contrast to Cain's eucharistical offering, from the earliest period testified that for sinners there was no other way of approach to God.

Notice must here be taken of an argument in favour of the Divine origin of sacrifice, erroneously deduced¹ from the expostulatory language of God to Cain, by rendering *הִנֵּה רִיחַ חַטָּאת רָיַח*, "a sin-offering croucheth at the door,"² (ver. 7,) and assuming that he was directed to offer such, and in that way obtain acceptance. There is no authority for taking *חַטָּאת* in this passage in the sense of "sin-offering,"—a secondary signification of the term, no doubt, but only in peculiar circumstances, and not in use until after the promulgation of the Levitical ritual. It is so applied exclusively to an animal set apart for sacrifice after being consecrated by imposition of hands, and confession of sin over it; in a word, "made sin," according to the terms *כִּי־יִשָּׁחֵט אֶת־הַזֶּבַח*, (Lev. vi. 19, [26]; ix. 15,) not well rendered in the English version, "that offereth it for sin," but more properly, "that maketh it sin." The victim has been made sin³—made to represent or embody it; just as it is said of Christ, on the very principle announced in the law, *ὅτι περὶ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν*, "He made him to be *sin* for us," (2 Cor. v. 21,) not a sinner, or, as frequently taken, a sin-offering, but "sin,"—that is, its representative. This is enough to show that the term is utterly inapplicable to an animal at large suitable for sacrifice, and can be used only of one actually consecrated, which is obviously not the case in this instance. But apart from this objection, to say that, in the event of Cain's not doing well, he is directed to take a

¹ Faber, Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice, p. 86.

² This view was first advanced by Lightfoot, is adopted by Magee, (Atonement, Note lxx., Works, i. 458.) and has been since extensively entertained. Witsius (Miscel. Sac., Lib. ii. 2. § 17, p. 466) remarks concerning it: "Hæc

explicatio multis obnoxia est exceptionibus."

³ "Quoniam vero victima peculiaris peccantis vices suscipit et pœnam peccati typice fert, hinc commode eodem venit nomine."—Hottinger, De sacrificiis; Minister. Sol. Expiat. Dici. p. 437. Tiguri, 1754.

sin-offering, and thereby obtain reconciliation with God, sounds, in the circumstances, like an encouragement to sin.¹ It is solely as a warning not to indulge in sin, and not as an intimation of the way of forgiveness, which from the example of Abel, it is to be inferred was already sufficiently revealed, that this expostulation is to be viewed—an expostulation, be it observed, with an unhumiliated man, unconvinced of sin, and unconscious of his need of atonement. It is not to such that God discloses gospel treasures, (Matt. vii. 6). The light which directed Abel was sufficient also for Cain, and it is a principle of the Divine administration that only to him that hath shall more be given.

How God testified his acceptance of the one offering, and his rejection of the other, does not appear; but it must have been in a way which left the worshippers in no doubt as to the fact. An early opinion—for it is found in the Greek version of Theodotion, (*καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν ὁ θεός*),—is, that fire consumed the animal sacrifice, while no cognizance was taken of Cain's gifts. It is certain that, on subsequent occasions of importance, as the inauguration of the Levitical sanctuary, and of Solomon's temple; and on the controversy between Elijah and the priests of Baal, the Divine approbation was so expressed, (Lev. ix. 24; 2 Chron. vii. 1; 1 Kings xvii. 38). But, however intimated, his rejection was fully known to Cain; and the act whereby his proffered worship was contemned stirred up the lowest depths of a previously self-pleased and placid consciousness. From a statement already quoted regarding Abel's faith, it may with certainty be inferred that Cain lacked that principle, while the nature of his offering showed that he felt no need of atonement, and recognised no suitableness in sacrificial blood. Such, also, seems to be intimated by the apostle Jude, when characterising the false teachers of his own day, as "ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness," and "speaking evil of things which they know not," (ver. 4, 10). There is here an allusion to Cain's character, as appears from the circumstances, that the persons described are said to be "before of old

¹ L. Cappellus: "Neque pro victima peccati expiatrix, ea enim parata est bene facientibus, hoc est, respicientibus, at non illis qui non bene faciunt." *Notæ Criticæ*, p. 335.

ordained to this condemnation," (*οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι*), long before so designated; and particularly, they are stated to "have gone in the way of Cain." The difference is immaterial whether this description be applied to the earlier or later stages of the fratricide's history, for the one was but the natural development of the other, no new principle having been introduced.

§ 2. *Other Ante-Levitical Sacrifices—The Divine Covenants.*

The next sacrifice of which mention is made is that offered by Noah on his leaving the ark (Gen. viii. 20, 21), and here one or two additional circumstances are recorded touching the ritual of those early ages.

Reference is here for the first time made to an altar *מזבח* (from *זבח* to slaughter for sacrifice) as a structure whereon the victim and the fire were laid; and the offering itself is distinguished as *עלה* from its being *raised upon* the altar,¹ or more probably from its *ascending* in flame,² the burnt-offering properly of the law, called also *קריבן* (Deut. xxxiii. 10), because of its being wholly consumed. In the former instance the act of presenting the offering was expressed by *הביא מזבח*, here it is definitely styled *העלה עלה*. The Divine acceptance of the offering, which is no less marked than in the case of Abel, is denoted by God's smelling *ריח ניחח*, "an odour of rest," not sufficiently explicit in the English version, "a sweet savour," which here follows the LXX. *ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας* (comp. Eph. v. 2); for the original points out more specifically the effect of the sacrifice upon the Divine mind. It was not only grateful; it was such as caused God to *rest*³ from the anger or displeasure with which, as intimated at the commencement of the narrative of the deluge, He viewed the wickedness of mankind (Gen. vi. 5-7). By this sacrifice God's anger was appeased; and, accordingly, He determined not to destroy the earth any

¹ Knobel, die BB. Exod. u. Lev. p. 353.

² Bähr, Symbolik, ii. 361.

³ Buxtorf: "Odor quietis, id est, gratus qui Deum ab ira sua quiescere

fecit. Aben-Ezra in Gen. viii. 21." Lex. Heb. p. 454. Basil. 1663. Comp.

Spencer, de Leg. Heb. Lib. iii. dissert.

ii. 3, § 2. Faber, Expiatory Sacrifice, p. 75.

more. This brought out more clearly than hitherto one at least of the purposes, that of expiation, which the patriarchal sacrifices contemplated, and which, as here acknowledged, Noah's offering effected.¹

What chiefly deserves notice, however, in the account of Noah's sacrifice is, that the class of victims embraced a far wider range than any deducible from the description of Abel's offering. It now comprehended not merely the firstlings of the flock, or even of the herd; but also "every clean beast, and every clean bird." This distinction of *clean* and *unclean* in the animal creation, to which great importance was subsequently attached in the law, did not commence however at this time, but must have been known antecedently to the flood, as it regulated the comparative numbers of the animals received into the ark; the various classes of "clean" beasts having, according to express directions from God, been admitted by sevens, and the unclean in pairs, (Gen. vii. 2.) This classification could not have arisen from dietetic considerations as to the fitness or unfitness of particular animals for food, as the use of such was permitted only subsequent to the flood, and the whole transactions here referred to (ix. 3). It was, in all probability, connected with the practice of sacrifice, and it must have had respect to certain moral truths and distinctions which God designed in this symbolic form to convey to mankind.²

The consideration of this matter must be reserved for a subsequent place; meantime it is enough to remark that the germ of this distinction can be traced to the period previous to the fall. The serpent, as the type of evil (Gen. iii. 1, 14) primarily exemplified the antagonistic and discordant principle which since and through the fall has entered into the creation, causing confusion in the works of God. And it is thus that men according to their various dispositions, are in Scripture so frequently described in terms borrowed from the animal world, the transformation of the poisonous and carnivorous properties of which serves to represent the new state of things. The lesson thus conveyed with respect to sacrifice, that certain characteristics or qualities were indispensable in the

¹ Tuch, Kommentar üb. die Genesis, p. 176.

² Witsius, Miscel. Sac. Lib. ii. 2, §§ 14, 15, pp. 463-465.

victims to be presented to God, and its precise bearing on the great scheme of redemption will form, however, the subject of subsequent inquiry in connexion with the intimations regarding the person of the Redeemer, while its general theocratic purposes will be noticed in the dietetic regulations under the law.

Another point to be adverted to in connexion with the subject of sacrifice at the Noachian period is, that when man was permitted the use of animal food, God expressly reserved the blood. "Only flesh with its life, its blood (וְנִפְשׁוֹ דָמָו) ye shall not eat." וְנִפְשׁוֹ is here in apposition, explanatory of the less distinct word וְנִפְשׁוֹ, which is, however, emphatically placed first, to express that, though the life of the animal may be taken away, that part which contains or represents it, must not be consumed by man,¹ (Gen. ix. 4.) No connexion, however, is here intimated between this prohibition and the rite of sacrifice, nor was any reason assigned for it until the establishment of the Levitical system fully unfolded the doctrine of sacrifice. In Lev. iii. 17; xix. 26, the prohibition is merely renewed; in chap. vii. 27, its transgression is declared punishable with the theocratic penalty of excision—"that soul shall be cut off from his people;" but in chap. xvii. 10-14, it is repeated more at large, the reason of the prohibition being also assigned, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement by means of the soul," (ver. 11.) The consideration of this important announcement belongs, however, to a subsequent stage of the investigation.

No further mention is made of sacrifice in the Pentateuch until the time of Abraham, who, on reaching the land of Canaan, built an altar to Jehovah, a practice which he continued in his various migrations through the promised territory (Gen. xii. 7, 8; xiii. 18). These altars, of course, were for sacrificial purposes, although such is not expressly stated, it being simply mentioned that he "called upon the name of Jehovah," which intimates probably that prayer was associated with the symbolic act of sacrifice. That sacrifice was commonly practised at this period there is no reason to doubt; and that it was a usual prac-

¹ Kalisch, Com. on Genesis, p. 218.

tice with Abraham himself, fully appears from Isaac's familiarity with the rite as manifested in the question he put to his father on the journey to Moriah: "Behold the fire and the wood; but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?" (Gen xxii. 7).

On one occasion, however, Abraham was specially directed by God to take certain animals,—“a heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle dove, and a young pigeon” (Gen xv. 9), which he was instructed to arrange in sacrificial order for God, “take for me” (לֶךְ קָרָבָה). In no former instance was there any notice of express directions on the subject of sacrifice. Its presentation appears as the spontaneous act of the worshippers, as in the cases of Abel, Noah, and Abraham himself, while the form in which it was conducted is assumed as fully understood. With regard to Noah's sacrifice, there was evidently a Divine suggestion in the directions given him as to the numbers of the animals to be saved in the ark, the seventh animal (Gen. vii. 2), not *pair*, as Knobel,¹ Kalisch,² and others understand the expression, of every clean species, being obviously intended for sacrifice.³ Here, however, for the first time, mention is made of specific instructions. The reason of this will be found in the fact, that a new idea was now to be evolved in the scheme of reconciliation, this whole arrangement being preparatory to the ratification of the Divine covenant.

The victims to be selected included all the animals usually offered under the law, though not comprising so numerous a class as the sacrifice of Noah. The age of three years, here required in regard to the three principal animals, is prescribed nowhere else. Under the law the usual rule was, that the victims should be one year old. The distinction in this case must, doubtless, be significant, but having reference only to the particular announcements now to be made. The three years, it is supposed, had a symbolical connexion with the intimation of the continuance of Abraham's posterity in a state of exile and oppression for three generations; and Delitzsch⁴ finds a parallel in Gideon's ox, of seven years old, as representing the seven years' subjugation of the Israelites by the Midianites (Judg.

¹ Die Genesis erklärt, p. 82.

² Com. on Genesis, p. 183.

³ Comp. Tiele, Das erste Buch Mosés, pp. 183 184. Erlangen, 1836. Baumgarten, Theol. Com. i. 111.

⁴ Die Genesis ausgelegt, p. 362.

vi. 1, 25). No directions appear to have been given as to the manner in which the victims were to be disposed, but Abraham understood that they were not intended as an ordinary sacrifice, and therefore he applied no fire; nor does it appear that he laid them upon an altar, but only on the ground: "And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another; but the birds divided he not" (ver. 10). There is no trace of this mode of dividing the animals anywhere in Scripture except in Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19, from which it appears, as fully attested by profane writers, to have been customary for the contracting parties in a covenant to slay an animal, and after dividing it, to pass between the parts.¹ But the mode of treating the birds accords with that which was afterwards prescribed in respect to such offerings: the priest "shall cleave it with the wings thereof, but shall not divide it asunder" (Lev. i. 17).

Abraham now waited the disclosure of the Divine purpose: he prevented the birds of prey from alighting upon the carcases, and was thus engaged until towards sunset, when, having fallen into an ecstasy—"a deep sleep fell upon Abraham" (תַּרְדֵּמָה), the same kind of sleep which seized Adam previous to the formation of Eve (Gen. ii. 21)—"and lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him" (ver. 12); whereupon God revealed to him the fortunes of his posterity, so far as concerned their sojourn in Egypt, and their being put into possession of the promised land. Then it is added: "And it came to pass, that when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace and a burning lamp (אֵשׁ בְּרָיִל, a flame of fire; see Ex. xx. 15), that passed between these pieces. In that same day Jehovah made a covenant with Abraham" (ver. 17, 18).

This transaction has usually, and from the earliest times, been regarded as an example of the ratification of a covenant by means of sacrifice; but Delitzsch objects that there was here no proper covenant or sacrifice. This is merely a dispute about words. He says correctly: "It was not a proper covenant; for Jehovah communicates and confirms his intentions to Abraham. He only passes between the pieces of the slaughtered animals; and it is thus not a covenant in the sense of *pactio*, but of *sponsio*, as בְּרִית בְּרִית is elsewhere used, as well of God's engagements to

¹ See Winer, Bib. Realwörterbuch, Art. *Bund*, i. 201.

men (Ex. xxxiv. 10 ; compare *בְּרִית* alone, 2 Chron. vii. 18), as of men's engagements to God (Ezra x. 3). In such cases the one side only can appear, for the nature of the engagement excludes the idea of reciprocity.¹ This is undoubtedly the case ; for wherever the discourse is of a covenant between God and man, the term is never taken in its primary sense, of a strictly mutual compact, by which each of the parties engages to render certain benefits to the other. The term *בְּרִית*, on its first occurrence, Gen. ix. 9-11, denotes simply a promise on the part of God to Noah, connected with which was a particular sign, but without any other formalities, that the earth should not be again devastated by a flood. Decidedly erroneous, however, is the further objection of Delitzsch, that in the ratification of the Abrahamic covenant there was no proper offering,—a view, for the support of which he adduces only a later and heathen mode of disposing of the animals slaughtered on the ratification of covenants, but which was quite foreign to Scripture. The sacrificial character of the transaction was fully declared in the purpose of setting apart the animals for God ; and by the fact that the Sinaitic covenant also was ratified by sacrifice (Ex. xxiv. 6-8), both alike intimating that, without an atonement there could be no communion between God and man, and no communication of Divine blessings.

Abraham's trial, in connexion with the command to sacrifice Isaac, has been already considered in some of its aspects ;² but notice must be taken of the additional light which it furnished on the doctrine of substitution. Sacrifice in general, and human sacrifices in particular, as practised at that very time,³ showed a consciousness of guilt, expressed in the most violent manner, frightfully perverting the idea of substitution, by offering the guilty for the associates in guilt. Human sacrifices originated, it is very evident, in a conviction of the insufficiency of animal oblations to make atonement for sin. The command to offer Isaac recognised the truth of this conviction ; while the Divine interposition which stayed the in-

¹ Delitzsch, *Die Genesis ausgelegt*, p. 365. Comp. Witsius, *De Oeconomia Fœderum*, Lib. i. 2, § 3, p. 2. Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, Art. *Covenant*, i. 362.

² See above, vol. ii., pp. 46-50.

³ For testimonies to the prevalence of human sacrifices see Magee, *Atonement*, i. 65-85 ; and Pye Smith, *Discourses*, pp. 217-220.

molation was intended to correct the perversion of this truth, seen in heathen practices. By the fact of God's providing and accepting a ram in the room of Isaac, Abraham's conviction, "God will provide a lamb for a burnt-offering," however he may have understood it, obtained a preparatory fulfilment, and the inquiring mind was in the meantime so far instructed as to the true principle of substitution.¹ Abraham was directed to the animal sacrifices as the symbols meanwhile of the necessary offering of the human life; sacrifices in themselves insufficient were thus legitimated by the Divine acceptance, and their provisional efficacy recognised. The insufficiency of animal oblations, attested by the offerer's own convictions, and at the same time their acceptance by God as sufficient, furnished a pledge that in due time there should be provided a real and efficacious atonement.² By the restoration, in the person of Isaac, of the life already in the purpose of Abraham given up, the difficulties which perplexed heathenism were solved. "Abraham took the ram, and offered it up for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son," אֶת־הַאֵילָנִים (Gen. xxii. 13). Here is the first explicit notice of the doctrine of substitution as connected with the ordinance of sacrifice, although obviously implied from the commencement of the system.

Isaac himself, following the example of his father, "builded an altar, and called upon the name of Jehovah" (Gen. xxvi. 25); but there is no further account of his sacrifices, which, there is no reason to doubt, were offered in the usual form. No additions seem to have been made to the ritual, or to the ideas which the act expressed, until the time of Jacob. On that patriarch's making a covenant with Laban, it is said, "Then Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread," &c. (Gen. xxxi. 54). If this was properly a sacrifice, which is doubtful,³ as the expression אֶת־הַזֶּבַח is literally "slew a slaughter," it appears for the first time in the aspect of a religious feast and social meal. The first undoubted instance of a proper offering by Jacob was at Bethel, after a Divine command to "make an altar unto God" (Gen. xxxv. 1). Upon receiving this charge, Jacob gave directions

¹ Hävernick, Einleitung, I. ii. 339.

² Kurtz, Geschichte des alt. Bundes, i. 213

³ Le Clerc, Com. in Genesis, p. 213.

“to his household, and to all that were with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments” (ver. 2). Here the idea of purification is for the first time exhibited as a necessary preparation for the special worship of God, as acknowledged even in heathenism,¹ and which subsequently reappears in Ex. xix. 16, where the people are directed to “wash their clothes,” preparatory to their approaching God.

After Jacob's sacrifice at Beersheba, on his way to Egypt, (Gen. xlvi. 1,) no reference is again made to the practice until Moses was directed “to demand of Pharaoh leave for the Israelites to go three days' journey into the wilderness to celebrate a feast (זָמֶה) unto Jehovah,” (Ex. v. 1); or, as it is explained, (ver. 3,) “to sacrifice unto Jehovah.” This included “sacrifices and burnt-offerings,” which required that they should take the cattle along with them for supplying them with victims, (Ex. x. 25, 26). Another incident which comes out on Pharaoh's proposal, that, instead of going into the wilderness, the Israelites should sacrifice to God in the land, is the strong opposition which even then existed between the Egyptian and the Hebrew mode of worship, (Ex. viii. 25, 26,) producing on the part of the Egyptians such an intolerance with regard to the Israelitish sacrifices, as must have put a stop to them altogether.

After the Exodus, but immediately previous to the establishment of the Levitical system, there are notices of two occasions on which sacrifices were presented, which supply additional particulars with respect to the rite to those already adduced. The first of these is the sacrifice offered by Jethro, the priest of Midian, when he visited Moses in the wilderness. “And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took a burnt-offering and sacrifices (עֹלָה וְזִבְחִים) for God, and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God,” (לֶפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) in God's presence, (Ex. xviii. 12). Here the sacrifice is followed by a solemn, friendly meal, to which the worshippers and their friends can sit down in the presence of God, reconciled through the atoning rites which preceded. Something of the same kind appeared in the his-

¹ Le Clerc, Com. in Genesis, pp. 230, 231.

tory of Jacob; but that it was connected with sacrifice, or that it had a special aspect to God as reconciled, is not so clearly stated as here. Further, the sacrifice now offered was by an official personage—a priest, though unconnected with the commonwealth of Israel. This is the first occasion on which mention is made of sacrifices being presented by an official mediating agency, although there is previous notice of the existence of such functionaries as Melchizedec, and in heathenism, the Egyptian priesthood, which constituted a distinct order in the State. Israelitish priests are also referred to previous to the establishment of the Aaronic order, (Ex. xix. 22, 24); but of this further notice will be taken in another place.

The other, and more important sacrifice of this period, is that by which the Sinaitic covenant was ratified, (Ex. xxiv. 4-8). On this occasion Moses first reared an altar, and set up “twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel.” Directions had been already given as to the construction of the Israelitish altar, (Ex. xx. 24-26,) where mention was also made of the sacrifices to be offered—“burnt-offerings,” and “peace-offerings,” (שְׁלָמִים) which appear here for the first time, but without any definition of their character, or intimation that such were not already well known and in use. The pillars which Moses erected are not to be viewed as constituting or supporting the altar, though somehow associated with it, and representing the tribes in the covenant, for the altar required to be of earth; or if of stone, it must be undressed stone, and in any case it must not be greatly elevated. The pillars formed so many (מִצְבֵּה) stones of memorial (see Gen. xxviii. 18, 22; xxxi. 45) surrounding the altar, and representing the Israelites assembled about Jehovah at the place where He promised to meet with and bless his people.

The persons entrusted with the offering of this sacrifice were “young men of the children of Israel,” commissioned by Moses. “He sent young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings, (זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים) sacrifices—to wit, peace-offerings¹) of oxen unto Jehovah.” Who these were, it is difficult to determine. The Targums of On-

¹ Gesenius, Gram., § 113. Ewald, § 287, c.

kelos and Jonathan render נֵעָרִי by בּוֹכֵרִי, “first-born,” and so it is understood by the Jewish expositors in general, who infer, from the consecration of the first-born in Ex. xiii. 2, that they were invested with priestly functions. In opposition to this, it is enough to remark that the first-born were set apart not for priests, but for an offering to Jehovah, (ver. 12). Others¹ take the persons here spoken of to be the priests mentioned in Ex. xix. 22, 24, but if such were the case, it is inconceivable how they should be called youths. The functions discharged, however, by these young men, were wholly of a subordinate character; the bringing forward and slaughtering of the animals—actions which, at least, under the subsequent ritual, were not the proper business of the priests. This, which consisted in receiving and sprinkling the blood, was performed by Moses himself, (ver. 6, 8,) with whom was lodged the priestly office of mediator, until the formal establishment of a new and special priesthood. The youths engaged on this occasion represented, according to Kurtz,² the Israelites bringing the offerings in their then youthful standing, ready to begin the course of life on which they had just entered. The sacrifices by which the covenant was ratified, and the consecration of Israel as a covenant-people effected, were “burnt-offerings” and “peace-offerings.” The latter (שְׁלָמִים, from שָׁלַם, to complete, to perfect) were expressive of reconciliation, or a state where, all misunderstanding being removed, there was room for peace and friendship.³ This had been produced by means of the burnt-offerings, by which these sacrifices had been preceded. Of the sin-offering and trespass-offering there is yet no trace, so that they, doubtless, owed their origin to the subsequent legislation. The primary purpose of sacrifice, as well here as in other cases, was atonement, while the peculiarities in the present instance had another special object to serve. Before Jehovah can enter into a covenant relation with the people, their sin must be expiated by sacrifice. This having been done, there are next the special rites for ratifying the covenant. Thus the blood is divided

¹ Vitringa, *Observationes Sacræ*, Lib. ii., cap. 2, § 19, p. 286.

² Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. 368. Fairbairn, *Typology*, ii. 358.

³ *Geschichte des alt. Bundes*, ii. 297.

into two parts, one of which is sprinkled upon the altar, and the other upon the people, in respect to the two parties in the transaction.¹ The sprinkling of blood appeared before this time in the ordinance of the Passover, which was properly an ante-Levitical institution, though it constituted a transition from the patriarchal dispensation to that under the law. "And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side-posts and on the upper door-post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it." "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you," (Ex. xii. 7, 13). Subsequently various other blood-sprinklings were enjoined, as upon the altar (Ex. xxix. 20) and before the vail of the sanctuary, (Lev. iv. 6); but there is no instance fully corresponding to the twofold application of the blood in this case—what most nearly resembles it being the blood and oil sprinkled upon the priests and their garments, after the altar had been previously sprinkled with blood, (Ex. xxix. 21).

The twofold application of the blood corresponds, according to Kurtz,² to the twofold application of the flesh of the offering; part of which was burnt upon the altar, and part reserved as a sacrificial meal. By the presentation of the animal, the blood as well as the flesh became Jehovah's. The blood was sprinkled upon the altar as a sign that God accepts the representative expiation. Thereupon the people appeared as atoned for, and capable of being admitted into covenant communion with God. But still there was needed a consecration on their part; and hence they are sprinkled with the other half of the blood. They needed not merely the removal of their guilt, for which God made provision in the blood of the sacrifice, and the efficacy of which, for that purpose, was shown by its being sprinkled upon his altar, but also the renewing of their life—the one to enable them to enter into covenant with God, the other to qualify them for the covenant services. The sprinkling of the people with the blood was thus the symbol of their consecration to these ends; as it is declared, with respect to the sprinkling of the priests and their garments: "He shall be hallowed, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him," (Ex. xxix. 21).

¹ Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. 421.

² *Geschichte des a. Bundes*, ii. 297.

The ratifying of the covenant was the very basis of the Israelitish economy. It was a transaction once for all, and every member of the covenant people had henceforth a part in it. The covenant relation might, indeed, be obscured by new sins, which required new atonement, but the covenant consecration availed while the covenant itself endured. From this arose the distinction between the sacrifices which were afterwards presented on the ground of this covenant, and those by which it was itself confirmed; and this explains the peculiarity already adverted to, that there is no other instance exactly corresponding to the present. The subsequent law of sacrifice recognises the expiation as completed by sprinkling the altar which received the offering, without any sacrificial consecration either of the community or of the individual, as the case might be, who brought the offering.¹

The truths obscurely intimated in the Abrahamic covenant were now more fully revealed. The expressions, “the blood of the covenant,” רֵם־הַבְּרִית, τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, (*Zech. ix. 11; Heb. x. 29; xiii. 20.*) and “the blood of sprinkling,” (Heb. xii. 24,) which originated in this transaction, declared not only that the sinner is incapable of entering into fellowship with, or drawing near to a holy God, and must die on account of his guilt if a mediator (*Exod. xx. 19*) or a substitutionary sacrifice be not provided for him—a truth already expressed in *Gen. xv. 9, &c.*—but also that he must die to his former life, in order to begin a new life to God—an idea represented by the sprinkling of his person with the blood of the covenant, which on this account is styled the blood “where-with he is sanctified,” (*Heb. x. 29*). Such are the more important doctrines deduced by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews in that enigmatical passage, (*chap. ix. 16-22.*) from the circumstances attending the ratification of the Sinaitic covenant, and in which, as regards the blood, he discerned a pardoning and purifying efficacy. The expression, “without the shedding of blood there is no remission,” (*Heb. ix. 22.*) which appears to many to be strangely introduced in reference to the ratification of the covenant, shows only that the covenant sacrifice was thus regarded as of an expiatory, atoning character,²—a truth already adverted to.

¹ Kurtz, *Geschichte, des a. Bundes*,
ii. 297, 298.

² Ebrard, *Com. on Hebrews*, E. T.,
p. 296. Edin. 1853.

SECT. II. THE PLAN OF REDEMPTION UNDER THE LAW—
THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES.

Outram, *De Sacrificiis Judæorum et Sacrificio Christi*, Lib. i. pp. 1-283. Lond. 1677; Eng. Trans. by Allen, pp. 1-292. Lond. 1817.—Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, ii. 189-453. Heidelb. 1839.—Kurtz, *Das Mosaisches Opfer*. Mitau, 1842.—The Sin-Offering [from Kurtz, *Mos. Opfer* pp. 155-196], *Biblioth. Sacra*. ix. 27-51. Andov. 1852.—Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, ii. 278-366, 490-479. 3d ed. Edin. 1857.

In the Israelitish constitution, sacrifice, which had hitherto been an occasional observance, left very much to the convictions of individual worshippers, was reduced to a regularly arranged system. It was made a duty of stated, public obligation no less than of personal convictions and necessities. Instructions were given for the presentation of public daily offerings, morning and evening, and for a solemn annual atonement for the entire community, additional to the sacrifices required from individuals on their transgressing, however unwittingly, certain ordinances of a civil or ceremonial character. Not only was the observance of these rites made imperative, and the number of the sacrifices multiplied, additional kinds also were introduced, adapted to various specific purposes, whether as respected the confession of sin or the thankful acknowledgment of God's mercies. Further, there were particular sacrifices appropriated to the several relations and conditions of the offerers; all which circumstances contributed to render the system exceedingly complicated, and no less rigid, inasmuch as the whole arrangements were a matter of distinct specification, nothing even of the minutest details being left to the option either of the offerer or of the ministering priest.¹

Some of the more distinguishing though general features of the law of sacrifice as established under the Israelitish constitution was its limiting the presentation of offerings to one specific locality—the instituted holy place where God manifested his presence, and its assigning the services to particular persons specially called and consecrated to that office. The idea of a sanctuary had already partially appeared in the first

¹ See Hottinger, *De Sacrificiis, fertis Ministerium. Expiationum Dicit. Tignui. libaminibus*, §§ 15-37, pp. 428-433. 1754.

primeval sacrifice; while the priestly order was shadowed forth by the heads of households acting in that capacity for their families and dependents; but there was no intimation whatever of the restrictions subsequently introduced under the law.

The idea of a sanctuary, not certainly under the form of a material structure, as under the theocracy, but as a locality hallowed by the special presence of God, was from the earliest times connected with the practice of sacrifice. But in the patriarchal period, whether owing to the cessation of the Edenic symbolism representative of the Divine presence, or to the necessities arising from the nomade and migratory life led by the Israelitish fathers, or to these and other circumstances combined, more enlarged views were entertained as to the omnipresence of God; and, accordingly, Abraham, wherever he pitched his tent, reared altars, and offered sacrifices to Jehovah. This liberty was taken away, however, under the law, which enjoined that there should be only one place of sacrifice. God indeed promised, "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee," (Ex. xx. 24), but at the same time also expressly interdicted the presentation of offerings elsewhere; "Whosoever offereth a sacrifice, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer it unto the Lord, even that man shall be cut off from among his people," (Lev. xvii. 8, 9.)

The restriction, however, it will be shown, had respect not so much to anything properly connected with the principle of sacrifice, as to other considerations bearing on the theocratic constitution; some of which made it necessary for a time to prohibit even the slaughtering of animals designed for food, except at the tabernacle. Leaving for future consideration the grounds on which these and similar restrictions rested, it is found however that the sanctuary was thus under the law so closely connected with the sacrificial ordinances, as to impart to them a more distinct form and character than they hitherto possessed. The sanctuary was the house of God as the theocratic King of Israel; the priests, the ministers of sacrifice, were the servants of that house, while sacrifice itself was properly its service. It will, therefore, be necessary to consider generally the character and design of this sanctuary, prelimi-

nary to an inquiry into the manner and purpose of its varied services, particularly those relating to sacrifice.

§ 1. *The Place of Sacrifice and the Levitical Sanctuary.*

After the ratification of the Sinaitic covenant, God commanded Moses to come up into the Mount to receive further instructions for the people, (Ex. xxiv. 12.) On repairing thither, the first charge given to him was that all who were willing should bring to Jehovah an offering (תְּרוּמָה) an oblation to the most High,¹ of certain specified materials; precious metals, gems, variously coloured cloths, skins, wood, and other articles suitable for the construction and adornment of a sacred tent, (Ex. xxv. 1-9.) In ver. 8, it is commanded, "And let them make me a sanctuary (מִקְדָּשׁ) that I may dwell among them." The mention of the "sanctuary," which is the more general name of the contemplated structure, and less expressive of its object than some of the other designations by which it is known, is followed by an intimation of the purpose it was intended to serve. In consequence of the covenant relation which Jehovah had just formed with the Israelitish people, and for the purpose of carrying out the ends of that covenant, He purposed to dwell among them as their King. It was, therefore, necessary that they should provide Him with a suitable residence. As God's dwelling with his people was designed to carry out the purposes of redemption, so the manner of his residence and the very form of his habitation must correspond with the plan of salvation. As, however, this originated with God himself; and as neither Moses nor much less the people had any conceptions whatever of this scheme further than it was imparted to them by its Divine Author, so all directions for the construction of, and the arrangements relative to, the sanctuary must proceed entirely from God.² Therefore it is prescribed: "According to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it," (ver. 9.)

Then follow (Ex. xxv. 10 to xxxi.) the specific details of the proposed structure, intermixed with various instructions as to

¹ Witsius, *Miscel. Sac. Lib. ii. 2, § 11,*
p. 401.

² Kurtz, *Geschichte, d. alt. Bundes,*
ii. 299.

the preparation of the priests' dress and ornaments, and the rites to be observed in purifying them for their office, and also notices of the Divine calling and qualifications of the workmen expressly selected for the construction of the tabernacle, and all its furniture. This is again succeeded by a description of the work in its finished state (Ex. xxxvi-xxxix), and which is almost a literal repetition of the preceding details. This was for the purpose of showing the fidelity with which the instructions had been carried out, as more expressly intimated in the concluding attestation: "And Moses did look upon all the work, and behold they had done it as the Lord had commanded, even so had they done it." The importance of this note may be seen from the reiterated charge given to Moses, to follow absolutely the pattern shown to him in the Mount (Ex. xxv. 9, 40; xxvi. 30; xxxvii. 8), and to which reference is made in Heb. viii. 5, for the purpose of proving that the tabernacle was an embodiment of Divine ideas.

It is impossible, and indeed quite unnecessary, to enter here into an examination of the various parts and appendages of the Levitical tabernacle, or the ideas they were intended severally to express; one or two observations will bring out, sufficiently for the present purpose, the more fundamental truths, and their special relation to sacrifice, and the other services appropriated to Divine worship.

The primary design of the sanctuary was, as stated in Ex. xxv. 8, to furnish a sensible representation of God dwelling in the midst of his covenant people; and with this correspond the various names by which the structure was designated.

First, there are the general names *בֵּית יְהוָה* (*בֵּית יְהוָה*, Ex. xxiii. 19), *אֹהֶל* and *מִשְׁכָּן*, which point it out simply as a habitation, in the character either of a house or tent; the last of the three terms specially referring to God's purpose to dwell (*שָׁבַן*), compare with this *σκηνοῦν*, John i. 14; Rev. xxi. 3) with his people, as intimated in Ex. xxv. 8; xxix. 45, 46.

The designation *מִקְדָּשׁ* and *קֹדֶשׁ*, "sanctuary," indicated it as

¹ The classification here followed is that of Bähr (*Symbolik*, i. 76); but in a different order; the designation of the Tabernacle, as the "holy place,"

being by that writer regarded, in accordance with his very erroneous views on the design of the structure, as the most specific of all.

the habitation of God, the Holy one; the inner apartment of the two into which the structure was divided, and which was the proper residence of Deity, being denominated קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוֹשִׁים, "the holy of holies," or the most holy place (Ex. xxvi. 33, 34).

Again, it was more particularly distinguished as אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, (from יָעַד, to appoint), "the tent of meeting," or appointment, the place where God met with and addressed Moses and the people (Ex. xxix. 42; xxv. 22); and אֹהֶל הָעֵדוּת, "the tent of the testimony," so called from the most important object preserved therein; the tables of the law or "testimony," עֵדוּת, (from עָיַד, to witness, to testify), not simply because witnessing for God against sin and sinners,¹ nor merely as a testimony of the Divine will,² but of the whole Divine character, perfections, and purposes.³ In like manner, the chest in which the tables of the law were deposited was called אָרוֹן הָעֵדוּת, "the ark of the testimony" (Ex. xxv. 22, 26, 33). It is to be remarked, that although the roots יָעַד and עָיַד are cognate, the appellations last noticed are by no means synonymous, although they seem to have been so taken by the LXX., who render the two alike by ἡ σκεπη τοῦ μαρτυρίου (see Ex. xxix. 42-45; Num. xvi. 19), and adopted in Acts vii. 44, as the equivalent of אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד. These designations are in fact expressive of two opposite, and, except for the special relation of the עֵדוּת to the כַּפֹּרֶת (Eng. ver. "mercy-seat"), which covered it, irreconcilable ideas. It was only through this כַּפֹּרֶת, which represented guilt expiated, that the "tent of the testimony" could really become a "tent of meeting," or a place where there could be any intercourse of a friendly kind between a holy God and sinners (Ex. xxv. 21, 22; Lev. xvi. 13).

The ideas expressed in the various names by which the tabernacle was designated, as the symbolical residence of Jehovah, receive further illustration, and are rendered more definite by the form of its construction, and its relative isolation from the Israelitish community, in the midst of whom it was erected. But that which chiefly served to exhibit its true

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, ii. 640, E. T. ii. 524.

² Kurtz, *Beiträge zur Symbolik*, pp. 27-31. Leip. 1851.

³ Keil, *Biblische Archäologie*, § 21, p. 112. See below, chap. v. sect. 3.

character and design was its peculiar service, or the rites through which alone the very circumscribed access to it which was permitted, was at all procurable.

The very distinction of holy places as such from the world at large manifested imperfection, and a state of estrangement as regards the Creator and his moral creatures. More particularly the Levitical tabernacle itself, separated from without by its fore-court, and divided internally into the holy and most holy place, the latter, as the most secluded apartment, being the proper residence of God, showed that there were hindrances to the Holy One's immediate and continuous intercourse with men on the earth, even though related to him as a covenant people. He could not dwell among them as He does with the holy in heaven, and as He shall yet do with men on the earth, (Rev. xxi. 3.) The most holy place where God revealed himself, while symbolically representing his *nearness* to Israel, was at the same time expressive of his distance from them; for the arrangement was such, that in order to reach this compartment of the tabernacle it was necessary to pass through two curtains or veils, (Heb. ix. 3.) The need of a special place where God made himself known, and received the homage of his people, intimated that He was in general as yet separated from men, (see John iv. 20-24;) and this was still further shown by the seclusion which marked his residence in the midst of the covenant people.

The same truth was even more fully expressed by the solemn ceremonious separation of such as were privileged in various degrees to approach to, and enter the tabernacle. First, there was the separation of a particular people, the Israelites, from the rest of the world, while certain aliens, of whom special mention is made, and even Israelites themselves, under peculiar circumstances, were entirely excluded from the congregation of the Lord and its attendant privileges, (Deut. xxiii. 1-3.) And indeed, any member of the community might be temporarily excluded from access to the tabernacle, owing to legal impurity or other disqualification. Then there was the further separation of the Levites from the other tribes for the more general service of the sanctuary, and again the separation of Aaron and his sons from the other Levitical families for the more special service involved in the

priestly functions. All others were expressly interdicted, on pain of death, from assuming any part of these functions, or approaching the tabernacle, (Num. iii. 10, 38.) Of the priests, again, only one specially consecrated for the service, and so standing at the head of his order, could enter into the most holy place, (Lev. xvi. 2, 15, 24, comp. Heb. ix. 7.)

Although, therefore, under the Levitical dispensation, God dwelt among his people, and permitted to a certain extent access to his tabernacle, nevertheless this privilege was exceedingly limited. It was confined to parties specially consecrated; and even to such access was afforded only occasionally and with much ceremony; while further, the entrant was not permitted to continue in the holy place for any time, but having discharged the particular duty or service which called him into God's presence he must immediately retire. It is in contrast to this that it is said of Christ:¹ "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God," (Heb. x. 12.) No description could more strikingly convey an idea of the privilege and dignity of this distinguished entrant into the most holy place.

While, however, the tabernacle arrangements, and particularly the institution of a priesthood with its exclusive privileges presented externally a remarkable contrast, as already remarked, to the greater freedom in religious matters enjoyed in the earlier ages, when every place was alike sacred, and every individual was allowed to transact directly with God for himself or his family,² there was properly no retrograde movement³ in the restrictions now introduced. The privileges of the worshippers of God were not in reality abridged, nor was God under the Levitical dispensation at a greater distance from his people, or in any degree more inaccessible than He had been at any earlier period. On the contrary, there was a decided advance in all that related to the manifestation of the Divine character, and the purposes of grace, with respect to the guilty, and particularly in the method of communication between God and man; but then, this very progress in the Divine revelation served primarily to increase the relative dis-

¹ Pye Smith, *Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ*, p. 128.

² Witsius, *Miscel. Sac. Lib.* ii. 2, § 18, p. 466.

³ Fairbairn, *Typology*, ii. 249.

tance by exhibiting more fully the opposition between the Holy One and sinners. It more immediately awakened that consciousness of guilt which called for a mediator, (Ex. xx. 29,) a feeling early evoked in the human breast, as appears from the existence of a priesthood in heathenism long prior to its institution among the Israelites. It is indeed worthy of consideration, whether the Israelitish priests referred to prior to the giving of the law, (Ex. xix. 22.) may not be accounted for on some principle of this kind. However this may be, the want thus felt, and which man's own devices attempted variously to supply, was as respects his own people authoritatively provided for by God through the appointment of the Aaronic priesthood, as the special ministers of his service and sanctuary.

As the tabernacle consisted, as already said, of two divisions, so its service was arranged into two parts. In the exterior apartment, and its adjacent court, in which was placed the altar of burnt-offering, *מִזְבֵּחַ הָעֹלֹתָהּ*, (Ex. xxx. 28,) so called, in order to distinguish it from the altar of incense, *מִזְבֵּחַ הַקְּטֹרֶת*, (ver. 27,) situated in the holy place, there was, in addition to private and occasional sacrifices, a regular daily service; one lamb being offered in the morning, and another in the evening, (Ex. xxix. 38-42). On certain stated occasions the number of the victims was greatly increased. The whole was thus emphatically a service of blood. The services carried on in the most holy place were of an entirely different character. None of the ordinary atoning acts were ever performed there, so that its service was properly without blood, yet not altogether independent of it. The purifying of the place itself from the uncleanness contracted by its connexion with a sinful people, was effected through blood, (Lev. xvi. 16); so that it is correctly stated, in Heb. ix. 7, that the entrance of the high priest therein once every year was "not without blood, (*ὅτι χωρὶς ἁίματος*), which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." Sacrifice, and the sprinkling of the blood, were the only procuring cause of admission into the Divine presence, (Lev. xvi. 3,) as also the medium for the removal of the defilement arising from the high priest's entrance, (Lev. xvi. 11-19); so that the blood of the sin-offerings for atonement, in respect both of the priest himself, and also of the people, was an essential element in this matter, as indeed

it had been shown, from the time of Abel's offering, that blood was indispensable in all approaches to God.

Other important truths represented by the Levitical sanctuary, its services and ministers, are noticed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and some of these will come afterwards under review; but, for the present, it is enough to consider very briefly the various kinds of sacrifice required by the law, and then more particularly the design of this institution. It was in sacrifice, whether stated or occasional, that all the various acts of the tabernacle services were concentrated; and in the ideas already suggested by that service, particularly when viewed in connexion with the sacrifices which were offered prior to the law, and which, being of a simpler form than those under the Levitical dispensation, expressed more clearly the general principle, it will appear that all the parts of that service were somehow related to the method of reconciliation, and were more particularly illustrative of the plan of redemption.

§ 2. *The kinds of Sacrifices enjoined in the Law.*

The sacrifices presented in accordance with the Levitical law were either stated or occasional. Of the stated or regular sacrifices, there were the daily burnt-offerings, consisting of a lamb presented morning and evening, with their complementary meal-offerings, (חֲמִצֵּי) and drink-offerings or libations, (שֵׂרֵבִית) Ex. xxix. 38-42; Num. xxviii. 3-8; all of which were to be doubled every Sabbath-day, (Num. xxviii. 9). There were also monthly sacrifices on the first of every new moon, in addition to the usual daily oblations, (Num. xxviii. 11); and, besides various annual sacrifices, as on the three great solemnities, the Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles, (Num. xxviii. 16—xxix.,) and other occasions, but especially the great Day of Atonement, (Lev. xvi.). All these sacrifices were of a national character, and so were provided at the public expense.

The occasional sacrifices were more numerous and varied, and had respect to the circumstances of individuals chiefly, and personal relations, whether of a public or private character. Another distinction with respect to these offerings

was, that they were either the spontaneous act of the worshipper, and so a free-will offering, (נִדְבָה, Lev. xxii. 18,) or the subject of statutory obligation arising from transgressions of the law, or some particular circumstances in the case of the individual occasioning uncleanness, which exposed to disabilities or punishment, from which sacrifice alone secured a deliverance. The voluntary oblations embraced three kinds—the sacrifice of thanksgiving, (תִּודָה,) of a vow, (נֶדֶר,) and the free-will offering in the stricter sense, (נִדְבָה), all comprehended under the general designation of peace-offerings, (שְׁלָמִים). The other division comprehended the sin-offering, (חַטָּאת,) and the closely related guilt or trespass-offering, (אֲשָׁם); the burnt-offering (עֹלָה) constituting the foundation of all the sacrifices.

There were other general distinctions dependent on the substances which constituted the various oblations. Offerings in the widest sense included everything presented to God as well before the altar as laid upon it; and so were designated in general as קָרְבָן (from קָרַב or הִקְרִיב, to bring near), *a gift*, (Lev. ii. 1, 4, &c.), comp. Mark vii. 11, *καρβῶν ὁ ἕσται ὁσῶρον*, and מִתְּנָה (from נתן, to give,) the same, (Ex. xxviii. 38,) and thus embraced the firstlings of the flock and the herd; the first-fruits; the incense and the shew-bread; and in later times, even the wood provided for the sacred fires of the altar was termed קָרְבָן הָעֵצִים, (Neh. x. 34; xiii. 31.)¹

A leading distinction with respect to the constituents of the offerings was the unbloody, (מִנְחָה,) consisting of productions of the vegetable kingdom, and the bloody sacrifice, (זֶבַח;) although the precise import of these terms was not always strictly adhered to, the former being in Gen. iv. 3, 4, applied indifferently to the two classes, and the latter sometimes occurring in a more limited sense as in the combination זֶבַח וְעֹלֹת, (Ex. x. 25; Josh. xxii. 26; comp. 1 Sam. vi. 15,) where it signifies what is elsewhere called peace-offerings. The second class, or sacrifices from the animal kingdom alone could be presented as independent offerings; the other, except in circumstances of extreme poverty, (Lev. v. 11,) could only be

¹ Winer, Bib. Real-Wörterbuch, Art. Opfer, ii. 177.

presented as supplementary to an animal oblation, (see Lev. xxiii. 10-12, 17-20.)

Further, the victims allowable in sacrifice were limited to the class of animals reckoned "clean," a distinction which, as already seen, was observed in the time of Noah, and in this class again there was a more special limitation to the domestic animals, bullocks, sheep, goats, turtle-doves and pigeons. Besides, all these must be without bodily blemish; and with the exception of the doves, with regard to which nothing is specified, not less than eight days old, (Ex. xxii. 30; Lev. xxii. 27.) As to the sex of the animal, it was in some instances left to the option of the offerer, as in peace-offerings, (Lev. iii. 1, 6;) in other cases males were required, as in the burnt-offering, (Lev. i. 3, 10,) and certain kinds of sin-offerings, as of the priests, the congregation, and the ruler, (Lev. iv. 3, 14, 23;) whereas in the sin-offering of one of the people a female was required, (ver. 28.)¹ In like manner a choice as to the kind of animal was permitted in burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, (Lev. i. 2; iii. 1, 6;) but the matter was regulated by law in the case of trespass-offerings and sin-offerings, (Lev. iv. 5.) In all such instances the higher class of victims was required from offerers who occupied a public official position, either civil or sacred. In one peculiar instance, that of the Red Heifer, there was a restriction as to colour, (Num. xix.,) but this did not properly come under the law of sacrifice, and was altogether an exceptional case.²

An ingredient which necessarily entered into all kinds of sacrifice was salt. So important was this, that it formed the subject of special injunctions, "And every oblation of thy meat-offering shalt thou season with salt: neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat-offering: with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt," (Lev. ii. 13, comp. Num. xviii. 19.) To this reference is made in Mark ix. 49, "For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." As salt is the great preservative of animal matter, it was fitted to serve

¹ Hottinger, De Sacrificiis, § 29, ² Kurtz, Das Mosaisches Opfer, p. p. 431. Winer, Bib. Real-Wörterbuch, 303.
Art. Opfer, ii. 178.

as a symbol of the purity which is essential to the worship of God. Just as on the other hand, all leaven was as expressly excluded from the offerings of the Lord, (Lev. ii. 11,) because containing an element of corruption, and so was utterly alien to the pure worship established in Israel.¹

The purposes for which offerings were brought, and which accordingly determined their character, have been already partially noticed. These purposes were in general to make satisfaction to God, and to his law established in Israel when violated in particular instances, or to thank Him for blessings received. Hence one reason at least for the great diversity of offerings introduced under the Levitical system, was to effect a correspondence in some measure between this institution and the various phases of the relation between God and man brought to light in the law, and which, owing to the imperfection inherent in animal sacrifice, could not be represented by any one particular offering. If the desire of the worshipper was to obtain forgiveness, he offered a trespass or sin-offering according to the special nature of his offence; or if, in the consciousness of reconciliation, he would express his gratitude for that state or other particular blessings, he offered a peace-offering. All these sacrifices rested on, or sprung out of the original burnt-offering.² They were in fact special applications of it to meet new exigencies, so that the very diversity and multiplicity of the legal sacrifices as compared with the simplicity of the earlier ritual was an evidence of the advance made in Divine revelation, with special reference to the medium of reconciliation.

The comprehensive and fundamental character of the burnt-offering will be apparent from the following considerations:—

First, burnt-offerings, הֲבִילָה , לֵבְלֵבָה , LXX. *ἑλοκαύτωμα*, (Mark xii. 33; Heb. x. 6, 8); Josephus, *ἑλοκαύτωσις*, because wholly consumed on the altar, were at first and for a considerable period the only sacrifices in use, or at least which found acceptance with God. During that time they were applied to every part of sacrificial worship; whether the object was to render thanks for benefits received, to deprecate evil or to supplicate good,

¹ Bähr, Symbolik, ii. 324-326. Fairbairn, Typology, ii. 365, 366.

² Bähr, Symbolik, ii. 362, 363.

³ Antiq. ix. 7, § 4.

or in general to keep up communion with God. All this appeared from the history of Abel, Noah, Abraham, and the other patriarchs. Noah, in particular, offered burnt-offerings, as well to deprecate the Divine wrath as also to express thanksgiving for the preservation of himself and his family. And at a time long subsequent, but in circumstances not affected by the law, though after its promulgation, Balaam directed burnt-offerings to be prepared when he sought the destruction of the Israelites and the prosperity of Balak (Num. xxiii.) "These facts," observes Outram, "justify the conclusion that those who lived before the time of Moses, or were unacquainted with his law, some times connected burnt-offerings with every part of Divine worship."¹

The sacrifices of Jethro on his visit to Moses presented some modifications of the original burnt-offering, inasmuch as it would appear some part of the flesh was reserved, if it indeed constituted that sacred feast of which the heads of Israel partook with the Midianitish priest. If such was the case, it shows the progress of the idea, the full development of which awaited the law. Yet even in this instance the primary and comprehensive character of the burnt-offering was fully maintained.

Secondly, the fundamental place occupied by the burnt-offering is further seen in the fact, that whereas sacrifices of this kind could, under the law, be presented apart from and irrespective of other offerings, these were usually accompanied by a burnt-offering, as in the case of the peace-offering, (Ex. xxiv. 5 ; xxxii. 6 ; Num. x. 10,) and even of the trespass-offering, (Lev. v. 7 ; viii. 14, 18 ; xii. 6 ; xvi. 3,) and were invariably associated with it in one way or other.

Thirdly, the burnt-offering constituted the stated public sacrifices which extended their influence to, and in a manner inclosed all the occasional sacrifices of whatever description and importance they might be, for they were all preceded and followed by the daily oblation, morning and evening. Even as occasional sacrifices burnt-offerings were frequently presented, both in compliance with the requirements of the law, and as votive and voluntary offerings. They were required of the Nazarite when defiled by a dead body, or when discharged

¹ De Sacrificiis, Lib. i. 10, § 5. E. T., p. 124.

from his vow (Num. vi. 11, 14); of persons about to be cleansed from the leprosy (Lev. xiv. 19, 20), and various other defilements (Lev. xv. 15, 30); of women after child-birth (Lev. xii. 8); and of the high-priest on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 24). Even in cases where the offerer could bring only two doves to expiate his transgression, one of them must be offered as a burnt-offering, (Lev. v. 10). Further, that the burnt-offering was presented as votive and voluntary sacrifices, appears from Ps. lxvi. 13-15; li. 18, 19.

Other circumstances might be referred to in proof that, even under the law, the burnt-offering retained much of its original distinction. Thus the fact that, in Deut. xxxii. 10, the functions of the priests with respect to the presentation of sacrifice is described by a reference to this kind of offering; and also, that the altar of sacrifice itself was designated as "the altar of burnt-offering." But enough has been advanced to show the precise position which this, the oldest of sacrifices, maintained under the law, and thereby to establish another point of connexion between the Levitical and the older dispensation. The connexion with respect to this particular is the more important, as it enables the inquirer to pursue with greater ease the principles deduced from the earlier and simpler form of sacrifice, without his attention being distracted, at the outset, by the numerous and minute details afterwards superinduced, and some of which had only a very remote bearing on the doctrine of sacrifice, and rather respected certain collateral objects.

§ 3. *The Design of Sacrifice.*

Although, however, the burnt-offering was the foundation of all the sacrifices, there were others in which special truths were more fully concentrated. The sin-offering, in particular, was the highest expression of the principle of expiation; having to do with sin in the most definite sense, and as consisting in special acts of transgression. Taking, however, the burnt-offering as embodying the general features of peculiar sacrifice, and without entering into a consideration of the minute distinctions of the various kinds of offerings, the manner of their presentation and disposal, or the more special

objects for which they were presented, except where it would appear some important truth was involved, the subject may be suitably arranged under the following heads:—1. The preparations for the sacrifice; 2. The manner in which the victim was disposed of; and, 3. The result to the offerer, or the benefits accruing from sacrifice.

1. The preparations for the sacrifice commenced by the offerer bringing the animal, appropriate in the particular case, to the door of the tabernacle, and laying his hand upon its head, (Lev. i. 3, 4).

The victims, as already noticed, must be taken from the domestic animals—an arrangement intended probably to denote the closest possible relation between the offerer and that which was to be accepted for him. By bringing the animal to the tabernacle or the altar, “before Jehovah,” the party confessed that he designed his offering for God, who there graciously revealed himself. By the imposition of hands, (על ראשׁוֹ יָדוֹ וְיָדוֹ עָלָיו) the victim, as the offerer’s property, was not only formally dedicated to God—a purpose to which Bähr¹ restricts this act—there was also, and more particularly imparted to it, a representative character in respect to the offerer’s person, intentions, and emotions—the distinguishing feature of which depended on the particular kind of sacrifice presented.² In the case of the proper piacular sacrifices, this imported the confession of sin, no doubt, and the transfer or imputation of guilt to the victim; although, from the use of this act in other instances, as the peace-offering, (Lev. iii. 2,) it must have had a more extended and general signification. The import of the ceremony, however, is put beyond question by the fact that, on the great Day of Atonement, in the case of the scape-goat, it was accompanied with an express confession of sin. “And 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,” &c., (Lev. xvi. 21). From this it is generally inferred, but perhaps without sufficient authority,

¹ Symbolik, ii. 341. So also Knobel, Carpov, Apparatus Antiq., p. 711. die BB. Exodus u. Leviticus, p. 354. Francof. 1748. Magee, Atonement. i.

² Kurtz, Das Mos. Opfer, pp. 67, 68. 236-244. Keil, Bib. Archäologie, p. 206. Comp.

that in all other cases the imposition of hands was accompanied by a confession of the particular sin for which the sacrifice was brought. But it is more probable that, on ordinary occasions, there was no verbal confession or transfer of guilt—that being sufficiently expressed by the symbolic act; while the public character of the transaction on the Day of Atonement made a confession of sin suitable. It is certain that confession of sin was required in some other private instances, (Lev. v. 5; Num. v. 7); but these had no direct connexion with the sacrificial ritual.

After the animal had been thus symbolically set apart for God, and as a substitute for the guilty—it being accepted by God for the offerer “to make atonement for him,” (Lev. i. 4,)—the next proceeding was to slay it. In the public and stated offerings, this part of the service was performed by the priests, and, in certain circumstances, by the Levites, (2 Chron. xxix. 33, 34); but in all private sacrifices this duty fell to the individual offerer, (Lev. i. 5,) unless it be that the expression is used indefinitely, as understood by the LXX.; *σφάξουσιν*, “they shall slay,” meaning that some one should do it. That it was the act of the worshipper himself, is, however, more in accordance with the text.¹ It was only after the slaughter of the victim that the proper priestly functions began, the first act of which was the disposal of the sacrificial blood.

It may, in passing, be remarked, that it is strange that any one, like Bähr² and Keil,³ from the fact that the slaughtering of the animal was the work of the offerer himself, and not of the priest, should conclude that its death was not regarded as a punishment for sin; on the assumption that, if it were such, the act must be performed by the priest, the representative of God, the judge and avenger of sin. But this is taking quite a mistaken, though by no means uncommon, view of the sacerdotal office.⁴ The priest did not represent God, but man,⁵ being ordained, as stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, for

¹ Knobel, Die BB. Exod. u. Lev., p. 355.

² Symbolik, ii. 343.

³ Biblische Archäologie, p. 207.

⁴ Fairbairn, Typology, ii. 298. There is here probably nothing more than an

inadvertence, as at pp. 251, 252, where the priestly relation is formally discussed, it is ably presented in its proper light.

⁵ See Witsius, Miscel. Sac., Lib. ii. 2. § 71, p. 500.

men (ὑπερ ἀνθρώπων) in their relation to God, (Heb. v. 1,) ordained or appointed for men as their representative before God, (comp. Heb. ix. 24). Were this not the case, the institution of a priesthood, with its exclusive privileges as to the presentation of offerings, would alter the entire aspect of the matter as exhibited in the ante-Levitical sacrifices, and would, in fact, be irreconcilable with the practice which long prevailed, of the offerer presenting the sacrifice in his own person, without an intermediate agency. The correct view of the priesthood is that, however, which regards it not as a new institution, or as occupying an antagonistic position to the privileges which the worshippers of God formerly enjoyed, but as a further development of the older system, and its attendant blessings. And then, in respect to the particular here objected to, there was, in fact, a special propriety in the offerer himself performing the act of slaying the sacrifice, and so carrying out, as it were, the sentence of his own condemnation.¹ This must have made the matter far more impressive, by bringing the mind into more direct contact with the transferred guilt and its penal consequences. And, besides, there was thus no violent break in the sacrificial service of the law, as compared with that of the older economy. So much of the earlier practice was retained as served to maintain the continuity of the principle, that in and through sacrifice there was access to God, though for the present not complete or immediate.

The animal having, by its adduction to the altar, and the imposition of hands, been designated for a sacrifice, it was through that very act constituted unclean. As the representative of the guilty offerer, it was made *sin*, made to embody or represent it; for such is the primary and literal import of the Piel form סָפַח , (a denominative from סָפַח),² in Lev. vi. 19 [26]; ix. 15, and not as it is usually taken, to offer as a sin-offering, an idea expressed by $\text{תָּסִיחַ הַזֶּבֶחַ}$ (Lev. xiv. 19; xvi. 9). There are other instances, indeed, where the same verb has an entirely opposite signification, of expiating or cleansing impurity

¹ See Kurtz, Das Mos. Opfer, p. 76. here with respect to the functions of the priest. The same confusion is apparent even

² Fürst, Heb. Handwörterbuch, p. 391.

and guilt, as in Lev. viii. 15 ; xiv. 49, 52. This, however, easily admits of reconciliation. In the latter case there is simply the carrying out of the former idea, completing the act or purpose for which the sacrifice was offered. A twofold signification of this kind often characterises a denominative Piel;¹ a striking instance of which is פָּזַח , to reduce to ashes (Ps. xx. 4), and also to purify from ashes, to remove the ashes of the sacrifice (Ex. xxvii. 3 ; Num. iv. 13). Closely related to its primary import is the use of סָפַח , in Gen. xxxi. 39, where Jacob intimates that he was made responsible by Laban for any loss among his cattle. It was further owing to the relation constituted between the sacrificial victim and sin that the term $\text{תּוֹשֵׁבֵי חַטָּאת}$, *sin*, came also to signify, as already noticed,² a "sin-offering." The only objection to the view that the animal was rendered unclean, by its being treated in the manner described, is the fact that the flesh was accounted holy, and was in consequence to be eaten by the priests in the sanctuary ; but this difficulty is at once disposed of when it is observed, that this was only after the expiation had been effected through the death of the animal and the sprinkling of its blood, and accordingly under an entirely new condition. But of this more fully afterwards.

A very explicit testimony to the uncleanness contracted by the animal is the fact, that in the case of the scape-goat the uncleanness was such as to pollute the person who led it away, and who was in consequence required to wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water before he could enter the camp. It was the same also with the person who burned the bullock and the other goat of the sin-offering, on the same occasion³ (Lev. xvi. 26-28), although this, it must be admitted, is capable of being viewed in an entirely different aspect. It is, moreover, in entire agreement with this that, according to Scripture usage, sins which have not been expiated are described as a taint by which the sinner is defiled (Lev. xviii. 20, 24), and hence the expiation of sin is very frequently designated by terms indicative of purification, as $\text{פָּקַד$ in particular (Lev. xiv. 11 ; xvi. 30), by the LXX. rendered $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\omega$.

¹ Ewald, Heb. Sprachl., § 120, e.

393, 409, pp. 274, 280. Outram, De

² See above, vol. ii. p. 133.

Sacrificiis, Lib. i. 17, §§ 1, 2.

³ Hottinger, Minist. Expiat. Diei, §§

Now, as the animal was of the class reckoned "clean," and must in itself have been free from all imperfection or blemish, so that there was nothing in its nature to constitute uncleanness, it was thus unmistakably declared that its defilement arose entirely from a cause external to itself. This could be none other than the special position which it was symbolically made to occupy previous to its immolation as a sacrifice, and this again consisted in the transfer or imputation to it of the sinner's guilt, so that the animal, in itself clean, thus became polluted.¹ In like manner, with respect to the one great sacrifice of the New Testament, it is said of Christ, in terms borrowed directly from the ancient ritual, that he was made *sin for us* (2 Cor. v. 21); and as a consequence of this substitution he was made, "a curse" (Gal. iii. 13); while, to show that this was entirely owing to the position which he occupied with respect to the law as the representative of sinners, it is added, "He knew no sin," for he was, as elsewhere described, "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners" (Heb. vii. 26). According to a prophetic intimation, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities" (Isa. liii. 5),—language well understood by all who were familiar with the doctrine of sacrifice, and which is thus rendered, as it were, in the New Testament, in even stricter sacrificial phraseology: "He himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree" (1 Pet. ii. 24).

2. All the preliminaries having been duly completed, and the animal slaughtered before Jehovah, the proper priestly functions began with the disposal of the several parts of the sacrifice, and first, of the blood as its chief constituent.²

The blood was applied variously, according to the different kinds of sacrifice; but always with a special reference to the altar. Most usually it was sprinkled upon the altar round about,—an arrangement indicative of a general or indefinite application. It was so applied in the burnt-offering, peace-offering, and trespass-offering (Lev. i. 5, 11; iii. 2, 8 3; vii. 2). In the sin-offerings, again, as conveying more distinctly the idea of expiation, the mode of applying the blood was much more formal, and this in proportion to the aggravated character of the sin in any particular case, considered in respect to

¹ Magee, Atonement, i. 240.

² Bähr, Symbolik, ii. 200.

the theocratic standing of the transgressor. In the ordinary sin-offerings of civil rulers, and of private individuals, the blood was smeared upon the horns of the altar, and the residue poured out at its base (Lev. iv. 25, 30, 34). But in the sin-offerings of the High priest and of the congregation, the ceremony was more complicated; for the blood was sprinkled "seven times before the Lord, before the vail of the sanctuary;" some of it was also put on the horns of the altar of incense, "before the Lord," and the residue poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. iv. 6, 7, 17, 18); while, upon the Day of Atonement, it was sprinkled upon and before the mercy-seat, and afterwards put upon the horns of the altar, "that is before the Lord," and also sprinkled seven times upon the same (Lev. xvi. 14, 15, 18, 19).¹

After the blood had been disposed of in the manner prescribed, the victim, except when the carcass was wholly burned without the camp, as was the case in the sin-offerings of the High priest and the congregation, was next stripped of its skin, which then became the property of the officiating priest (Lev. vii. 8). In this appropriation of the skin of the sacrifice, many² detect a connexion with the early notice of the coats of skin with which God clothed the first transgressors in Eden; and certainly there is much ground for such a supposition, for in both cases there was the expression of an important spiritual truth, while the two notices are supplementary of one another. In the first, the provision made for the sinner's moral nakedness was particularly brought out, corresponding to the teaching on this subject in Rev. iii. 18; but it was only inferentially that this clothing could be seen to be the produce of sacrifice. Any obscurity on this point was removed by this notice in the law, and which in turn assumed its full significance only in the light of the earlier intimation.

Next the victim was divided into its pieces, natural, appropriate parts, whereupon the priest arranged the fire on the altar, and then burned so much of the sacrifice as was requisite in the several offerings. In the burnt-offering the whole

¹ Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, Lib. i. 16, §§ 2-4.

158. Witsius, *De Economia Fœderum*, Lib. iv. 7, § 4, p. 516. *Idem*, *Miscel.*

² Cloppenburg, *Schola Sacrif.*, cap. ii., § 4, p. 11. Heidegger, *Hist. Patr.* i.

Sac., Lib. ii. 2, § 12, p. 463.

was consumed, after the inwards and the legs had been washed with water (Lev. i. 9); in other cases only certain portions were burned, but always the fat, which was expressly reserved for the Lord, and appropriated to the altar (Lev. iii. 16), and was, equally with the blood, interdicted as an article of human food (Lev. iii. 17; vii. 23-27). The remaining parts were in general reserved for the priests, as in the sin-offering (vi. 21), and the trespass-offering (vii. 6, 7); while in the peace-offerings (vii. 15, 16, 33, 34) it was appropriated between the priest and the offerer; the flesh of the sin and trespass-offering possessed such a character of sacredness that it must be eaten exclusively by the priests in the court of the tabernacle. The meat-offering also belonged to the priest (ii. 3, 10; vi. 16, 17), and also the vegetable sin-(or trespass-) offering (vi. 26). It was only, however, in ordinary cases that the flesh of the sin-offering was allowed to be eaten at all: "No sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile in the holy place shall be eaten, it shall be burnt in the fire" (Lev. vi. 30; comp. Heb. xiii. 11).

In every respect the sin-offering possessed a peculiar character of holiness. It rendered sacred every person and thing with which it came into contact. The garment on which a drop of the blood happened to be sprinkled must be washed in the holy place; and the vessel in which the flesh was cooked must if earthen be broken, inasmuch as its porous quality allowed it to imbibe of the substance; or if of metal, it required to be thoroughly scoured before it could be put to any other use.

The peculiarity which attached to the sin and trespass-offering, that it must be eaten by the priests, and by them exclusively, was one of special importance. The participation of the offerer and his family, as well as the priests in the eating of the peace-offering, showed it to be a social repast, affording an occasion of family rejoicing, (Deut. xii. 18,) in consequence of the efficacy of the atonement, but there was nothing of this kind in the eating of the sin-offering. As Bähr¹ remarks: "It was peculiarly a *priestly* meal, and the joyousness and

¹ Symbolik, ii. 294.

festivity, which, according to the oriental idea, are inseparable from a repast, are wholly wanting. Here the priests appear as priests, in the exercise of their peculiar office and dignity." The purpose which by this act they discharged, consisted, as stated in Lev. x. 17, in bearing by Divine appointment, the iniquity of the congregation. On one occasion, when this duty had been neglected, Moses inquired of the priests, "Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it unto you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord?"

The expression נָשָׂא אִשָּׁתוֹ, "to bear iniquity" has a two-fold signification, according as it is used of the person who committed the wrong, or of him who was injured or offended thereby. In the former sense it means to *bear* or carry as a burden, and so endure the penal consequences of transgression (Gen. iv. 13; Lev. v. 1, 17; xvii. 16;) in the latter, it is *bearing with*, or forbearing, and hence pardoning, (Gen. l. 17; Exod. xxxii. 32; xxxiv. 7.)¹ In no instance whatever is the explanation "to bear away," or remove, still given to this term by Bähr,² after the early Socinian writers, admissible. The removal of the guilt is indeed involved in forgiveness, so that the one act may be fitly described by the other, as in Psalm lxxxv. 3, [2:] "Thou hast forgiven the iniquity, (נָשָׂא אִשָּׁתוֹ) of thy people," is explained in the second hemistich by, "thou hast covered all their sin." Still the ideas are far from identical, and wherever the "bearing of sin" is applied to the sinner, or to a substitute provided for him, it expresses only the endurance of the penalty of transgression. However, this substitution and its Divine appointment are clearly set forth in the passage under consideration, (Lev. x. 17.) Whether in "bearing the sin" the reference here be to the priest, as taken by Bähr, or to the victim, is immaterial, as in either case the vicarious character of the transaction is manifest, while indeed the chief

¹ Magee, Atonement, i. 281-290.

² Symbolik, ii. 206. Hofmann, (Der Schriftbeweis II., i. 184, 185,) admits that Lev. x. 17, refers not to the priests taking away, but to their

taking upon themselves the sins of the congregation; but his attempted explanation of the mode of forgiveness is exceedingly defective.

purpose of this specific provision is to identify the priest with the sacrifice. The bearing of the sin by the victim or by the priest, instead of its being left to be borne by the sinner himself, was wholly through a Divine appointment, while it further appears that the object contemplated in this substitution and transfer, was that the sin so borne might be taken away by atonement. The Levitical priest, as man's representative, could not of himself, though possessed of a symbolical holiness and dignity, bear the sin, or expiate it by undergoing its penalty; this accordingly, under so imperfect a dispensation, must be accomplished by a separate medium, the sacrificial victim; but in order to connect as much as possible the priest and the sacrifice, to incorporate the two as it were, the priest must eat the sin-offering in which was expressed, as already remarked, the highest embodiment of sin. It is a confirmation of this view, that it was only in cases where the priests sustained fully their representative character, that they partook of the sin offering, and that wherever they appeared themselves needing expiation, as when the offering was for the whole congregation, including the priests, or for the High priest as the head of his order, the victim must be disposed of in another mode.¹ In the same manner also the priests' own ordinary meat-offering must be entirely burned; nothing of it was allowed to be eaten, (vi. 22, 23.) In these latter circumstances they could not at all represent Him, who united in himself priest and sacrifice, and who needed not to offer for his own sins, but only for the errors of his people, (Heb. vii. 27.)

Dr. Fairbairn regards the eating of the flesh of the sin-offering by the priests as "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."² To denote reconciliation was the distinctive characteristic of the peace-offerings, where not only the priest, but the offerer and his friends could feast on the sacrifice "before Jehovah," and if this idea be expressed at all in the present case, it is

¹ Bähr, Symbolik, ii. 395.

² Typology, ii. 346.

certainly not the primary one. All that seems to be intimated by this arrangement was the close relation which the priest sustained to the offering, and consequently to the offerer, nor is there evidence at all to warrant the supposition of Kurtz,¹ who in this matter closely follows Bähr,² that it also pointed to the priests' relation to Jehovah realized through the Divine humanity of Christ. This truth was however expressed in another way, but not by the present ordinance, which indicated simply the identity of the priest and the victim, a relation necessary to the idea of a proper substitution and sacrifice.

It cannot but appear at first sight very remarkable that the victims rendered impure during the preliminary sacrificial process, which symbolically represented the transference or imputation of the offerer's guilt, were, immediately after the shedding of their blood, rendered pure. The blood itself was not only pure, but it purified everything with which it was brought into contact; as the altar, the sanctuary, and even the most holy place, which on the Day of Atonement were thus severally "cleansed and hallowed from the uncleanness of the children of Israel," (Lev. xvi. 16, 18). Even the flesh, too, after it was washed with water, assumed such a sacred character as admitted it to the previously blood-sprinkled and cleansed altar, which represented the table of Jehovah, which was in this manner furnished with "the food (or bread) of the offering made by fire (לֶחֶם זֶבַח) unto Jehovah," (Lev. iii. 11, 16; xxi. 6, 9).

It would thus appear that the legal consequences of the imputed guilt terminated with the death of the victim, or at least with the application of its blood in the manner enjoined. That everything of a penal character was fully exhausted in the death of the sacrifice, is evident from the fact, that with the application of the blood an entirely new relation seems to have commenced. That the blood, as representing the physical life, had a special sacredness attached to it even as early as the time of Noah, has been already shown; but the particular ground of this consecration was not declared until sacrificial observances were systematized under the law, and their principles more fully explained; whereupon there is this inti-

Mos. Opfer, p. 183.

² Symbolik, ii. 395

mation from God, after interdicting the use of blood in food : "For the soul (נִפְשׁוֹ) 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 (or by means of) the soul,"¹ (טִבַּחְכֶּם) Lev. xvii. 11.

In this declaration, first, God appears as the author of the atoning ordinance. Man's own wisdom was utterly inadequate to the devising of means whereby sin could be satisfactorily atoned for ; but God interposed, and by an ordinance of his own removed what was offensive in his sight, and what separated between him and the transgressor of his law. If there be not in this statement an express intimation of the Divine origin of sacrifice, there is, at least, a full confirmation of the arguments deducible from the nature of the case, which would preclude any other supposition. The words, "I have given it to you," are parallel, as far as the Divine ordination is concerned, with the first promise of redemption, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman," only that now there is a fuller disclosure of the plan by which that purpose shall be accomplished.

But while it was this Divine appointment that gave to the blood of sacrifice its whole value, why this, rather than any other medium, was adopted for effecting reconciliation, is also accounted for in this statement. It was not because there was any virtue in the material blood either of man or of beast, but simply because it constituted, or rather contained the life principle.² "The soul, or living principle, is in the blood ;" . . . "the blood atones by means of the soul, or life of the immolated animal," and not as the expression טִבַּחְכֶּם is generally rendered, "for the soul" of the offerer ; nor, as taken by Hofmann : "the blood, as the soul, in this character atones."³ It was on the pouring out of this life principle that the whole efficacy of the sacrifice depended, while the subsequent application of the blood, whether to the sanctuary, or, in certain cases, to the person of the worshipper, denoted the cleansing power and meritorious virtue with which, as the

¹ Bähr, Symbolik, ii. 199. Kurtz,

² Knobel, Die BB. Exod. u. Lev., p. 498.

Der Schriftbeweis, II., i. 151.

blood of sacrifice, it was ended. The whole sacrificial system, from the first notice of the rite in the history of Abel, declared with ever-increasing emphasis, that "without the shedding of blood there was no remission." Why the condition was such, or in other words, why, in the substitutionary arrangement designed by God for carrying out his purposes of grace, it was necessary that life should go for life, was clearly taught in the primal threatening, and repeated at every subsequent stage of the economy of redemption: under the law, it was declared, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die;" and no less emphatically under the gospel, "the wages of sin is death."

As it is, however, with respect to this point, that the views of some of the more recent writers on the subject of sacrifice, as Bähr, Hofmann, and Keil, chiefly conflict with that generally entertained, and which is ably supported by Kurtz, it may be well to notice briefly the peculiarities of the respective theories. Such a review, if it serve no other purpose, may contribute to place the doctrine of substitution in a clearer light.

(1.) According to Bähr,¹ the idea expressed by sacrifice was the surrender of the sinner's life to, and its reunion with God, from whom it had been separated by sin. The giving away of the life of the irrational animal symbolized the life of the offerer dedicated anew to God, on returning to him by faith and repentance—the death of the victim being expressive of the penitent's mortification to sin, to be completed in sanctification through fellowship with God. There was, however, no proper substitution, and no punishment whatever in the transaction.

(2.) In the view of Hofmann,² the animal offering was a compensation to God, a satisfaction for sin; for rendering which, God had committed to man power over the life of the animal to apply it to this purpose, (Lev. xvii. 11). The offerer's power over the animal, and his purpose to avail himself of it, were denoted by the imposition of hands upon the victim's head—an act which Hofmann regards as including more than Bähr assigns to it, when he views it as merely testifying to the offerer's property in the animal, and his readiness to de-

¹ Symbolik, ii. 210, 211.

² Der Schriftbeweis, II., i. 191, 192.

vote it as an offering to God. Hofmann considers the transaction as grounded not so much on the common right of property, as on the Divine grant for this particular purpose, and which he holds to be the prior right of the two, inasmuch as man was clothed with the skins before he was allowed to eat the flesh of animals. This view, equally with that of Bähr, denies all substitutive connection between the offering and the offerer. Sacrifice, as an atoning medium divinely provided for man, was an arrangement from which he could discern that God does not forgive sin unconditionally, or without some satisfaction being rendered for it.

(3.) The theory of Keil¹ differs considerably from the two preceding. This writer maintains with Bähr, and in opposition to Hofmann, that the death of the victim is in no sense a satisfaction for sin, although the sinner may discern in that act what he has merited, were God in His righteousness so to deal with him. The death of the victim symbolized the death of the sinner in consequence of sin, not in a penal aspect, but serving as the medium of transition from a state of estrangement towards God, to that of holy fellowship with him. In this there is some resemblance to the views of Bähr, with whom Keil further agrees in holding, that the slaying of the sacrifice had nothing in it of a penal character, although he admits, less consistently than that writer, that it was laden with the sins of the offerer.

After what has been already adduced with respect both to the earlier and the Levitical practice, it must be evident that all these theories fail to convey an adequate and consistent view of the teaching of Scripture on this subject, and that violence must be done to various texts before they can be brought into harmony with one or other of these representations. Notice was already taken of Bähr's erroneous view of the imposition of hands, and which was necessary, if he would exclude the idea of the transfer of guilt, as may be seen from the inconsistency manifested in the theory of Keil, when he accepts this act in its only proper sense, and yet denies that the death was of a punitive character. The inadequacy, or rather, the futility of one of the grounds on which both Bähr

¹ Bib. Archäologie, §§ 43, 47, pp. 207, 228.

and Keil deny the penal character of the death of the victim, because not inflicted by the priest, has also been already exposed. Indeed, the great aim of these writers, if they would at all commend their respective theories, must be to depreciate as much as possible the death of the victim; and accordingly, with this view, they confine the significance of the rite to the sprinkling of the blood. This, Bähr holds, was the essential part of the sacrifice. The blood, as the bearer of life, was the atoning medium, irrespective of the death endured in obtaining it, which was only incidental to the transaction. Keil does not go so far in eliminating the death of the victim of all participation in the matter, although he denies that it was an element in the expiation, which was effected by the bringing of the blood to the altar, and which symbolized the reception of the offerer into the gracious communion of God.

On this it is enough to remark, that the shedding of the blood is, according to the invariable usage of Scripture, the primary element in the sacrifice—and that the death of the victim in the room of the offerer was a feature brought prominently into view long before there was any direction for the disposal of the blood. The passage in Lev. xvii. 11, appealed to¹ as indicating that the sprinkling of the blood was the essential matter, does not warrant such a conclusion, for it does not treat directly of sacrifice, or the relative importance of the blood in that rite, but only of its prohibition from common use, because specially appropriated to sacrificial purposes.² Nor can it have escaped notice that the expiation from which, on such views, death was excluded, is of a different character from what Scripture represents under that term; but of this under the next head.

With regard to the view of Hofmann, it may suffice to observe that it is not easy to discern, on such a supposition, either what the death of the victim, or the presentation of its blood, had specially to do in effecting the satisfaction ascribed to these acts. Nor is it more intelligible why so complex a ritual should be needed for inculcating a truth so simple as the necessity of some satisfaction before God would pardon sin—the main purpose which Hofmann ascribes to it; while,

¹ Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. 202, 203.

² Kurtz, *Mos. Opfer*, pp. 11, 12.

on the same view, its teaching was so deficient as to the source whence an adequate satisfaction should be provided, particularly when it must have been so fully apparent that the animal oblation was no proper equivalent for transgression.

3. The result to the offerer, or the nature and extent of the expiation arising from the acceptance of the sacrifice, is the last point to be considered.

The directions given with regard to the selection, presentation, and slaying of the victim, with the instructions as to the disposal of its blood and its flesh, the more important of which have been noticed in the foregoing observations, would suffice, even were there no express intimations on the subject, to give an idea of the purposes which sacrifice was intended to serve. That the sacrificial act had respect to God, and that its object was to reconcile Him or secure his favour, and in certain cases to express gratitude for benefits received, was clearly discernible from the whole history of this rite, as well as from the more direct statement in the law. Further, that the victim was the subject of vicarious punishment, or was substituted in room of the offerer with the design of expiating his guilt, so that he might be delivered from its penal consequences, was no less clearly manifested. The vicarious or substitutionary character of the victim was shown in the fact that after the imposition on its head of the offerer's hand, representing the transfer of his guilt, the animal became unclean and obnoxious to death. The doctrine of substitution had been unmistakably exhibited in the sacrifice of Moriah, but it was in the law it found full expression, particularly in the explanation of the ordinance which appointed the sin-offering to be eaten by the priests. And, finally, it was also apparent that it was owing entirely to this substitution, and the death which resulted therefrom, that any benefit accrued to the offerer.

On some of these points, however, it will be necessary to adduce some of the more express testimonies on the subject. And first, that God accepted the sacrifice in the room of the offerer, and to make atonement for him, is clearly stated at the very outset of the ritual. "If any man bring an offering.—a burnt-sacrifice . . . he shall offer it for his acceptance before Jehovah," לְרִצְוֹנוֹ לְפָנַי יְהוָה, not as in the Eng. version, "of his

own voluntary will," but as in the LXX. *δεκτὸν ἔναντι κυρίου*, and closely in the Vulg. "Ad placandum sibi Dominum"—a sense moreover demanded by the next verse, "it shall be accepted for him," (Lev. i. 2-4.) The object contemplated by the presentation of the victim, and its favourable acceptance by Jehovah, was reconciliation. This is stated in the words immediately following: "It shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him," agreeably to the Divine purpose expressed in Lev. xvii. 11, "I have given it (the blood) to you upon the altar to atone for your souls."

The term כָּפַר usually rendered "to atone," signifies in Kal *to cover* as with pitch, Gen. vi. 14. the only instance where it occurs, but sufficient to indicate the primary import of the frequently occurring Piel in relation to sin,¹ as connected with כָּפַר also denoting the covering of sin in respect to propitiation or forgiveness (Ps. xxxii. 1; lxxxv. 3.) The term כָּפַר is variously construed;² sometimes it is followed by the accusative of the sin or uncleanness to be covered, or the thing to which the uncleanness adheres, as כָּפַר עֲוֹן (Ps. lxxv. 4; lxxviii. 38); כִּי אֶת־הַקָּדוֹשׁ (Lev. xvi. 20, 33); more frequently by עַל of the person, as כִּי עָלָיו (Lev. i. 4; iv. 20), but sometimes of the sin (Ps. lxxix. 9). The more complete form, however, is כִּי עָלָיו עַל־הַחַטָּאתוֹ (Lev. iv. 35; v. 13, 18), "to cover upon him upon his sin;" or כִּי עָלָיו מִחַטָּאתוֹ (Lev. iv. 26; v. 6, 10, xvi. 33, 34), "to cover upon him from his sin," LXX. ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀνεσθ. From this covering follows the idea of propitiation, as a removing from view whatever is displeasing to a person whom it is desired to reconcile, or in general whatever constitutes a ground of opposition and controversy.

With כָּפַר is also related יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים (Lev. xxiii. 27, 28). "The day of coverings," or atonement, when all sin and uncleanness was to be removed from the congregation and the sanctuary; and also כִּפְרוֹת the *cover* of the ark of the covenant, not in its material character of a lid to the receptacle of the tables of the law, but as related to the covering of sin, or to expiation, as viewed by the LXX., ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα (Ex. xxv.

¹ Hottinger, *Minist. Expiationum*, Diei, p. 119.

² *Ibid.* p. 139. Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Vet. Test.* ii, 200. Gesenius, *The-saurus*, pp. 706, 707.

17), and afterwards simply *ἱλαστήριον*, the same also in Heb. ix. 9. This, on his entrance into the most holy place, the high priest must cover (כִּפֶּה) with the smoke of incense burning in the fire taken from off the altar, "lest he die," and afterwards it must be sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering (Lev. xvi. 13-15). It was in this way that the most holy place was covered or cleansed from the impurities contracted from the uncleanness of the people, and that what formed the central part of its furnishings, and the very basis of reconciliation, was itself covered or expiated, so that, as already remarked, the Tent of Witness became a Tent of meeting between a Holy God and a pardoned people.

The sin thus covered had in fact no longer any existence. It had, as regards the sinner, been transferred to the head of the sacrifice; and as regards God and the claims of Divine justice, it had met its deserts in the death of the vicarious oblation; so that the sinner was thus "covered upon from his sin," which henceforth occupied a separate sphere of existence, a truth which found its fullest expression in the dismissal of the live goat of the sin-offering of the Day of Atonement with the expiated or covered sins of the congregation,¹ (Lev. xvi. 10.) The ground of offence had been completely taken out of the way; and on this reconciliation ensued. With regard to the transgressor it is intimated לְכִפּוּרָתוֹ, "It is forgiven to him," (Lev. iv. 26, 31, 35,) an expression which by no means warrants the conclusion deduced from it by Keil,² who applies it to disprove the penal character of sacrifice, and the satisfaction thereby rendered, as if such afforded no room for the exercise of grace or forgiveness. Nor is it undeserving of notice, that this statement should occur in the ritual of the sin-offering, where sin had been presented in its most intense form, and also in that of the closely related trespass-offering, and in such cases where the offerings were of the lowest order, as in the offering of doves or of flour, appropriated to extreme poverty, (Lev. v. 10, 13.) In the latter circumstances this intimation served to assure the worshipper that his impoverished condition proved no bar to his acceptance with God, but chiefly to

¹ Hottinger, *Minist. Expiationum* ² *Bib. Archäologie*, pp. 208, 209. *Dici*, pp. 251, 252.

teach this truth, that the efficacy of any sacrifice was not dependent on any thing inherent in itself.

This forgiveness restored that communion with God which sin had interrupted. It was only through sacrifice that one could come into God's house or draw near to his altar. "I will go into thy house with, or, *by means of*, burnt-offerings," (בְּעֹלֹתַי, Ps. lxxvi. 13.)—a construction exactly parallel with Lev. xvi. 3, which prescribes the method of entrance into the most Holy Place. There is here not only an intimation of a purpose to present such offerings to God; but also an acknowledgment that this was the only means of access to His house. The entrance thus obtained was only occasional, and the stay in any case very brief, yet the pious worshipper discerned therein a prospect of the realization of the very highest aspiration of his soul, "to dwell in the house of the Lord for length of days," (Ps. xxiii. 8). Such a residence needed, it must have been felt, a consecration far more perfect than that even of the High priest, and how could such an idea as regards himself be entertained by an Israelite of any other than the family of Aaron, or could an individual, even of that family itself, look for higher privileges than those accorded to its founder? According to the covenant the priesthood pertained to the whole Israelitish people, but the individual members still lacked that development which could fit them for approaching God, and even the High Priest himself was deficient in this respect, and hence his very brief stay in the presence of God, while at the same time he beheld symbolic figures dwelling in that presence as their proper home. These were the Cherubim on the Ark of the Covenant.

The very attitude of the Cherubim,—"*standing* upon their feet (רַעְמָדִים עַל-רַגְלֵיהֶם, 2 Chron. iii. 13), in such a situation, was one which gives special point to the observation of the Psalmist: "If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall *stand*? But there is forgiveness (תְּפִלָּה) with thee, that thou mayest be feared" (Ps. cxxx. 3, 4). With respect to these symbolic figures, God did not mark iniquities, for the very ground on which they stood was that wonderful propitiatory which, while it covered the testimony (עֲרִיבָה) borne by the law, was itself supported by the Ark of the Covenant, which enclosed

the law, while the whole, surmounted by the Cherubim, formed the very throne of the Divine glory. Here, then, was seen the great result of sacrifice and reconciliation, and a prospect of dwelling for length of days in the house, and even the very presence of Jehovah.

But if the doctrine of sacrifice was fitted to awaken such expectations with regard to the future, its immediate and direct bearing must have been very considerable. The efficacy of the Levitical atonement, however contemplated, must not be limited to external purifications, breaches of the ceremonial law, or according to Bähr,¹ sins of a theocratic character. That it extended to moral transgressions is evident from the fact that in respect to lying, theft, perjury, and similar offences, sacrifice was expressly required in addition to the satisfaction due in any of these cases to the civil law. But in fact, as regarded the obligation of the law, the ancient Israelite knew no distinction between what was moral and what was merely ceremonial, for all alike bore the sanction of the Theocratic Ruler of the nation. It is true, sacrifice was limited to such acts as were committed inadvertently, or generally through human weakness (בְּטִיְשָׁה,² Lev. iv. 2, &c.), and not of set or determined purpose, "with uplifted hand" (בְּיָד רְמוּהָ, Num. xv. 30). Crimes of the latter character were excluded from the benefit of sacrifice, because evincing a purposed rebellion against the theocratic constitution, and despite to the word and commandment of Jehovah (ver. 31). This distinction was necessary for the vindication of authority, and the very maintenance of order; and to provide sacrifice in such cases would be like offering encouragement to a spirit of revolt. This distinction, moreover, was not peculiar to the law; it extends also to the Gospel, and is, indeed, a necessary feature in every well ordered economy (Heb. x. 26-29).

It must have been obvious, however, that the satisfaction rendered in any case by animal oblations, however numerous and costly, was utterly inadequate to meet the claims of the Divine law, or silence the sinner's own convictions, bearing witness against him in behalf of the violated law. It was so

¹ Symbolik, ii. 387, 388.

is too limited, for this cannot be well

² The sense, *inadvertently* given to this term by Kurtz (Mos. Opfer, p. 156) applied to the commission of such acts as are specified in Lev. v. 1, 21.

from the absolute disproportion between the life forfeited, and that substituted in its stead. The only solution that could be found for this difficulty was, to regard the arrangement as entirely of a provisional character, waiting a future effectual expiation, which, however dimly discerned by man, was yet present from the beginning to the mind of God, and the virtue of which had a retrospective effect, in conferring on its provisional substitutes an atoning and purifying power, which did not and could not naturally belong to them.

It was, however, with the plan of reconciliation that sacrifice had chiefly to do, and this in its great features was presented in the very first sacrifice, not less clearly than in the Levitical ritual. This unquestionably introduced many new ideas, and further illustrated some of the older ones, and none more so than that of the insufficiency of the sacrifices that were offered, and yet which were constantly required to meet the ever recurring transgressions. But the fundamental doctrine of substitution, and the endurance of the death-penalty by the substitute, was explicitly taught in every sacrifice referred to with approval in Scripture; while the person and character of the proper Substitute, and his relation to sinners, were gradually evolved, more especially in those verbal prophecies which ran parallel with the prophecies expressed by sacrificial and other symbols, concerned chiefly with showing the nature and necessity of a vicarious atonement. The two kinds of prophecy, in word and symbol, thus mutually illustrated one another, by casting their united light on the scheme whereby God purposed to secure man's salvation, and thereby the revelation of his own character and the vindication of his law.

CHAPTER IV.

GOD'S REMEDY FOR FALLEN MAN.—ii. THE PERSON AND OFFICES OF THE REDEEMER.

FOLLOWING up the inquiry into the Divine purposes entertained regarding man's restoration, the next point to be considered is the doctrine of the Pentateuch, with respect to the agent by whom the work should be effected. On this there are two sources of information,—verbal prophecies, indicative of the person, and various institutions and ordinances which relate to the offices of the Redeemer; the teaching on both these subjects, but more especially on the latter, forming the necessary complement to the intimations of the plan of redemption just treated of.

SECT. I. DIRECT INTIMATIONS ON THIS SUBJECT.

Hengstenberg, *Christologie des alten Testaments*, i. 1-143. 2te Ausg. Berlin, 1854.—Hofmann, *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*, i. 62-139. Nördling, 1841.—Hävernick, *Vorlesungen üb. die Theologie d. alt. Testaments*, pp. 112-131.—Pye Smith, *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, i. 151-169, 4th Ed. Lond. 1847.—Alexander, *Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, pp. 176-214.

Direct statements respecting the Divine will and purposes necessarily formed, as already noticed, the basis of all revelation. It is also observable, that the intimations regarding the Redeemer of mankind were chiefly conveyed in this way; while the method whereby the redemption should be effected was taught almost exclusively by symbolic acts and institutions. The reason of this is obvious. With respect to the person, there was a liability to error or imposition, and therefore it was necessary so to define the relations of family, time, and place, that there could be no ground for mistake. The plan of redemption, as involving a principle of Divine admi-

nistration, not being open to such danger, was fitly exhibited in those ordinances which constantly kept before the view of the Israelites those great truths which in due time were to be exemplified in their reality through Him, of whom the accompanying prophecies afforded explicit information.

§ 1. *The Seed of the Woman*—Gen. iii. 15.¹

The first intimation of mercy is not more remarkable in itself than in the circumstance in which it was made. The transgressors of God's law, having had their eyes opened to a sense of their misery, and by his gracious dealing with them, being made aware that there was no escape from his scrutiny, and no plea wherewith to excuse their conduct, were at length brought to an acknowledgment of their guilt. Never was an intimation of grace more opportune than in such circumstances, when unutterable despair must have taken possession of souls who had never heard of pardon. To manifest, however, the sovereign character of the mercy to be bestowed, and its consistency with justice, it is addressed not directly to the parties for whom it was intended, but as a curse or punitive sentence on the author of their overthrow.

This must be kept in view, as previously remarked, in order to understand the form which the announcement assumed. God having interrogated the woman as to her participation in the act of disobedience, she answered: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." Whereupon the supreme Judge addressed the accused, "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed from all cattle, and from every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Without positively determining what conceptions had been formed by the parents

¹ Compare, in addition to the works enumerated at the head of this section, Sol. Glassius, *Disputatio de Protevangelio*: *Philologica Sacra*, pp. 692-705. Amstel. 1694.—*Idem*, *Christologia Mo- saica*: *Opuscula*, pp. 57-150. Lugd.

1700.—Witsius, *Œconomia Fœderum*, Lib. IV., cap. i., pp. 421-438. Reinke, *Ueber das Protevangelium*: *Beiträge zur Erklärung*, ii. 203-461. Münt. 1853.

of mankind up to that time, as to the character of the Serpent through whose agency they had been drawn into sin, it is certain that, from the judicial sentence passed upon him in their hearing, they must regard him as a moral agent, because a subject of punishment, and not a mere irrational creature, whatever may have been his assumed guise. So much is certainly deducible from the narrative, and that such was the view intended to be conveyed by the historian, appears from the description of the Tempter-serpent, as distinguished from the beasts of the field, or the creatures as formed by God, (Gen. iii. 1).

Whatever may have been the views formed at first by the parties immediately concerned regarding the Tempter, there can be no question that on this, as on other points, their knowledge would be gradually enlarged. Taking subsequent revelation as a guide, it clearly appears that the inimical Power, who, by his subtlety, obtained an advantage over the first head of humanity, was the same that afterwards unsuccessfully tempted the Second Adam himself, and who is described as the Devil, a liar and murderer from the beginning, the Dragon and old Serpent—designations taken from the part he enacted at the outset of man's history, and which he again tried at the commencement of the public career of Him who was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil, and redeem man from the miseries introduced by his yielding to the first temptation.

The curse upon the Tempter consisted of three parts. In the figurative language formed on the mould presented by the guise assumed for the purpose of the temptation, he was condemned to go on his belly, to eat dust in perpetuity, and to be held as an object of lasting hate by the human race. The sentence embraced two great ideas—the perpetual degradation, and the final discomfiture of this enemy of man, through the seed and representative of the woman. The first of these points has been already considered;¹ it is the latter part of the condemnation that will form the subject of the present investigation.

In the statement, "I will put enmity between thee and

¹ See above, vol. ii., 90, 91.

the woman," God appears as the avenger of the wrong done to his creatures, and intimates that the connexion which they had formed with the Tempter shall cease. Enmity shall take the place of confidence, and shall give rise to a controversy, embracing more than the parties present, and extending to the seed of the woman and of the serpent respectively. But though the conflict be protracted, there is no ambiguity in the language which declares on what side the victory shall be. The serpent shall be overcome, his head or vital part shall be bruised, though with suffering to the conqueror.

This promise, though full of comfort to the parties so miserably overcome through the subtilty of the serpent, as assuring them of victory over their adversary, was yet of a very general character. It gave no intimation of the time of its fulfilment; and but little of the person, whether the woman's posterity in general, or some individual thereof by whom the victory should be achieved. It has been remarked by one who has given much attention to such subjects: "The first prophecy, called forth by the circumstances of the fall, delineates in graphic, but general and comprehensive outlines, the leading characteristics of the world's history; projects as it were the channels alike of evil and of good, in which the stream of events was destined to run, and gives some prognostication of the final ascendancy of the good over the evil. Indefinite as the prophecy was, it was of unspeakable moment, on account of the promise it embodied to the heart of faith, whereby, in the midst of brooding darkness and wide-wasting destruction, it lighted up the hope of better things to come. As a prediction, however, of contingent events, destined to appear in the future, this primeval word of life is scarcely to be mentioned, since it rather announced great principles of working, and pointed to ulterior results, than defined beforehand particular acts of Providence."¹

Indefinite however though it may be, as compared with the specific promises of subsequent times, and by which it was so overshadowed as to be only incidentally adverted to either in the Old or New Testament, as in Isai. lxxv. 25; Rom. xvi. 20, and probably Gal. iv. 4, nevertheless it exerted remarkable

¹ Fairbairn on Prophecy, pp. 20, 21. Edin. 1856.

influence on primeval faith and expectations, on the direction given to the prophecies which followed, and on the form into which the Biblical history of man is cast. Its influence upon our first parents themselves was eminently marked, and this will explain its import better than any grammatical examination of the terms of the announcement. There are at least three incidents recorded in their history, which, taken together, place their views on this matter in a very important light.

The first is the circumstance already taken notice of, that after the sentence of death, or a return of the body to its original elements, had been passed upon them, Adam regarded his wife as the parent of all life, and bestowed upon her a name strongly expressive of that conviction. The relation intimated in the name Eve or Life, it was shown, must, considering the state into which sin had plunged them, be some other than the mere natural one which the first mother should sustain to the human race. The creation blessing, viewed in the light of the first promise, presented an entirely new aspect, compared with what it did before the fall. The life expected through the woman was quite of a peculiar character—life from the dead, or a restoration of the blessings forfeited by sin.

That there is here evidence of Adam's faith in the promise, and of an interest in the life which it revealed, appears further from indications of a like faith in the woman herself, the chief accessory to the fall, but constituted by Divine grace the medium of recovery. Of the state of Eve's mind from the time when she charged the serpent with being the cause of her transgression, to the birth of her first-born, nothing is recorded, yet from her language on this occasion there is enough to mark the direction her hopes had meanwhile taken. In bestowing names on her children—an act deeply significant in a Scripture point of view—she no doubt acted with the concurrence of her husband, and so the ideas expressed in this way may be viewed as common to both parents. That such was really the case may be gathered from the circumstance, that, as regards Seth, their third son, the bestowal of the name is indifferently ascribed to the father, as well as to the mother, (Gen. iv. 25 ; v. 3.)

But however this may be, the very remarkable expressions with which the birth of Cain was greeted by the mother, and by which the bestowal of that name was accompanied, afford, under whatever aspect they may be viewed, evidence of more than simply maternal feelings. In considering the nature of the expectations to which utterance was given on that occasion, it will be necessary to settle first of all, philologically the proper translation of the terms employed, apart entirely from dogmatical preconceptions, which have greatly perplexed this question.

It cannot be denied, even by those Hebraists who adopt an entirely different view of the subject, that the expression in Gen. iv. 1, קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה, admits philologically of being rendered, "I have gotten a man Jehovah." It is, indeed, so rendered by many of the earlier writers; among others, Lud. de Dieu, Witsius, Glass, and Pfeiffer. Of modern critics who adopt this translation, may be mentioned Pye Smith¹ and Baumgarten;² while its grammatical admissibility is fully acknowledged by Delitzsch,³ who, nevertheless, rejects it solely on dogmatical grounds.

On the other hand, there is little agreement among those who adopt a different view, as appears from the variety of translations proposed, all of which, it must be said, offer considerable violence to the text. Thus the LXX., *ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and Vulg. "per Deum," take אֱלֹהִים as equivalent to אִישׁ, — a translation which Knobel asserts is quite inadmissible. Others, as the Arabic version, the Targum of Onkelos, and the Eng. ver. "from the Lord," take אֱלֹהִים for אֱלֹהֵי, which Tuch again maintains is quite opposed to the idiom of the language; while no less objectionable is the rendering by Jarchi, Mercer, Rivet, Drusius, among the earlier, and by Tuch,⁴ Knobel,⁵ and others among recent writers, "with or with the help of Jehovah;" for this idea is never expressed by אֱלֹהִים, but only by עִם־אֱלֹהִים (1 Sam. xiv. 45), — a point on which Hofmann⁶ and Delitzsch are no less decided than Pfeiffer⁷ and others among the older critics.

¹ Scripture Testimony, i. 154. See also Alexander, Connection, p. 186.

² Theolog. Commentar, i. 74.

³ Die Genesis ausgelegt. i. 193.

⁴ Kommentar üb. die Genesis, p. 102.

⁵ Genesis erklärt, p. 51.

⁶ Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. 77.

⁷ Dubia Vexata, Op. i. 19. Ultraj. 1704.

In short, there is no satisfactory evidence whatever that the particle in question has any of the meanings which these several versions assign to it. But even were it possible to adduce examples of a later, or a poetical usage, which delights in variety and brevity of expression, they must, in a matter of this kind, unquestionably yield to the rule observed in the Mosaic writings, nowhere more marked than in the earlier portion of Genesis. This particle occurs forty times, exclusive of the present instance, in the first four chapters, and in every case it is used as the sign of the accusative; it is so in the first clause of this very verse, and such, it may be added, is its primary and usual force.¹ It is true it has in some instances a prepositional power, denoting *with*, in company or conjunction with, and *beside* or *near to*, as in the expressions הִתְהַלֵּךְ אִתְּהוֹאֵלִים, “to walk with God” (Gen. v. 22, 24; vi. 9); ‘טָכַב אִתּוֹ, “to lie down with, or beside one” (Gen. xix. 35), and בָּרַת אִתּוֹ, “to cut or form a covenant with one” (Gen. xv. 18); but in these and similar instances the verbs are either intransitive, or otherwise so peculiar, as to prevent any ambiguity, and so present an entirely different construction from that under consideration.

As for the objection of Drnsius and others among the earlier writers, that if the historian intended to put אִתְּהוֹה in apposition to אִישׁ, this also would have been preceded by אִתְּ, there are numerous examples, as in Gen. vi. 10; xxii. 9, 20, which clearly show that such is quite unnecessary. Equally destitute of authority is the objection still urged by Tiele, that if a specific individual, as the Redeemer, were intended by אִישׁ, it must have the article הָאִישׁ. The article, however, is not required in a case like this, where a proper name immediately precedes. Besides, the objection has no bearing whatever on the view to be submitted at present.

Such, then, is the amount of the philological argument. No valid objection can be preferred against the literal rendering of the words of Eve, given above, while everything bears in its favour, not the least important consideration being, the want of unanimity among those critics who put a different

¹ Pfeiffer: אִתְּ precedente verbo accusativi, nec datur dissimile exemplum, a quo regitur semper est nota.

construction on the passage. It is, however, on other than grammatical grounds that the literal rendering is set aside. It is urged that, dogmatically viewed, the knowledge which the language thus taken implied of the promised Redeemer and his Divine character, surpassed anything deducible from the revelation then vouchsafed, while, moreover, utterly incongruous with the gross error manifested in the application of the prophecy to Cain. Such is the great objection of Tiele¹ and others; and it is the sole ground on which Delitzsch, who, as remarked, admits that it is grammatically admissible, rejects this rendering.

On this it may be generally remarked, objections of this nature, whatever may be their force, are not entitled, in any circumstances, thus summarily to dispose of all philological rules, especially when, as in this case, they happen to rest on an entire misapprehension. Here the error consists in determining Eve's views of the Redeemer, or of the term Jehovah, by the fulness of meaning which is known from subsequent revelation to belong to that name, instead of inquiring into the sense attached to it by the speaker on this, the only recorded occasion of its use in the first age of man's history. To this confusion is due any difficulty which is supposed to attach to the language taken in its strict, grammatical acceptance. It has, indeed, proved exceedingly injurious to the interpretation of the Old Testament, more particularly of its earlier portions, and when carried to a great length by writers such as Glass,² and others—to refer only to the present instance—who saw in this expression of Eve her acquaintance with the mystery of the incarnation, it only furnished occasion for critics of an opposite character to disown entirely a passage from which such unwarrantable conclusions were deduced. In matters of this kind it is obviously necessary to distinguish what the historian advances from his own point of view, and what he relates as to any precise period. It was in overlooking this principle that the objections and difficulties connected with

¹ Das erste Buch Mosés, p. 119. So also Drechsler, Die Einheit, p. 85, Hofmann, Weissagung, i. 77: and Fairbairn, Typology i. 275.

² Of the two terms employed Glass

remarks:—Prins veræ humanitatis index est; posterius virtutis omnipotentis, atque sic veræ et eternæ divinitatis.—Christologia Mosaica, Dissert. v. § 12. Opuscula, p. 147.

the interpretation of this passage mainly originated, and not from any ambiguity in the terms employed.

Much, if not the greater part, of the religious knowledge of our first parents, originated after the fall; and, indeed, whatever they may have previously known of the Divine character, must have been placed in a new light by the promise of redemption. Whether the idea attached to the term *Jehovah* is to be directly referred to that promise or not, it was certainly, according to the whole tenor of Scripture, one which was gradually developed. Reasons have been already assigned for holding that this term, as a designation of God, was not in use in the first ages of primeval history, and further observations will presently be offered in support of this view. It is, however, important to observe, that when it does undoubtedly appear as a Divine appellation, it is the peculiar name of God in his character of Redeemer. It comes prominently into view in connexion with deliverances purposed or procured for his people. Preparatory to the *Exodus*, God so explicitly assumed the name of *Jehovah*, that it is sometimes argued, from the strong language employed on that occasion, that the term was previously unknown, and that it could have been introduced only proleptically in the earlier history. This, however, as shown elsewhere, is at variance with the facts of the case. The name *MORIAH*, which originated in Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac, (*Gen. xxii. 2, 14.*) and which was shown to contain in its formation a contraction of the term *Jehovah*, is itself enough to preclude such a supposition.¹

The use of the term, however, and the precise idea which it was intended at any time to represent, are totally distinct questions; and although from an early period it was unquestionably employed as in one aspect the most distinctive designation of God, this of itself is no evidence that it was originally so understood. On the contrary, various considerations strongly favour the assumption, that it was not so employed by the first mother. The term itself means, etymologically, "He that shall be," indicating such a relation as that of *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, as used in the New Testament of Christ, in view both of his first and second advents, (*Luke vii. 19; Rev. i.*

¹ See above, vol. i., pp. 165-171.

4-8 ; iv. 8). The term was thus originally not a proper name, nor did it convey any idea of the character to be sustained by the person to whom it was applied, further than that he was the subject of some special manifestation. All that can be fairly deduced from the language of Eve is her belief that some personage promised and expected had now appeared. This could be no other than the Seed of the Woman, on whom her most cherished expectations were entirely built. The term thus applied to one taken for the promised deliverer, affords no indication of the speaker's views of his character and special qualifications for the work to which he was designed, or that he was in any way regarded as possessed of more than human dignity. It is entirely a gratuitous conclusion that Eve at that time expected that the enemy of the serpent would be other than man. There is certainly no evidence that she in any way identified him with God. On this point there need be no controversy, even with the most decided opponents of the Messianic bearing of the passage. For wherever Eve speaks of God, as well before the fall, as also long subsequent to the event here recorded, it is only as Elohim, (Gen. iii. 3 ; iv. 25) ; nor, indeed, is there any circumstance whatever, to show that any other Divine name was then in use. The entire avoidance of the term Jehovah in the conversation with the serpent, and for which the usual explanations are utterly unsatisfactory,¹ and its occurrence nowhere save in this solitary instance, to allow its being connected with that first period, contrasts strongly with its use by the historian himself throughout this narrative, and the relation which he evidently wished to establish between Elohim and Jehovah in the first and third sections of Genesis respectively, by means of the peculiar compound, Jehovah-Elohim, adopted in the intermediate section.

Eve's knowledge, however, of the Conqueror of the serpent, was greatly enlarged, it will be seen, at the birth of Seth, owing in part, no doubt, to the melancholy history of

¹ Thus Drechsler (*die Einheit*, 77) holds that the idea of Jehovah was unsuitable to the irrational creation ; and Hengstenberg, (*Authentic*, E. T., i. 317.) that it was a part of the Tempter's policy to present the Divine idea as vaguely as possible to the woman, and that therefore he used Elohim instead of Jehovah.

her family in the interval. But not only the Messianic ideas of the first mother, those of the Sethites also, her descendants, were attaining to greater clearness and consistency. The prayer of the Psalmist, "Give us help from trouble; for vain is the salvation of man," (Ps. lx. 11,) would seem to express the feelings of the true worshippers of God at the time when, as already noticed, Seth called his son's name Enosh, (עֲנוֹשׁ,) that is, *man* in his weakness and insufficiency, (Ps. viii. 5); and when in the same connexion it is added, "then it was begun to call upon (אֲנַחֵן, to invoke, Zeph. iii. 9) the name of Jehovah," (Gen. iv. 26,)—the promised, and now, as appears from the contrast thus presented, the acknowledged super-human deliverer. The incident here described, it is needless to remark, after the historian's previous account of the offerings of Cain and Abel, cannot be the origin of public worship; nor from the terms אֲנַחֵן, can it refer to its resumption after a supposed interruption owing to the death of Abel. It is the first dawn of that light which revealed the Divinity of the promised Saviour—the rise of what may be properly called *Jehovism*, although the term still intimated but a dim apprehension of the truths which centre in the incarnation of God. In the subsequent Messianic announcements will be traced the gradual expansion of this cardinal truth.

Viewed thus, the language of Eve is divested of the difficulties usually supposed to attach to it; and, therefore, little need be added to exhibit its precise import, the convictions which it expressed, and wherein it was defective. There can be no question that on this memorable occasion in her history, the thoughts of "the mother of all living" reverted to the promise regarding her "seed;" and that she saw in her child not merely a pledge of its realization, but the very deliverer that had been announced. This appears from the marked relation between אֲנוֹשׁ, *man*, the perfection of the manly nature (Gen. ii. 24), though here only seen as a helpless infant, and Jehovah, the coming one; and also partly from the name Cain, *an acquisition*. The language of the mother shows that she not only forgot her anguish for joy that a man was born into the world (John xvi. 21); but also in the exuberance of her confidence over-looked the feebleness of the supposed Conqueror, when she spoke of him already as a man.

Eve, it is evident, had not yet learned, what painful experience was soon to inculcate, that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," (John iii. 6); nor does it seem she had any clear conception of the nature and consequent duration of the conflict which had in fact only begun; and yet her misinterpretation of the prophecy was, in the circumstances, natural and perhaps unavoidable, considering the general character of the announcement, and the entire absence of anything specific as to time, while it afforded evidence of strong faith in the promised deliverance and earnest desires for its speedy advent. The circumstances were altogether extraordinary. The first birth of the first mother was itself an event quite peculiar, and it followed in the train of a prediction which raised the blessing of creation as regards the propagation of the race (Gen. i. 28) from the sphere of nature to constitute it a channel of Divine grace, so that with a foundation for faith there was room for misapprehension, to be corrected however by the progress of events, and particularly of the Divine revelations.

The enlargement of Eve's views, especially as to the nature of sin and its propagation with the race at the time of Abel's birth, has been already considered; and also some of the lessons which his death, the first occurrence of the kind in the human family, read to the men of the primeval world with respect to that life which Adam had discerned in the promised redemption. How this latter event enlarged also in other ways their conceptions of the promise of the woman's seed appears from the terms in which the mother, bereaved of both her sons—of the one by a brother's murderous hand, and of the other, as an outcast from his family and the face of God—recognised this trying dispensation at the birth of Seth. "Adam knew his wife again, and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God [said she] hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew," (Gen. iv. 25.)

This statement contains various important truths illustrative of the primeval faith, and of the growing convictions of the import of the first promise. It shows that the expectations originally centred on Cain were, as the character of the brothers respectively unfolded itself, transferred to Abel; and that he only was at length recognised by the "mother of all living" as "her seed." Cain, so far from proving an "acqui-

tion," in maintaining the controversy with the tempter, showed that his "enmity" was entirely on the opposite side. In the warfare waged in their own family the parents of mankind witnessed a painful illustration of the words, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and *between thy seed and her seed,*" and so obtained an insight into their meaning possibly unsuspected before. It showed, at least, that "the seed of the woman" to whom was assigned the bruising of the serpent's head, was not co-extensive with her progeny in general, which it was now seen might include of the serpent's seed as well as the heirs of blessing. This conviction was clearly recognised in the words: "God hath given *me another seed* instead of Abel."

It also appears that the faith of our progenitors, instead of suffering from the shock so very painful to all their natural affections, was confirmed and corrected. The second son had been regarded as "vanity," or a fleeting breath; the thoughts of the mother at his birth dwelling on the condemnation under which the race lay; but the son now constituted his substitute she names **SETH**, (שֵׁט from שָׁטַף to place, to establish, Gen. iii. 15), "settled," or "established." This designation is remarkable, seeing that already she had painful experience that all was *vanity* (Ecces. i. 1), a conviction which must have imparted an emphasis to the name **ABEL**, little anticipated at the time it was bestowed. Cain, on whom such reliance had been placed, proved to be the seed of the enemy, and Abel had perished in the conflict, now no longer presented merely as a prophecy, but seen as a present reality; and yet the mother's confidence is undiminished; nay, faith is more triumphant than before. It is now firmly based on the right, because a Divine, foundation: "God hath appointed me another seed." Every word is here deeply significant, and points distinctly to the first Edenic promise. God had said to the serpent, "I will put (שָׁטַף, fix or establish) enmity," &c., and, accordingly, the very marked reference in Eve's language to God, the great Author and Upholder of the enmity instituted between the parties, as the ground of her assurance of the unalterable disposition and of the happy issue of the controversy שֵׁטִי אֱלֹהִים, "God has established for me." And so, although the conflict threatened to be protracted, and had already drawn into its

ranks parties of whose participation in the strife the original prophecy gave but obscure intimation, the mind confidently reposed on God who raised up another seed to represent him who, though apparently fallen, had nevertheless given evidence of a triumphant career. The nature of the conflict was thus more truly recognised, and with it the qualifications necessary in the author of the final conquest through whom the whole controversy should be brought to a successful termination.¹

The influence of the first promise upon primeval faith and expectations, is further seen in the succeeding prophecies, which, without any express reference to it, formally carry out and confirm its principles.

The next prophecy in order of time, although no record has been made of it in its proper place, is that of Enoch, preserved in the Epistle of Jude, ver. 14, 15. This is not the place to enter into an investigation of its authenticity, or its relation to the apocryphal work which goes under the name of Enoch. It is enough to remark at present, that the prophecy, however it may have been preserved, has an apostolic sanction, and that it fully accords with all that is known of the period to which it is assigned, and of its reputed author. Thus, according to a writer already quoted: "It may be regarded merely as an application of the prophecy uttered at the fall, to the times of growing apostasy and wickedness in which he lived. It declared the certainty of God's appearing to check the temporary triumph of the adversary, and establish the just. The revelation to Noah of the general deluge, is again but the more specific application of Enoch's announcement, and is, in truth, the first definite prediction we meet with, being required for the support of Noah's faith, amid an almost universal backsliding, and for the direction of his course

¹ On Hengstenberg's theory to account for the occurrence of Elohim in this passage, this order is reversed. "In her first-born Eve saw a blessed pledge of Jehovah's grace. At Seth's birth, her pious feelings were less lively, they went no further than an acknowledgment of God's general providence; and the view of the event as one in the ordinary course of nature, was not, so

entirely as before, kept in the background." *Authentic*, E. T., i. 319. Not so erroneous but quite as unsatisfactory is the view of Drechsler (*die Einheit*, p. 86), and Delitzsch (*die Genesis*, p. 212), who see in it only a contrast between the Divine and the human, God restoring what Cain or man had destroyed.

in respect to the approaching catastrophe.”¹ Indeed, throughout its early stages, prophecy if not altogether, is yet chiefly occupied with the controversy established between the evil and the good, and with the triumph of the latter, notwithstanding temporary or apparent checks.

But it is not merely the prophecies, strictly so called, which bear the stamp of the Edenic announcement; the entire history of Genesis, and, indeed, the whole Bible, has been written with that object directly in view, so that the whole future to which it points is that indicated in the prophecy of the woman's seed in conflict with the serpent. This is particularly exemplified in the very chapter (Gen. iv.) succeeding the narrative of the fall, and which properly begins the history of fallen humanity. In this initial chapter, which may be regarded as a type of the whole history, and as such, records the first birth and the first death in the great human family; everything is, in the circumstances, necessarily new, yet in strict accordance with the altered constitution of things, and with the Divine provision announced for the recovery of fallen man. The specific purpose of the narrative, however, is to show how, notwithstanding the spread of the moral disorder introduced by the fall with the propagation of the race, the Divine idea contained in the first announcement of redemption began to be realised in and through humanity, and by the establishment—notwithstanding an apparent check—of the kingdom of God in antagonism to the power of evil—a truth felt by Eve, and forcibly expressed in her declaration already considered, “God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew;” and further confirmed in the closing words of the same chapter: “And to Seth, to him also there was born a son.” The construction here is, in the original, peculiarly emphatic,² as if the very arrangement of the terms was intended to convey a pledge of the continuity of the new line now begun for connecting, as the subsequent history shows, and as the repetition of the first genealogical member in Gen. v. 1 renders more striking, the first Adam with the second—the two divinely constituted heads of humanity.³

¹ Fairbairn on Prophecy, p. 21.

² Gesenius, Gram., § 121, 3.

³ Fairbairn, Typology, i. 376, note.

§ 2. *The Curse and Blessings of Noah*—Gen. ix. 25-27.¹

The salvation of Noah and his family from the wickedness and violence with which the earth had been filled, was not the deliverance announced in the first promise, however it may have typified it. This was evident, were it only from the fact that sin survived the ordeal through which the old world passed, and reappeared at the opening history of the new, unchanged in its character, and its disposition to the good. The enmity between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman still continued, without any appearance of a near approach to the promised victory, the prospects of which must have been exceedingly dark just before the flood, from which only Noah and his family were preserved alive. After his deliverance, as well from the violence of wicked men as from the waters of the deluge, Noah presented burnt-offerings which the Lord graciously accepted, expressing His determination not to visit mankind again with a similar judgment; and thereupon blessed Noah and his sons, and renewed with them, as the heads of the new world, the blessing bestowed on man at his creation. Next follows, for the fourth time in the history, a notice of the names of Noah's sons: "Shem, and Ham, and Japheth;" but now with the additional note, "and Ham was the father of Canaan," (Gen. ix. 18).

Notwithstanding the Divine testimony to Noah's character for righteousness (Gen. vi. 9 ; vii. 1), his remarkable preservation, the blessings bestowed upon him, and the destiny to which he was called as the second father of mankind, almost the next event recorded in his history is his yielding to a sinful indulgence, which produced results which furnished altogether a poor picture of fallen human nature:² "Noah planted a vineyard,

¹ Compare Heidegger, *De Prophetia Noetica*: Hist. Patriar. i. 623-636.—Venema, *Dissertatio ad Vaticinium Noachi*: Diss. ad Lib. Geneseos, pp. 75-114. Leovard. 1747.—Reinke, *Ueber den Fluch u. Segen Noachs*: Beiträge iv, 1107. Münst. 1855.

² Pye Smith (*Cyc. Bib. Lit.*, Art. *Noah*, ii. 436) would excuse the conduct

of Noah on the ground of his ignorance of the properties of the fermented juice of grapes,—“innocently, and without suspicion, he drank of the alluring beverage.” So also many of the fathers, as Cyril, Theodoret, and Jerome. There is, however, no foundation for such a supposition. More appropriate is the remark of Calvin: “I rather sup-

and he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without" (ver. 20-22). The sin of the parent gave occasion to that of the son, who manifested in this matter a disposition as unfilial as it was unseemly; for, not satisfied with being a solitary witness of the humiliating spectacle of a father's dishonour, he would have his brothers share with him in this unhallowed delight. They, however, manifested a totally different spirit; what they could not prevent they endeavoured to remedy, by a method which veiled their father's infirmity, as well from their own eyes as from the gaze of others: "And Shem and Japheth took a garment and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness" (ver. 23). The use of the verb singular at the commencement of this statement, *וַיִּקַּח יָשֵׁם וַיִּפֶּת*, seems to ascribe this act to the suggestion of Shem. "And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his youngest son had done to him." *בְּנֵי הַקָּטָן* is not "his little son," or grandson, as Rabbinical and some other writers would interpret the expression, in order to avoid a difficulty in the application of the curse to Canaan instead of Ham, and who they assume was the real offender, or at least was present with his father; nor is it "his younger son," LXX. *ὁ νεώτερος*, in respect to Shem; but "his youngest son"¹ (comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 14), in respect to the other two brothers, however opposed this may seem to the order in which the names invariably occur, where the second place is assigned to Ham. There are other intimations, however, which show that this is not the natural order, as in Gen. x. 21; for whether that passage be taken as assigning the relative priority to Shem or Japheth, it unquestionably makes them the two elder sons.²

Next follows the prediction which the patriarch was com-

pose that we are to learn from the drunkenness of Noah what a filthy and detestable crime drunkenness is" (Com. on Genesis, E. T., vol. i. 300. Edin. 1847). On the relation of the sins of the patriarchs to the apologetics of the Penta-

teuch, see Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, E. T. ii. 432-446.

¹ Gesenius, *Gram.*, § 119, 2. *Tneh. Kommentar üb. die Genesis*, p. 190.

² See above, vol. i., p. 408; and Heidegger, *Hist. Patriar.* i. 628.

missioned to pronounce regarding his sons respectively ; for it was assuredly not from personal vindictiveness or partialities that he spoke, but ministerially, as the organ of the Divine Spirit. Were it merely on the ground of private or personal considerations that the patriarch expressed himself, in a way which showed "blessing and cursing proceeding out of the same mouth," Scripture would pronounce it as "things which ought not to be," (James iii. 10) ; but it was otherwise in this case.

1. "And he said, Cursed be Canaan : a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." By this sentence Canaan was devoted to the lowest, most degrading servitude, עֶבֶר עֶבְרִים, "the lowest, most abject slave," and subjected to his brothers, namely, Shem and Japheth, as appears from the verses following. The historian had twice noted (ver. 18, 22) that Ham was the father of Canaan ; and it is a difficulty of long standing why no mention is made of Ham, the really guilty party, and if the punishment to be awarded to him was to reach him only in his posterity, why should it be exclusively in Canaan? ¹

It may lessen the difficulty by observing generally, that by this arrangement Ham's punishment was conformed to his sin : his impious conduct towards his father should be visited on himself as a father, ²—a mode of punishment through which it is found such even as are lost to all other feelings, may be most effectually reached ; the parental affections being, perhaps, the last that are obliterated. Further, this announcement showed that the curse was not to be of a merely temporary character, or such as would exhaust itself in producing some personal inconvenience to the transgressor himself, but had, on the contrary, a wider bearing, and would extend into the future. Thus Calvin : ³—"The punishment was carried forward even to Ham's posterity, in order that the severity of it might be the more apparent ; as if the Lord had openly proclaimed that the punishment of one man would not satisfy him, but that he would attach the curse also to the posterity of the offender,

¹ See Heidegger, Hist. Patriar. i. 629, 630.

² The supposition of Hofmann, Delitzsch, and others, that Canaan was the youngest son of Ham, who was himself

the youngest son of Noah, is doubtful ; but even if true, the circumstance is of too incidental a character to be taken into account here.

³ Com. on Genesis, vol. i., p. 306.

so that it should extend through successive ages. In the meantime, Ham himself, is so far from being exempt, that God, by involving his son with him, aggravates his own condemnation." The grounds of this procedure are found in that principle of Divine government, which, as already noticed,¹ visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, and which, however incomprehensible, when judged by a merely human standard, is seen in daily exercise in the world, agreeably to the teaching of Scripture, so that in this, as in many other matters of difficulty, there is a complete accord between the Bible and experience. Again, a reason, mediately at least, why Canaan was singled out from among the Hamites in general to occupy this specific place in the curse may have been, that the eye of prophecy already discerned the abominations which should characterize the Canaanites, and on account of which, in the strong language of Scripture, the very soil on which they lived should spue them out (Lev. xviii. 28).

It is only, however, by viewing it in connexion with the first promise that the import of this announcement will be rightly perceived. There, as in the present case, there is the infliction of a curse, yet carrying in its bosom the intimation of a blessing to other parties, to whom reference is made. Further, the curse in both cases is productive of degradation to the parties on whom it lights, while securing to the others relatively introduced mastery and dominion. In the primal promise all this was conveyed in the words of the curse itself; but here, in addition to the incidental notice of blessing or mastery over the degraded, there is appended a fuller and more explicit statement of the blessing, and of those to whom it properly belongs. The more formal connexion of the curse and the blessing, here for the first time indicated, is afterwards maintained throughout the Pentateuch, and is strikingly exhibited at its close in Moses' charge to Joshua, to arrange the tribes of Israel on mounts Ebal and Gerizim respectively, to pronounce both the curse and the blessing on their entrance into the land of Canaan (Deut. xi. 29; xxvii. 12, 13),—an act which loses much of its significance, unless viewed as embodying the principles presented in the primal promise, and more distinctly exhibited in the prophecy of Noah.

¹ See above, vol. ii. pp. 53, 54.

What principally deserves notice is the change, which, as the scheme advanced, is observable with respect to the incidence of the curse. At first it fell directly on the serpent, though accompanied with an intimation that it should embrace the serpent's seed. No curse was pronounced on man, but only on the ground for his sake. Adam, though fallen, constituted the root of blessing. But with the propagation of the race, there was a separation of it into two classes—representative of the antagonistic powers of which the first promise gave notice. Accordingly, on Cain as a head of the God-opposing faction, a curse was directly pronounced,¹ (Gen. iv. 11;) and so again on Canaan, a representative of the same power under the new dispensation; while further, at the stage commencing with the law, the curse was specifically directed against every individual transgressor, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them," (Gal. iii. 10, comp. Deut. xxvii. 26.) In the meantime, the curse on the ground, if not removed, was at least not aggravated. In connexion with Noah's burnt-offerings, "The Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse, (לֹא אֶקְרָא לְקַלְל עוֹד) I will not add to curse further) the ground for man's sake; for (כִּי, because, not *though*, as Bush² and some others take it,) the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," (Gen. viii. 21.) The reason which God here assigns for his clemency for the future is remarkable. It is an admission as it were of the insufficiency of the method hitherto adopted for repressing evil; so inveterate had it proved, and so inherent in fallen human nature, that other means must be adopted for that purpose. The curse on the ground was felt as a grievous burden by the better disposed portion of the race, (Gen. v. 29;) but on the Cainites it produced morally no beneficial impression, though it stimulated them to inventions, (Gen. iv. 22,) suited to alleviate the physical labour which it imposed on man. Accordingly, God will henceforth apply the curse more directly and personally to the despisers of his law.

¹ The explanation of Baumgarten, (Theol. Com. i. 80,) and Delitzsch, (Die Genesis, p. 200,) that this was owing to the more aggravated charac-

ter of Cain's sin is exceedingly unsatisfactory.

² Notes on Genesis, i. 148. So Patrick, Com. upon Genesis, p. 153, 3rd ed. Lond. 1704.

Further, that Canaan was here introduced as the object of the curse, not so much personally, but as the representative of the God-opposing principle, as Israel afterwards represented the seed of blessing, is apparent from the history of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, relative to the conflicts with, and the destruction of, the Canaanites, and also from such early notices, as the Canaanite was then in the land, (Gen. xii. 6,) which God had specially promised to Abraham and his posterity. This last notice possessed something more than an ethnographical interest; it had doubtless a relation to the present subject; and thus with the other circumstances adverted to, forms a commentary on the Noachian prophecy, and shows that it had respect to outward and material relations only so far as they served to express great spiritual principles. Yet, that there was no arbitrary procedure in the case is equally clear from the same record, and particularly from the intimation made to Abraham of a Divine long-suffering and patience, which postponed the merited and impending judgment until the iniquity of the various Canaanitish tribes should be filled up, (Gen. xv. 16.) This fully showed that the judgment was entirely a punitive retribution.

2. The blessing on Shem: "And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." The first thing to be remarked here is the indirectness of the address. The curse was pronounced directly upon Canaan; but now the prophet, seeing the blessings reserved in the future for his son Shem, breaks out in praise of God, the Author of these blessings; just as Moses, instead of directly addressing Gad, says, "Blessed be he that enlargeth Gad,"¹ (Deut. xxxiii. 20.) The blessing of Shem consists in this, that God sustains towards him the relation denoted by the terms, "Jehovah God of Shem." This is the first instance where God is named the God of individuals, and the first clear, incontrovertible evidence of the relation of Jehovah the Redeemer, to Elohim the universal Creator. The Christology of the patriarchs had now, it thus appears, taken a very important step in advance.

From Eve's remark at the birth of Cain, it was shown

¹ Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, i. 30.

that the name Jehovah, there used for the first time, designated the promised Redeemer, without any indication, however, that He was regarded as more than man. On the next recurrence of the term in a notice of the time of Enos, it appears with its hopes and blessings somehow transferred to God; Jehovah having now become the object of worship. At the birth of Noah, Jehovah was regarded as the author of the curse upon the ground, which it was believed by his father Lamech, the child then born to him would in some way remove or mitigate, (Gen. v. 29.) showing probably that expectation still fluctuated between a human and a divine Redeemer. Like Eve, Lamech expressed a hope of his son's proving the deliverer from the consequences of the curse;¹ but though he also erred in his anticipations, yet his disappointment did not by any means equal that of the first mother. On the fourth occurrence of the name Jehovah, Noah, in the statement under consideration, was enabled to place it in a light which should obviate all misapprehension on the subject, at least, as to the nature of Him to whom the designation properly belonged.

The principle thus announced by Noah, and which it was one great object of the writer of Genesis clearly to establish, was no doubt very much lost sight of amid the corruption of truth and morals which soon ensued; so that even the patriarchs, who were led by a Divine light, recognised God rather as El Shaddai, God Almighty, than in his character of Jehovah, (Ex. vi. 3.) Yet in no age from the call of Abraham was this latter name altogether unknown, though in general so dimly apprehended, that at the time of the Exodus, it had, as it were, to be announced anew. To Abraham its import was made particularly apparent in the transaction of Moriah; and both the name of the locality and the proverb connected with it,—“Abraham called the name of the place Jehovah-jireh, (*Jehovah will see*), as it is said to this day, In the mount of Jehovah he will appear,” (Gen. xxii. 14,) show that it was a standing memorial in Israel of the patriarchal age. How Abraham himself viewed the revelation then made to him, appears not only from the name Moriah, but also from his

¹ Pfeiffer, *Dubia vexata*, Op. i. 29. Pye Smith, *Scrip. Test.* i. 158.

subsequent constant use of the name Jehovah, as for instance, JEHOVAH ELOHIM of heaven, and JEHOVAH ELOHIM of earth, (Gen. xxiv. 3, 12,) so that even the patriarch's servant spoke of God, as Jehovah Elohim of his master, (ver. 12,) and strangers like Laban recognised the servant as the "blessed of Jehovah," (ver. 31.) This is the more remarkable, because previously Abraham designated God variously as Jehovah El Elyon, Adonai Jehovah, Adonai, and Elohim, (Gen. xiv. 22 ; xv. 2 ; xviii. 30-32 ; xx. 11, 13 ; xxii. 8.) So also Isaac refers to JEHOVAH as the author of blessings on nature, and to EL SHADDAI as the source of blessing on Jacob, (Gen. xxvii. 27 ; xxviii. 3 ;) and Jacob himself is seen in the closing scene of his history, waiting in faith for the salvation to be wrought through this deliverer : "I have waited for thy salvation, O Jehovah," (Gen. xlix. 18.)

Enough has been advanced to show that the truth first clearly announced in the prophecy of Noah, was recognised by the patriarchs, and also, how at special epochs it was attaining more significance, and a deeper hold on the hearts of God's people. But it is of importance to notice how it operated during the trying interval which elapsed from the close of Genesis when Jacob announced the coming of Shiloh, and expressed his own trust in Jehovah, the author of salvation, to the time when Moses was called to deliver his brethren from their Egyptian bondage.

The Exodus was an important epoch in Israelitish history, for which preparation was made by a strong but silent life of faith, of which there are many indications of a very interesting kind, even in the names of the down-trodden sojourners in Goshen, their hopes reviving as the determined period (Gen. xv. 23,) of exile drew to a close. The convictions of that time are seen in the fact of Moses' first interposition in behalf of his Israelitish brethren, based on the expectation that they were prepared to hail him as their deliverer ; and also in the faith of the parents of Moses, (Heb. xi. 23,) who ventured to preserve their child from the murderous decree of a Pharaoh, particularly so in that of the mother, who, moreover, by her name Jochebed, (Ex. vi. 12,) "the glory of Jehovah," showed that her faith was in a manner hereditary. Another and more striking instance of similar views to those which

led to the bestowal of the name Jochebed, occurs in the name of BITHIAH, (*daughter, i. e. worshipper, of Jehovah,*) a daughter of Pharaoh, who married Mered of the tribe of Judah, (1 Chron. iv. 18.) As this is not an Egyptian, but a pure Hebrew name, compounded like the last with an abbreviation of Jehovah, there is reason to believe, that it was assumed by her on her Israelitish marriage, and that there is here, as Kurtz¹ remarks, an Egyptian Ruth declaring in this very significant way, "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God." These are the earliest instances of the name Jehovah entering into the formation of personal names; and they show how endeared the idea it expressed had become to the godly, and how brightly the life of faith shone during a period in which the direct communications of heaven were suspended, and no incidents occurred of sufficient importance to obtain a place in the sacred record.²

In the designation, "God of Shem," another idea was also for the first time expressed, but which recurs repeatedly in the subsequent history, particularly of Abraham. The personal relation into which God thus enters with his people, and by which, as by an eternal covenant, He pledges to them the fulness of his love and power, has its foundation in their connexion with his eternal Son, (John xx. 17.) But while it attains its highest significance only in the Gospel, it is interesting to trace its development throughout the older dispensation. To the prophetic eye of Noah, Jehovah the God of Shem sustained, as such, a relation to Shem, which not only secured a higher communion than that which subsisted between God and man unfallen, but also rendered it perpetual by basing it on the union between Jehovah and Elohim, the Redeemer and Creator. Notice has elsewhere been taken of the fact, that the declaration, "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," contained an assurance, not only that these patriarchs are still in being, but that their dust, de-

¹ Geschichte des alt. Bundes, ii. 32.

² The proper names of the period immediately preceding the Exodus, throw considerable light on the religious apprehensions of the Israelites at that time, and the strong theistic

element in which these appellations originated, but as it is only the idea involved in the designation Jehovah that bears on the present subject, there is no room for a general inquiry of this kind.

posited in the cave of Machpelah, should be reanimated, in order to their entering into the full possession of the promises intimated in the relation in which they stood to God; and it is only necessary to add, that in accordance with this one of the closing utterances of revelation is: "I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be *their God*,"—a relation which infallibly secures to God's people the consummation of their blessedness in and with Him the Fountain of life and all enjoyment.

3. The blessing on Japheth: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." To assume, from the use of Elohim here in contrast to Jehovah, in the former prediction, that only natural blessings were intended, is utterly unwarranted. A case somewhat similar is Isaac's blessing on Jacob (Gen. xxvii. 27, 28), where the use of the two names is such that Elohim must be viewed as the author of spiritual, no less than of the temporal blessings more expressly mentioned. It may indicate, as Hengstenberg states, "that for the present Shem and Japheth are not on an equality," but not as he alleges, that "Jehovah is the God of the Shemitic race. Elohim is related to Japheth,"¹—a distinction for which there is no authority in Scripture. The use of the name Elohim in this instance was intended simply to indicate that it was by a Divine agency such results should be produced.

In this blessing two things are announced: first, an abundant increase,—“God shall enlarge,” יַפְתֵּהוּ אֱלֹהִים. The jussive Hiphil of יַפְתֵּהוּ is a paranomasia on the name יַפְתֵּהוּ, and it is on that account evidently that this verb is selected in its Hiphil form, which occurs nowhere else. In Kal it signifies “to open” (Prov. xx. 19), and from this the Hiphil is to be determined. So the LXX., πλάτυναί ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἰάφεθ: Vulg., “dilatet deus.” The sense of “to persuade,” assigned to it by some of the earlier writers, as Calvin, Junius, Piscator, and others, is precluded, apart from other considerations, by the fact that this

¹ Authentie, E. T. i. 330. Christologie, i. 35.

would require the verb to be followed by the accusative, and not, as here, by a preposition.¹

The *enlargement* thus predicted of Japheth is, however, variously understood. It is generally taken as referring to extended territories, or a numerous posterity, or both these combined. Tuch and others view it as a state of freedom and prosperity. These two ideas are not antagonistic, so that both may be comprehended in the blessing. A common mistake, however, of expositors is, their viewing these elements in the promise too much apart from the announcement in the second member of the verse, for the realization of which they were specially intended. The blessing, as Hengstenberg remarks, must be regarded as a whole. The geographical, political, or other relations here referred to, constituted, in the plan of Divine providence, important conditions towards the development of a moral and spiritual life, and the establishment of God's kingdom in the world; and it is in this aspect they are chiefly presented in the sacred history, and not in those more material and palpable forms in which they are viewed, not merely by rationalists, but sometimes by Christian expositors.²

From the ambiguity of the subject of the second clause, admitting grammatically of its being rendered, "But God shall dwell in the tents of Shem," or "Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem," it is a question whether this should be considered a continuation of Japheth's blessing, or a resumption of the prediction relative to Shem; and there are not wanting arguments on either side. First, it is true that יְהוָה is the proper term for God's special presence in Israel. "In Judah is God known: his name is great in Israel. In Salem also is his tabernacle and his dwelling-place in Zion" (Ps. lxxvi. 1, 2). And equally so that mediately in this theocratic arrangement, but ultimately in the incarnation of the eternal Word, whose dwelling with men is, in reference to the Old Testament type, described as ἐσκήνωσε (John i. 14), the blessing of Shem culminated; yet it must be concluded, in opposition to Hofmann³ and Baumgarten in recent times, and Onkelos and others of an earlier period, that such is not the truth here stated. For

¹ Pfeiffer, *Dubia Vexata*, Op. i. 40. Tuch, *Kommentar üb. die Genesis*, p. 192.

² Thus, for instance, Bishop Newton on the Prophecies, *Dissert.* i.

³ *Weissag. u. Erfüllung*, i. 90; *Schriftbeweis*, i. 101.

the gracious presence and communion of God with Shem was expressed in the terms, "Jehovah God of Shem;" and further, the mention again made of Canaan and his relation to Japheth show that the intermediate clause must also refer to Japheth, otherwise the connexion would be fatally interrupted.

Taking it then as spoken of Japheth, the announcement had respect both to the past and to the future. In the common feeling of Shem and Japheth, shown in the filial act which they discharged, the prophet discerned a type of blessed intercourse in the future. Shem is, and shall continue to be, what his name testifies, "the renowned" among his brethren, inasmuch as Jehovah styles Himself after him; while to *dwell with Shem*, to participate in his privileges, will be the blessing of Japheth. The partial accomplishment of this prediction was seen under the Old Testament economy, when at various times strangers joined themselves to the peculiar people, declaring, like Ruth, the Moabitess, "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God;" but its completion was reserved for what is described in the New Testament as the grafting in the branches of the wild olive-tree among the natural branches, and with them partaking of the root and fatness of the olive-tree (Rom. xi. 17).

In the prophecy of Noah there were thus three distinct intimations. (1.) The general principle announced in the primal promise, of the subjugation of evil and the triumph of the good was re-affirmed, and still further illustrated by the abject position assigned to Canaan, the type of the evil power. (2.) The line along which the blessing should flow was defined more precisely than hitherto, and so a commencement was made for the minute specification of families, which was to follow in relation to the genealogy of the promised Seed of the woman. And (3.) The mediatorial relation which Shem, as the appointed medium of blessing, should sustain towards his brethren, more expressly to Japheth, though, with the exception of Canaan, not excluding the posterity of Ham. This mediatorial relation, it will be found, is the point brought most prominently into view in the next Messianic announcement, where its universality, as respects the nations of the earth, is declared far more expressly than in this prophecy of Noah.

§ 3. *The Seed of Abraham—the Blessing of the Nations.*¹

The indefiniteness which characterised the promise of the woman's seed, was greatly removed, and its bearing rendered more distinct by the course of Providence, and by the very next Messianic announcement. The line of blessing became more specific by the separation of Cain from the faithful, and still more by the destruction of his posterity by the flood, while the single family preserved from the universal ruin verified the expectations of Eve respecting Seth. The channel of the Divine blessing was further contracted when Noah, by the spirit of prophecy, assigned it to the Shemitic branch of his posterity. Not only was the line of descent rendered more specific, the nature of the blessing itself was more distinctly described. In the primal promise it was rather of a negative character; the destruction of evil, and an opposition instituted between it and man, as related to the Seed of the woman, were the points rendered most prominent—the blessing itself being rather a matter of inference, yet so obvious, that it was correctly deduced by Adam, as elsewhere shown. In the blessing of Shem there was announced, in addition to the subjugation of evil, a positive good consisting in a covenant relation to God.

In the communications made to the Hebrew patriarchs, these principles were still further developed, while, at the same time, they had superadded to them several new truths, either by express revelation, or by the events of providence. One of these was the important principle brought to light in connexion with the birth of Isaac, which showed that the seed of promise must be produced not in the usual and natural course, but by an extraordinary interposition of God, (Rom. iv. 17-21); and of which notice had been given in the expression, "the Seed of the *woman*," though so obscure, that it unquestionably needed further revelations to explain its import. Another circumstance which deserves to be noticed in connexion with the evolution of the scheme of redemption

¹ Comp. Reinke, Ueber die den Patriarchen ertheilten Verheissungen: Beiträge, iv. 111-175.

at the time of Abraham's call, was the designation and the geographical boundaries of the land set apart for the growth of the Divine seed. This was a very considerable addition to those other terms, which, it will be seen, were gradually rendering the promises more definite and precise.

In order, however, to avoid repetition, and at the same time to present their principal features, the Messianic intimations of the patriarchal period, made successively and substantially alike to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, may be viewed in relation to the past, which they continued to project into the future, in their relation to one another, and in the light of the New Testament.

1. The Divine intimation to Abraham, when called to leave his country and his father's house for another land, where he should become the founder of a new race, contains various links of connexion between the past and the future in the scheme of grace. The record of Abraham's life is, in many respects, a remarkable one. In one point of view, the whole antecedent history of Genesis was but an introduction to it; its genealogies and chronologies centering in the Shemite from beyond the Euphrates. In accordance with the distinguished place allotted to Abraham in Genesis, as previously marked out in Divine providence, Matthew begins Christ's genealogical register with this patriarch. Abraham's history, more than any other, except that of Moses, was a series of Divine communications. He was the first to whom God gave a direct Messianic promise—a circumstance which practically carried out the distinction conferred on his ancestor Shem in his covenant standing with God, while it also showed Abraham's own distinction as the "friend of God," (Isa. xli. 8).

God's first promise to Abraham was: "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," (Gen. xii. 2, 3).

There are various references here to the blessing on his distinguished ancestor Shem: "I will make *thy name* great," contains evidently an allusion to SHEM, (*name*). Further, the expression, "in thee shall all families of the earth be

blessed," is an expression of the idea of Japheth dwelling in Shem's tents, with the additional notice that he shall find Jehovah and salvation there.¹ The same truths were subsequently repeated: "Abraham shall surely become a great nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him," (Gen. xviii. 18). And again: "Blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies: and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," (Gen. xxii. 18).

The line of blessing was now rendered much more specific; an individual was chosen out of the great Shemitic race to be the founder of a nation whose geographical place on the earth was, at the same time, distinctly delineated, (Gen. xii. 7; xiv. 15); and this was subsequently followed by an intimation of the time when they should be put into possession of it, (Gen. xv. 16). In Gen. xvii. 8, this land is first definitely introduced by name, as "the land of Canaan," although it is remarked, in connexion with the notice of Abraham's arrival, that "the Canaanite" was then partly occupying the soil, (Gen. xii. 6)—the mention of the land of Canaan, in ver. 5, is a prolepsis of the historian himself. The notice respecting the Canaanites clearly connects this promise with the Noachian prophecy; and so also does the statement: "thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies;" while the blessing and the curse are placed here in that juxtaposition which they first distinctly assumed in the cases of Shem and Canaan respectively. The good to be procured is also more distinct, and so are the parties for whom it is ultimately designed. The former assumes the form of a "blessing," expressing not merely the covenant relation, but also the benefits resulting therefrom, and the precise nature of which the subsequent history will more fully disclose. Further, it is a blessing for "the families of the earth," תַּאֲרִמְהָ, *the ground*, which had been cursed for man's sake, and even "the nations of the earth;" so that it was not limited to families or tribes, but included the nations whose dispersion and estrangement

¹ Kurtz, Geschichte d. alt. Bundes, i. 162.

are mentioned in Gen. x. 32. Here the individual embraces the universal; with the Shemite Abraham were thus linked the destinies of the human race.

The same promises were repeated to Isaac and to Jacob, (Gen. xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14,) without the addition of any new element. Significant, however, is the occurrence in all these cases of בְּךָ וּבְזַרְעֶךָ, בְּזַרְעֶךָ, בְּךָ, “in thee;” “in thy seed;” and “in thee and in thy seed,” respectively; the second of these terms defining the first, and the third, which is a combination of the other two, showing the fundamental position of Abraham in the scheme of blessing. So also is the use of the Hithpael הִתְבָּרַכְתִּי, xxii. 18; xxvi., as compared with the Niphal in the other passages; though it is more than questionable whether the distinction is of the importance attached to it by Hengstenberg and others. The Hithpael of בָּרַךְ means, according to Hengstenberg, “to bless one’s self,” followed by בְּ of the person from whom the blessing proceeds, (Isa. lxxv. 16; Jer. iv. 2,) or whose blessing is desired, (Gen. xlviii. 20). It is in the latter sense he takes the expression here, as also in Ps. lxxii. 17, “Men shall bless themselves by him, all the heathen shall praise him.” “To bless by” is the preliminary “to be blessed through;” the acknowledgment of the blessing awakens a desire to be partaker of it. He adds: “That we are not to explain the passages in which the Niphal occurs from those in which the Hithpael is used, but rather that these passages are to be supplemented out of the former, is manifest from the fact that the Niphal of בָּרַךְ has never been proved to occur in the sense of the Hithpael.”¹ Others, however, as Delitzsch,² deny that the Niphal is here less reflexive than the Hithpael. The whole distinction seems to be, that the latter sets Abraham in a position towards which the longing desires of the nations are directed; while the Niphal makes him the source whence all the blessings of the nations flow, or to which they are to be referred. But on either view, the words introductory to this crowning promise, “I will make thee a great nation, I will,” &c., announcing the Divine agency, show, as in the primal promise, that God Himself, and not man, is the immediate author of the bless-

¹ Christologie, i. 51, 52.

² Die Genesis ausgelegt, p. 343.

ing, which He is pleased to connect with, and to make conditional on a relation to Abraham: "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee."

2. The mutual relation of the patriarchal promises is also deserving of notice, as throwing light on various important truths intimately connected with the great Messianic blessing.

These promises were substantially repeated, and directly by God himself to Isaac and to Jacob, showing that they, no less than Abraham, occupied the relation expressed in the words, "I am thy God,"—a fact announced long after in God's statement to Moses: "I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob." But while repeated mention was made of a numerous posterity, and a general participation in the blessing, these promises were addressed to single individuals sprung from the respective patriarchs, and not to their offspring at large, or even in the order of primogeniture. The prerogative of birthright would seem, indeed, in this matter to have been systematically disregarded, as if to show in the most expressive manner that the whole rested on Divine sovereignty. Abraham himself, nowise distinguished in his antecedents from the other members of his father's house, was by a Divine call severed from the parent stock, and its natural associations, and afterwards separated even from his kinsman Lot, (who, through some impulse or other, had been disposed to connect himself with the patriarch,) in order that he might be brought more closely into the ancestral covenant. When planted on a new soil, and after a long tantalizing delay shooting forth branches, one after another was broken off, until the single stem was at length permitted to divide into the twelve branches bearing the name of Israel. This rejection of the collateral lines, as formerly in the cases of Cain and Canaan, not only made the promise more definite with respect to the channel of grace in general, but also in particular as to the sense of the term "seed" in these successive promises.

The circumstances which marked the birth of Isaac, and partly also of Jacob, have an important bearing on these points. The patriarch to whom it had been said, "I will make of thee a great nation," needed even long after to ask, "Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless?" But the remark: "Behold, to me thou hast given no seed:

and one born in my house is mine heir," drew forth the Divine assurance, "This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir," (Gen. xv. 2-4). When Abraham, on natural calculations, considered the fact of Sarah's barrenness, stated at the outset of the history, (Gen. xi. 30,) and afterwards frequently referred to, and so concluded that the son born to him by Hagar should be the medium of blessing, both he and Sarah were informed that the latter herself should be the proper mother, the question, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" being intended to silence all doubts on the subject, (Gen. xviii. 10, 14). The idea from the very first, implied in "the Seed of the woman," as somehow distinct from that of the man, and which, viewed in connection with its long subsequent realization in the history of redemption, as expressed in the apostle's statement, "God sent forth his Son made of a woman," (Gal. iv. 4,) and to which all the intermediate prophecies more or less distinctly pointed, had clearly reference to some extraordinary conception and birth, found a partial correlative in the birth of Isaac. This event, so far as it exceeded the ordinary course of nature, and when read in the light furnished by the words, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" served as a preparation for the more extraordinary birth wherein the promise, both verbal and typical, found its complete realization.

3. The New Testament references to the patriarchal promises are of the utmost importance for forming correct views on the subject; but as the chief object here is to consider the matter from its own historical point of view, there need be little more than to indicate the light in which they are regarded.

These references are exceedingly numerous. The promise to Abraham, of a blessing through his seed for the families of the earth, is indeed the earliest in the prophetic series to which express reference is made by the New Testament writers. St. Paul, referring to this promise, observes that "the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not made to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." And he then adds, "It is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be made to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the

father of us all" (Rom. iv. 13, 16). The promise that Abraham should be the "heir of the world," is not formally expressed in the old Testament, though contained substantially in Gen. xv. 7, where Canaan is promised to him for a possession; and it is also implied in the dominion announced for his seed (Gen. xxii. 17). By this *κληρονομία κόσμου*, which, as Olshausen remarks, "does not mean the mere possession of the land of Canaan, in an outward or inward sense, but the incorporation in himself of the whole race, so far as it is faithful, and the spiritual government of the world by his influence proceeding therefrom," Abraham was, as the apostle elsewhere shows, the representative of Christ, to whom, in the highest sense, belongs the distinction here mentioned, dominion over the world, and which his people shall share with Him (Rom. viii. 17; Rev. iii. 21). On this account is here added *τῷ σπέρματι*, by which St. Paul considers Christ to be designated, and in him the whole body of believers (Gal. iii. 16, 28, 29).¹ The inheritance was confirmed to all the seed, Gentiles as well as Jews, but only as believers; so that by this arrangement the paternity of Abraham, which was co-extensive with the inheritance, embraced all who are of his faith.

Another reference to the Abrahamic promises is in Gal. iii. 8, 14, 16: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed . . . That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith . . . Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one,—And to thy seed, which is Christ."

How rightly these promises may be styled Messianic, appears from the fact, that the announcements made to Abraham are here viewed as a preaching of the Gospel. But as it is only through Christ that the blessing of Abraham comes upon the nations; through Abraham mediately, through his Seed immediately; this leads the apostle to specify who that seed is. The reasoning, however, is perplexing to Biblical expositors. The difficulty consists in the apostle's taking as singular the word "seed," which, whether as the translation of *זרע*, or *σπέρμα* is used only as a collective, though in 1 Sam. viii.

¹ Olshausen, Com. on Romans, E. T. p. 167. Edin. 1849.

15 a plural occurs, but meaning "grains of seed," or wheat. The passage particularly referred to is Gen. xxii. 18, rendered by the LXX. ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς. But, according to the apostle's statement: τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἐβλόγησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, the promises are to be viewed as subservient to the advantage of Abraham and his posterity, while in Genesis the relation of the blessing to others is more prominent; and this suits the personal reference to Christ better than if taken to apply to Abraham's descendants collectively, or to the body of which Christ is the head. As to the manner of conducting the argument, it is better to view it as a critical, explicatory remark, than an argument at all; showing that the reference is not to Abraham's descendants in general, nor to his descendants by Isaac, nor to his spiritual descendants, but to his great descendant the Messiah.¹

But how did Abraham himself view these promises? The promise of the woman's Seed was already understood once and again by Eve and Lamech in a personal sense, or as referring to an individual; and this, no doubt, may have had considerable influence on the view in which Abraham would regard it, whilst there were other circumstances too which would help to place the matter in its true light. Our Lord stated to the Jews: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad" (John viii. 56). The *day of Christ* can here only be His first advent, as in Luke xvii. 22, though more commonly it denotes His triumph in connexion with a future appearance (1 Cor. i. 8). Various expositors, as Lampe, and more recently Tholuck, Lücke, and Alford, refer this vision to Abraham's Paradaisical state; but this, apart from other objections, is opposed to a very essential point in the context, representing not only the dignity but the eternity of Christ, which showed how it was possible, at the time objected to by the Jews, for Abraham to behold Him, since He *was before* Abraham.

To what incident, it may be asked, in Abraham's life can this vision of Christ be referred? Hengstenberg would connect it with the Theophanies witnessed by the patriarch, on the ground of the relation of the Logos of John's Gospel to the Old Testament doctrine of the Angel of Jehovah. But

¹ Brown, Exposition of Galatians, p. 144. Edin. 1853.

though these appearances enlarged his conceptions of heavenly things and relations, there is in Christ's statement reference to some definite occurrence in Abraham's history. This was, unquestionably, the transaction of Moriah,¹ where, in the interposition which stayed his hand when about to slay his son Isaac, and in the substitute found for the intended victim, the patriarch saw his own prophecy, unconsciously uttered, it may be, receive its fulfilment, in a way which gave pre-intimation of the appearance of Jehovah Himself, for the accomplishment of the purpose expressed inadequately by the animal oblation, which, however, in the meantime, He was graciously pleased to accept, for the purpose for which it had been presented. Nor should it be overlooked, that in the promise renewed to Abraham on this occasion the spiritual element was more distinctly brought out than at any time since his call, and in the very words then employed. But the expression, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," would now, it is very evident, be differently understood; it would no longer be regarded as conveying merely temporal benefits, to which, at an earlier stage in the patriarch's spiritual history, there was a possibility, it might be thought, of its being confined.

§ 4. *The Prophecy of Jacob—Shiloh.* Gen. xlix. 10.²

With Jacob ceased that process of excision which hitherto had confined the patriarchal fortunes to single individuals for three successive generations, and which, on merely human calculations, threatened to defeat the promises, or at all events conduced to postpone indefinitely their fulfilment. Now all the sons are allowed a place in the scheme, which is to secure the blessing of the nations. But if there was in this respect an advance towards the realization of the innumerable progeny, there was a severance, by the removal to Egypt, of the pre-

¹ Olshausen objects that "those types which relate to the suffering Christ, such as the offering of Isaac, are by no means to be regarded as pertaining to this subject; for *here* it is only the glorious part of the Messiah's appearance that is viewed." (Com. on the Gospels, iii. 516). This objection is certainly not borne out by the text; nor does it

accord with Olshausen's own admission, that Christ's *day* here means that of his "appearance and ministry upon earth" (p. 514).

² Comp. Venema, Dissert. ad Lib. Genesis, pp. 240-329. Reinke, Die Weissagung Jacobs. Münst. 1849. Kurtz, Geschichte d. alt. Bundes, i. 320-331; ii. 546-563.

vious limited connexion with the promised land. This, however, it had been expressly declared, was only to be temporary. Such was the confidence of Jacob with regard to the possession of the destined inheritance, when he declared on his death-bed in Egypt, "Behold I die; but God shall be with you, and bring you again into the land of your fathers," that he actually bequeathed a portion of it to Joseph (Gen. xlviii. 21, 22). Further, the dying patriarch summoned to him all his sons, that he might solemnly convey to them, as the founders of tribes, the patriarchal blessing imparted to himself by his father Isaac, and subsequently confirmed by God: "Jacob called unto him his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days." With Jacob the series of direct Divine communications ceased for a time; for none of his sons stood in the same close relationship to God as himself and his two preceding ancestors. Accordingly, the communications now to be made, along with the previous traditions of the family, will be the only light to guide them through the darkness and affliction of many days to come.

The time referred to in these announcements is a future, not immediate but remote, בְּאַחֶרֶת הַיָּמִים, "in the end of the days." This expression is in itself indefinite, and the future which it denotes must be determined by other considerations. It frequently occurs in the prophetic writings (*e. g.*, Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1), indicating a period which should be preceded by great changes in the Israelitish economy; or, as the Rabbins take it, the days of the Messiah. So ἐν ἑσχαταῖς ἡμερῶν (Acts ii. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jam. v. 3) includes the interval between the first and second advent of Christ; though sometimes referring specially to the period adjacent to the first coming, as in the first of the passages referred to, but in the others to the time before the second appearance. Jacob's perspective, it is apparent from the whole description, opened with the conquests of Joshua, and the tribal settlements in the promised land. But although this was the foreground of the picture, and so greatly influenced its general colouring, there were grander objects beyond. The time of Joshua was only the beginning of the "days," and the conquest of Canaan but a prelude to the history of the tribes, whose fortunes were intimately bound up with those of the world at large.

Of the announcements made to Jacob's first three sons no particular notice need be taken. Reuben is prophetically stripped of his pre-eminence as the first-born; while Simeon and Levi, the next two in seniority, are to be scattered in Israel. But when he comes to speak of Judah, the prophet's language assumes another character. Whereas the previous intimations carried in them a deposition and a curse, though not to the extent of that pronounced by God upon the fratricide, who was "cursed from the ground," or by Noah on Canaan, inasmuch as they did not imply a division or scattering *from* Jacob or Israel, but only *among* the chosen community,—that made to Judah conveyed a blessing to himself and to his brethren.¹ It announced that he should really be what his name implied. His mother, when bestowing it said: "Now will I praise the Lord; therefore she called his name Judah" (Gen. xxix. 35),—that is, praise; so now he shall be the *praised* one among his brethren. The opening words of the address are distinguishing,² יהודה אתה, "Judah thou;" thou rightly bearest that name (comp. Gen. xxvii. 36; Matt. xvi. 18); or, "thou Judah"—to whom something special is to be declared (comp. Gen. xxiv. 60). The reason of this distinction is the victory of which he was here assured: "Thy hand shall be on the neck of thine enemies;" (See Job xvi. 12)

The pre-eminence thus assigned to Judah shall be continued to him: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." He appears not merely as the victorious warrior, trampling upon his enemies, and receiving the homage of his friends after the victory, but also as a prince, with the insignia of office and of peaceful times, enjoying and administering the fruits of his prowess. It is in this latter point of view that the subject is to be chiefly considered.

The term שֵׁבֶט, primarily "a staff," a rod for smiting (Isa. x. 15), a shepherd's rod (Ps. xxiii. 4); but here, as in Num.

¹ Comp. 1 Chron. v. 2: "For Judah prevailed among his brethren, and from him, as respects the prince" (לְנִיחַד מִמֶּנּוּ)

that is, the prince was destined to spring from Judah. (See Berthcau, Die BB. d. Chronik, p. 53. Leip. 1854), and not

as usually taken, "of him *was* the prince." The reference is undoubtedly as Lud. Capellus (Notæ Criticæ. p. 440) observes, to the promised Shiloh.

² Gesenius, Gram. § 145, 2. Ewald, § 301, b.

xxiv. 17 ; Ps. xlv. 17, a "regal rod" or "sceptre," further defined by מִנְיָן, in the parallel clause, usually rendered "a law-giver," but which signifies the baton of a commander (Num. xxi. 18 ; Ps. lx. 9). It is so understood by Hofmann, Kurtz, Delitzsch, and the majority of recent Hebraists, although Hengstenberg and some others, adopt the other acceptance. The expression מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו, "from between his feet," accords with the oriental mode of placing the insignia of office when the prince was seated, as represented on the monuments of Persepolis. The continuance of Judah's rule is denoted by עַדְעַד, like εἰς (Matt. v. 18), indicating the term to which it shall extend (Gen. xxvi. 13 ; xxviii. 15), but without any notice of the cessation of that sovereignty.¹ On the contrary, the very nature of this dominion puts it in striking contrast with the notices of the world-powers afterwards represented by Egypt and Assyria. Thus, in Zech. x. 11 : "The pride of Assyria shall be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away" (סִימָה). "All the rule of the world," says Hengstenberg, "over the people of God is only temporary ; so that the rule of God's people over the world, as it culminated in Judah, can only suffer a temporary interruption ; its passing away is only apparent, or if it does pass away it is only in general, that it may return with greater force."²

The sovereignty thus committed to Judah unquestionably had respect to the promise made to Abraham : "Kings shall come out of thee : " "Sarah shall be a mother of nations ; kings of people shall be of her ;" and to Jacob, "Kings shall come out of thy loins" (Gen. xxvii. 6, 16 ; xxxv. 11). But if the honours of a royal offspring, which attached to the patriarchs in general, were now prophetically conferred on the head of one of the tribes, this, it must be presumed, will be the one in whom will also be lodged the other great element of promise, the blessing of the nations, as that which would give to the regal dominion its true worth.

As regards the general import of this prediction there is little difference of opinion among expositors ; for, with the exception of such rationalistic writers as would limit the

¹ Reinke, Die Weissagung Jacobs, pp. 91-94. Delitzsch, Die Genes. ii. 141.

² Christologie, i 62

reference to the place occupied by Judah in the march to Canaan after the Exodus, or those who, denying all prophecy, get rid of the correspondence between Judah's history and these statements, by assigning this composition to the time of David, all others recognise its Messianic character. Indeed, on this point there is evidence enough to satisfy all who recognise Scripture authority on such subjects. It is unnecessary to advert to Old Testament references to this passage, as many of them will be considered in connexion with another point; while, from the New Testament, it is enough to adduce the importance attached to the fact, that "our Lord sprung out of Judah," and the title, "The Lion of the tribe of Judah" (Heb. vii. 14; Rev. v. 5),—the latter in particular having a very marked allusion to this passage.

However, with this general agreement there are diversities of opinion as to the special import of the announcement. Leaving out of view such expositions as those of Tuch, Kalisch, and others, who see in it only a temporal superiority of Judah, somehow related to the assembling of the tribes at Shiloh, the well known town of that name in Palestine,¹ the others fall into two classes; those which regard the prophecy as Messianic, but without reference to a personal Redeemer, and those which take it to be Messianic and personal. This division turns chiefly on the point, whether Shiloh is to be taken as the subject of the verb; and then differences as to the import of the term cause numerous minor diversities of opinion.

1. *The Messianic but not Personal View.*—The ablest defenders of this view are Hofmann, Baumgarten, and latterly Delitzsch, though formerly² he held that there was a reference in the passage to a personal Redeemer. But as Kurtz is the writer who has expressed himself most fully on this side of the controversy, reference will be chiefly made to his observations.

¹ According to Tuch (Kom. üb. die Genesis, p. 578), "Judah's superiority shall continue as long as the people assemble at Shiloh, there to serve the Lord, that is, in the author's view, for ever." Kalisch (Genesis, p. 751): the notice does "not apply to the incon-

siderable preference enjoyed by Judah during the time of the Judges, but to the period when the independence of the kingdom of Ephraim was proclaimed at Shiloh."

² Delitzsch, Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, p. 233. Leip. 1845.

Omitting much that is irrelevant—as the statement—certainly not of a critical character, and even, in a dogmatic point of view, opposed to various established facts—that the idea of a personal Redeemer was unsuitable to that period, and on which Delitzsch¹ remarks, that we must not prescribe to prophecy what course it shall take, the chief arguments of Kurtz² are these:—1. Admitting that, viewed personally, Shiloh is the descendant of Judah, and that the term denotes the Messiah in his kingly office and his peace-bringing dominion, then Jacob would be represented as prophesying that Judah should rule until the coming of the Ruler out of Judah; that is, according to Kurtz, Judah shall rule until Judah rule, which he pronounces to be absurd. (2.) In the first part of ver. 10, the discourse is of Judah; but in the second, another subject, Shiloh, is introduced; but with this new subject the description in ver. 11 cannot accord. (3.) The natural course of the thought running through the whole discourse, (ver. 8-12,) requires that Shiloh be taken as the object, and not as the subject.

The first of these objections deserves little consideration, for even in the form into which Kurtz puts the statement, it yields a good sense; and there is no difficulty in conceiving how it might be said that Judah, who ruled up to a certain term, should, after that had been passed, rule in another and higher relation.

The remaining arguments, which are essentially one, are of more value; and were it necessary to limit the description in ver. 11 to the condition of Judah in Canaan, it would be difficult to maintain that a new subject was introduced at the close of ver. 10, which must so far interrupt the connexion. There is, however, no necessity for applying that description directly to Judah, or to his location in the promised land. Indeed, the reverse of this is demanded by the context; for the terms, “unto him shall the gathering of the people be,” if applied to Judah, would be tautological after the statement in ver. 8, where the subjugation and homage resulting from his power had been already disposed of. Moreover, the words which follow, “Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass’s

¹ Die Genesis, ii. 142.

² Geschichte des alt. Bundes, ii. 555.

colt unto the choice vine," descriptive of the Prince or of the state of matters to issue under his government, obviously contain the idea reproduced by a later prophet: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass," (Zech. ix. 9.)—an intimation deemed of such importance by our Lord, that he provided it should be literally accomplished, (Matt. xxi. 5).

It must, however, be admitted that the rendering, "till he come to Shiloh," explained by the defenders of this view as the "place" or "state of rest," has this much in its favour, that it retains the connexion between the locality where the tribes assembled after the conquest of Canaan: "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at Shiloh, and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there; and the land was subdued before them," (Josh. xviii. 1). There is here plainly a reference to Jacob's prophecy; and although this assembling of the tribes, resting from their victorious warfare (chap. xxi. 44; xxii. 4) was not the object which presented itself to the eye of the seer, still it may be fitly regarded as a point in advance, and a pledge of the full realization of the promise. This may explain the manner in which the name Shiloh is introduced in the narrative of Joshua, and which probably originated in the circumstances there recorded. Granting, however, the connexion as thus regarded between the Shiloh of the prophecy and the locality of that name, both being expressive of a certain relation to *rest* or peace after victory, this unquestionably does not preclude all reference to the Author or procuring cause of that enjoyment. In other words, it is by no means decisive against a personal application of the prophecy; while, on the other hand, there are various circumstances, to be presently noticed, which strongly favour, if indeed they do not necessitate, such an interpretation.

2. *Messianic and Personal View.* The more recent defenders of this view are Hengstenberg and Reinke. The monograph of the latter is especially full and exhaustive. Without adverting at any length to the various arguments

adduced by these and the older writers favourable to this view, the following considerations deserve notice:—

An important argument in proof that, by the mention of Shiloh, a new subject was introduced, is the statement: “Unto him the obedience of the people.” The term הִקְיָה , again only in Prov. xxx. 17, means “obedience,” free and filial, the result of affection and piety; connected with this is the name הַקִּיָּה , “the pious,” (Prov. xxx.). The rendering of the LXX., $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\text{-}\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ἰθνησύν , depends on an erroneous derivation of the term from הִקְיָה . The obedience here predicated is that of the “nations,” (עַמִּים ;) not the tribes of Israel simply, or the nations of Canaan, but the nations in general, as must be concluded from the earlier prophecies, which embraced all the families and nations of the earth, and from the mention, in ver. 8, 9, of “enemies” in general.¹

In Shiloh was concentrated all the glory and dominion of Judah, so that through him all resistance should be effectually put down, (Num. xxiv. 17; Ps. ii. 9). But while the nature of the dominion is evident, and corresponds to the description elsewhere given of the reign of the Prince of Peace, (Ps. lxxii. 8; Isa. xi. 10,) it is difficult to settle the precise meaning of the term Shiloh, with regard to which the differences of opinion are, as might be expected, greater among the defenders of the personal view, than with those who take it as a mere general statement. Passing over the derivation, once numbering many supporters, among others the Targum Jonathan, Calvin, and Dathe, that שִׁלֹה is compounded of שִׁל , (comp. שִׁלָּה , Deut. xxviii. 57,) to which was unwarrantably given the sense of *child*, and of the pronominal suffix, but which now meets with no countenance, and also that of the Vulgate, “donec veniet qui mittendus est,” adopted by Grotius as if the original were שִׁלֹה , instead of שִׁלָה , the leading views may be thus stated:—

(1.) An etymology having much to recommend it, is that

¹ Venema, (Dissert., p. 270), “Pia hæc et religiosa obedientia a *populis* pacifico regi præstanda ubi dicitur omnes et qualescunque populos, in unum corpus coalitos, sive Judæos

sive Gentiles, intelligendos esse, ex generali dictione, nulla addita restrictione, et verbi prophetici harmonia, elucescit; et ab aliis abunde est evictum.”

which takes שִׁלְהָ for שִׁלְהָ , and formed from ש , an abbreviation of שֹׁפֵר , and לְהָ . This would give the meaning, "till he come, whose is, or to whom belongs," the sceptre. This view was favoured by several of the ancient versions. Thus the LXX., $\xi\omega\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\upsilon \epsilon\lambda\theta\eta\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha \alpha\beta\tau\omega\phi$, or, according to another reading, $\omega\phi \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$, which is followed by Aquila and Symmachus; while the former corresponds with the version of Theodotion. The Syriac, "till he come whose it is." The Targum of Onkelos: "Till the Messiah come, to whom the kingdom belongs." The Arabic of Saadias: "till he come to whom it (dominion) belongs."¹ It is also contended that this view is favoured by Ezek. xxi. 32 [27], the words, "until he shall come whose is the dominion," being considered a paraphrase of Shiloh.

It is, however, a serious objection to this, that none of the existing MSS. contain any trace of the pointing שִׁלְהָ , for the reading שִׁלְהָ adduced by Jahn as found in several MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi, can only be viewed as a defective mode of writing common in words of similar form. Further it is objected that no instance of ש for שֹׁפֵר , occurs earlier than in the book of Judges. This, however, may be doubted; for there are traces of this abbreviation in some of the earliest Biblical proper names; מִתְהִישָׁאֵל (Gen. iv. 18) for instance is formed according to Gesenius from מִתְהִי for מִתְהִי , שָׁ for שֹׁפֵר , and אֵל .² It is also maintained that the ancient versions were influenced by Ezek. xxi. 32, which, although containing a reference to Gen. xlix. 10, cannot be regarded as a paraphrase on the term Shiloh. According to Hävernick³ it is הַמִּשְׁפָּט , and not שִׁלְהָ , that corresponds to שִׁלְהָ . Without right or government in full exercise, he argues, there is in the proper theocratic acceptance no true peace (Isaiah ix. 6). Right, peace, and the enjoyment of peace as ascribed to Judah after his triumph, are correlative ideas. In Genesis is described the effect, in Ezekiel the cause. But however this may be, Ezekiel's

¹ See Reinke, Weissagung Jacobs, pp. 58-63, 97, 98.

² Jahn, Einleitung, § 148, i. 517. Wien, 1802.

³ Knobel (Die Genesis, p. 335) finds another instance in בְּיַעֲקֹב in Gen. vi. 3;

but this is doubtful; see Rosenmüller, Schumann, Tuch, and Delitzsch.

⁴ Commentar üb. den Prophet Ezechiel, p. 362. Erlang, 1843.

paraphrase of *שִׁלָּה* by the personal idea *אִישׁר לוֹ הַמַּ*, shows distinctly that he took the former not in an abstract sense, *rest*, but “Giver of rest;” and so he could substitute for “He who brings peace,” “he who brings right,” and thereby, putting an end to a state of confusion and division, introduce harmony and peace. There is here, as Hävernick adds, not only the oldest Messianic conception of the prophecy of Shiloh, but also a recognition of its referring to a personal Redeemer.

(2.) A derivation largely adopted at present is from *שָׁלָה*, *to rest*, (Ps. cxxii. 6), or some cognate root; *שִׁלָּה* being formed, according to Hofmann, Kurtz, and others, after the model of *פִּירור* *tumult*, from *פָּרַר*; *קִיטַר* *smoke*, from *קָטַר*; and *שָׁלָה* from *שָׁלַח*, and so signifying abstractly “rest,” or concretely “the giver of rest.” The objections urged by Tuch against this etymology, have led Hengstenberg, who formerly entertained this view, to abandon it. Tuch holds that such forms are foreign to verbs *Lamed He*, and arise only from reduplication, as *קִימֹוּט* compared with *קִמֹוּט*. He also avers that the gentile nouns *גִּלְגִּי* (2 Sam. xv. 12), and *שִׁלְגִי* (1 Kings xi. 29; xii. 15), show that the termination of the noun was *ón*, which the *liquids* allow to drop, and the vowel *o* which remains is represented by *ה*. The original form here then must have been *שָׁלַח*, which he argues¹ is a proper name, as it is only in such the contraction occurs, as *קִינְדֹו* from *קִינְדֹוֹן* (Zech. xii. 11). So also Hengstenberg² takes *שִׁלָּה* to be a contraction of *שִׁילֹוֹן* analogous to *שָׁלְמָה* and *שָׁלְמוֹן* (1 Kings ii. 1). There can be little question that “the Pacific,” or “the Pacificator,” correctly represents the original, and that the name Solomon, bestowed by David on his son, whose reign he was assured (1 Chron. xxii. 9) would be eminently peaceful, had respect no less than the name of the city to the Shiloh of Jacob’s prophecy, whatever doubts may be entertained of the precise etymology, which in points like the present must be very much a matter of conjecture.

However this may be, the general scope of the prediction is manifest. It announced the advent of an illustrious person-

¹ Tuch, *Kommentar üb. die Genesis*, pp. 575, 576.

² *Christologie*, i. 68.

age to be descended from Judah, and in whom should be realized the promises contained in the earlier history, now further illustrated in this prediction itself. How it received a partial fulfilment in the calling of David to the Israelitish throne, and the covenant which secured the sovereignty to his family (1 Chron. xxviii. 4), is so apparent from the tenor of the history, and from the Messianic Psalms which so thoroughly breathe the spirit of the history as a record of God's dealings, both with his people and his enemies, that it is unnecessary to advert to it here (comp. Ps. lxxii.) One remark only need be offered with respect to the cessation of a national government in Judah before the advent of Shiloh,—a fact which many¹ would controvert by assumptions as untenable as they are unnecessary for the vindication of this oracle.

In regard both to this prediction and the intimations made to David (2 Sam. vii. 1-17), which connected with his family the blessing designed for mankind, the history presented such interruptions or suspensions of the promise as gave rise to painful surmisings in the minds of the faithful. Something of this kind it must have been which prompted the question, "Doth his promise fail for evermore?" (Ps. lxxvii. 8.) But not only inferences of this kind, there were express determinations respecting the Davidic house; such as, "I will rend the kingdom from thee, and give it to thy servant," (1 Kings xi. 11,) which must have appeared in entire opposition to former promises; nevertheless, as events proved, all this respected only the mode of the fulfilment of the prophecy without prejudice to its essentials. A distinction of this sort must obviously be made with regard to the dominion here promised to Judah. The trust committed to him was not wholly independent of outward or political relations. Yet these constituted nothing more than subordinate elements in the case. Judah occupied a place as distinct and peculiar when serving in Egypt, exiled in Babylon, or paying tribute to Cæsar, as when, in the persons of David and Solomon, he extended his conquests on every side; for the one relation was as needful, both for his own discipline, and the preparation of the world

¹ *E. g.* Vitringa, *De Sceptro Judæ* 1723. Deyling, *De Sceptro Judæ non superstite, nato Christo: Obss. Sacræ, recessuro: Obss. Sacræ.* ii. 106-137. *Lib. iv. capp. 5, 6, pp. 934-961* Jenæ,

for the promised blessing, as the other and externally more glorious position which he sustained. Prophecy has respect to inward and spiritual relations more than to literal forms. Still it is not without deep significance as bearing on the present prediction, and others to which it formed the proper basis, that of all the Israelitish tribes, Judah should be that which retained most distinctly its character and position, and that its genealogical registers could fully authenticate the descent of the Messiah when He appeared in the fulness of time (Heb. vi. 14). Nor should it be overlooked, that although the prophecy of Jacob gave no direct intimation whatever of the cessation of Judah's temporal superiority, yet that, soon after the coming of Shiloh, a change took place, which, beyond any occurrence in the previous history, put an end to the national life, and the whole theocratic constitution.

§ 5. *The Prophecy of Balaam—The Star and Sceptre of Israel.* Num. xxiv. 17-19.¹

The next intimation of a Redeemer which occurs in the Pentateuch proceeds from a source altogether peculiar and unexpected. Hitherto the promises were given directly by God himself, or through the medium of "holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But here was a man, evidently against his own inclinations, made the organ of blessing to Israel. The character of Balaam, who had come from "the mountains of the east," at the call of the king of Moab, for the purpose of "cursing Jacob and defying Israel," was very enigmatical. The proper object of his mission required that he should curse, but, as he himself acknowledged, he could only bless the covenant people: "How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy, whom the Lord hath not defied?" (Num. xxiii. 8). This was an acknowledgment which must have been exceedingly mortifying after the compliment paid to Balaam by his employer: "I

¹ Comp. Carpzov, Bened., De Vatinio Beleam evangelico contra Abarbanelis detorsiones. Lips. 1692. Meig. J. F., De Stella et Sceptro Bileamitico. [Heidelb. 1669]: Critici Sac. Thes., Nov. i. 423, ff. Amst. 1701. Hengstenberg, Die Geschichte Bileams. Berlin, 1842, E. T., pp. 467-507. Reinke, Die Weissagung Bileams: Beiträge, iv. 179-287. Kurtz, Geschichte d. alt. Bundes, ii. 485-500.

wist that he whom thou blessest is blessed, and he whom thou cursest is cursed" (Num. xxii. 6).

There was, however, a peculiar fitness in the appointment of such a man to the work to which, by an overruling Providence, he was now called. The occasion was a trying crisis in the history of the Israelites. They needed strong encouragement for the conflicts in which they were soon to engage ; and so God, in His wisdom and goodness, adopted a method of revealing his purposes, which, while it cheered the hearts of His people, brought confusion on their adversaries. It was to the enemies of the world-powers, before whom they were ready to quail, that the predictions of the irresistible career of the latter were now primarily addressed, and by a prophet of their own, whose identity of interest with themselves could not be suspected, and whose oracle therefore, only with greater certainty, announced the disappearance of their glory, and their complete subjugation to the kingdom of God.

To the position of the prophet outside the church reference will subsequently be made, inasmuch as it gave a peculiar aspect to the intimations regarding Israel's future, which he was charged to make to their very enemies, and which accounts for only one side of the future being more prominently exhibited ; but of this again. In introducing his closing discourse, to which alone attention need be given, as it completes the notice of Israel's ascendancy, only partially intimated in the preceding discourses, Balaam thus addresses the king of Moab : " I will advertise thee what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days," or " end of the days."

This note of time was met with before in the blessing of Jacob, indicating the remote future, yet not the ultimate termination, but only the end of the precise development in view of the speaker. In Gen. xlix. 2, everything was considered as belonging to the " end of the days," which should happen after the possession of Canaan ;¹ here the Israelitish victories over the neighbouring nations belong to the " end of the days ;" yet the end is remote, as appears from the words " not now," and " not nigh" (Num. xxiv. 17). The beginning was brought nearer by the time which elapsed since the death of Jacob,

¹ Hengstenberg, *Bileam*, E. T., pp. 465-467. Reinke, *Die Weissagung Bileams*, pp. 236-238.

but the period designated as the "end of the days" was itself not abridged. It must also be noticed, that although, in this introductory remark, Balaam had the Moabites chiefly in view, yet in the announcements which follow he does not confine himself to them, but shows how the threatened destruction would overtake others who already stood in hostile relation to the covenant people, or should hereafter occupy such an attitude.

The central idea in the prophecy, and on which depend all the results announced, is the object presented under the image of a star and a sceptre to the rapt eye of the prophet, scanning the dark and dreadful vista of the future. The character of the object thus seen it is not at all difficult to determine. "The *star* is such a natural image and symbol of regal power and splendour, that the use of it exists amongst almost all nations."¹ Further, there can be little doubt that the figure, "a sceptre shall arise out of Israel," is founded, it may be unconsciously to Balaam, who was only the organ of the Spirit, on Gen. xlix. 10: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah." The figures are, moreover, literally explained in ver. 19: "Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion."

The chief question to be determined is, whether the reference here be, according to the more recent view of Hengstenberg,² to an ideal person, the personified Israelitish monarchy, which culminated typically in David, and anti-typically in the Messiah, or to an individual king of Israel; and if the latter, whether it be David exclusively, according to Hofmann,³ or to the Messiah exclusively, according to Baumgarten⁴ and Delitzsch,⁵ or to David and the Messiah inclusively, according to Kurtz.⁶

There is plainly much in the history of David, especially in his subjugation of the Edomites, Moabites, and other neighbouring enemies of the Theocracy, (2 Sam. viii. 2, 11, 12, 14,) which corresponded with Balaam's predictions. But any such fulfilment of the prophecy was only partial; the subjugations thus effected being limited both in extent and duration. The

¹ Hengstenberg, Bileam, E. T. p. 472. See also Le Clerc, Com. *in loc.*

² Bileam, p. 172. E. T., p. 476. Christologie, 2te Ausg. i. 104.

³ Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. 153.

⁴ Theologischer Commentar, ii. 373.

⁵ Biblisch-proph. Theol., p. 293.

⁶ Geschichte d. a. Bundes, ii. 491.

Moabites, for instance, so far from being totally destroyed, as here predicted, not only asserted their freedom, and triumphantly maintained it, (2 Kings i. 1; iii. 4; xiii. 20.) but are frequently referred to by the later prophets as enemies of the Theocracy, and their destruction foretold as a matter still future, (Isa. xv. ; xvi. ; xxv. 10 ; Jer. xlvi. ; Amos ii. ; Zeph. iii.)

“But supposing,” as Hengstenberg remarks, “that the Moabites were completely destroyed by David, still such an event could not be spoken of as a perfect fulfilment of the prophecy. What is here said of the Moabites, is only an individual application of the idea ; the Moabites are only to be regarded as a part of the great whole of the enemies of the Church of God. To imagine that the disappearance of the Moabites, in their historical individuality, would suffice for the fulfilment of the prophecy, that it would be a matter of indifference whether their essential character prolonged its existence in other powerful enemies, is not to acknowledge the difference between *prophesying*, which never has to do merely with the *drapery*, the exterior, and *soothsaying*. Only by the complete and enduring conquest of the enemies of the kingdom of God *in general*, can the fulfilment of the prophecy be regarded as consummated. Where enemies of the Church still exist, there are Moabites still ; there the word uttered by Balaam must be in process of fulfilment. With this latter observation, another objection against the Messianic reference is also disposed of—namely, that the Moabites, at the time of the Messiah’s appearance, had already vanished from the field of history. . . . If the prophecy, as long as the Moabites existed in a narrower sense, was fulfilled respecting them not as Moabites, but as the enemies of God’s people, then the limits of their existence cannot be the limits of *its* fulfilment. The Messianic reference could only be denied, if it could be shown that, at the time of the Messiah’s appearance, the Moabites, in a *wider* sense, the enemies of the kingdom of God, were already annihilated, which no one will maintain.”¹

The admission, however, that the prediction contains indirectly a reference to David, and to the fact that what was

¹ Bileam, p. 196 ; E. T., p. 479.

begun by him outwardly and typically should be consummated by Christ, who apparently, in allusion to this very circumstance, styles himself "the Root and the Offspring of David, and the bright and morning Star," (Rev. xxii. 10,) affords no support to the view that it treats of an ideal or personified Israelitish kingdom.

The chief arguments by which Hengstenberg¹ would maintain this view, are substantially these:—

(1.) That reference to an Israelitish king is contrary to the analogy of the other prophecies of the Pentateuch. Any single person is never named in them, with the exception of the Messiah, whose annunciation is essentially different from that of David; whereas the establishment of a regal government was announced even to the patriarchs; so that the "star" and "sceptre" can refer only to such promises as, "Kings shall come out of thee," (Gen. xvii. 6). To this it may be replied, any value which this objection may possess weighs only against those views which refer the prediction either to David exclusively or to him including the Messiah; for it neither supports Hengstenberg's own theory, nor in any way opposes the direct Messianic application of the passage. On the contrary, if, as Hengstenberg fully admits, there is a personal reference to the Messiah in one passage of the Pentateuch, (Gen. xlix. 10,) specially referred to in the present case, analogy requires that the Star out of Jacob be so understood too.

(2.) The term, "sceptre," considered in itself, is, the same writer argues, unfavourable to the view that an individual is meant, since it denotes not a ruler, but dominion in general. But, on the other hand, the "Star" applies more decidedly to an individual, and this determines the reference in the other term.

(3.) The commentary, ver. 19, "and dominion shall come out of Jacob," on the words, "a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel," and also ver. 7, "His king shall be higher than Agag," where it is maintained by Hengstenberg, the king of Israel is an ideal person, the personification of royalty. But the king

¹ Bileam, p. 172; E. T., 476. They are repeated by Reinke, Weissagung Bileams, pp. 259, 260.

here is not an ideal, but a real person, as appears from the very contrast instituted between him and the king of the Amalekites. In ver. 17, where definite individual actions are ascribed to the Star out of Jacob, they must be those of some distinct person. When Balaam exclaimed, "I see a Star rising out of Jacob, and a Sceptre out of Israel," there was certainly presented to him, as Kurtz¹ observes, the image of a concrete appearance, and not a pure ideal abstraction.

It is unnecessary to adduce further evidence in disproof of the view of Hengstenberg, who not only here, but throughout the early Messianic prophecies, discerns, for the most part, no other than an ideal person, contrary to the clearest evidence, both direct and collateral. From the very first announcement on this subject, there is the most obvious reference throughout the Pentateuch to a person specially called and qualified for the work assigned to him; and that it was in such a light the promises were viewed by those to whom they were originally made, appears wherever any notices of this kind occur. The work to be effected by the Redeemer was, indeed, of a character which allowed of its being partially exemplified from the first propagation of the race, while at certain epochs it was more fully manifested in the triumph of good over evil, either by direct interpositions of God, or by a human agency which foreshadowed not merely the office, but also the person of Him who had been destined to carry out to their proper consummation the principles thus partially exhibited. But although the great truths announced in redemption were thus at various periods brought distinctly into action through human agency, this by no means warrants the view that the predictions had more than an indirect reference to such partial or typical accomplishments, or to the instrumentality so employed. The effects produced, however they might illustrate the principles involved, were of too outward and material a character to admit of their being in any way identified with them, or to support the conclusion that the prophecy had respect to more than the proper Agent in the matter.

¹ Geschichte d. alt. Bundes, ii. 490.

Against the Messianic application of the present passage, it is objected by J. D. Michaelis, Dathe, and others,¹ that the effects to follow the coming of the person here announced differ from the works elsewhere ascribed to the promised Redeemer. Here, it is said, only conquest, ruin, and destruction are foretold, whereas, in the other predictions, the Messiah was declared to be the author of blessing to all the nations and families of the earth, and his reign was characterised as one of peace, arising from a willing submission of the people.

The contrast, however, is more apparent than real, and the difference arises mainly from the precise aspect in which the prediction may be viewed. No doubt there are here most express intimations of the destruction which awaited the enemies of Israel as the covenant people. Yet in this respect it is not more full of denunciation than the primal promise of the seed of the woman, with which, indeed, it is essentially identical, and to which even formally it bears a very strong resemblance. There, the serpent, the enemy of man and the representative of evil, was doomed to destruction; here, in accordance with the progress made in the scheme of providence, and the consequently more explicit character of prophecy, the representatives of the world-power in opposition to God and His purposes are more specifically described, and their overthrow announced. In all these predictions, salvation and destruction go invariably together, although it may depend on circumstances which of the two ideas is in any case rendered more prominent. In the first promise, though fraught with blessing, the curse was the only express and direct object; and so here, although the immediate reference is to the destruction of the enemies of the theocracy, the other element is not unnoticed. In Balaam's remark regarding Israel: "Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee," (ver. 9), the two sides of the Messiah's character are distinctly presented.

In the present instance there was a special propriety in the form which the prophecy assumed. As in the case of the serpent, the announcement was made directly to the enemy.

¹ So also Hengstenberg in the 1st ed. of his *Christologie*, i. 88, where he denied all Messianic reference to the present passage.

It is accordingly a curse and not a blessing, and it is pronounced by a prophet of the enemy himself. That the seer occupied a position outside the Church is a circumstance which fully accounts for the form which his discourse assumed, and for the precise view which the future presented to his entranced eye. It appeared not as it did to the patriarchs, charged with blessings to the nations; but in its destructive aspect, with regard to which this prophecy is more explicit than any which preceded it.

It is also of importance to notice the completeness of the destruction here announced. No greatness, no martial prowess, no mere ties of kindred with Israel, no favoured position, will afford protection from the threatened ruin. The first nation whose doom is pronounced is the Moabites, at whose instance Balaam appeared upon the scene, having been specially engaged by the king of Moab to curse Israel. The typical character of these enemies of the theocracy is shown by the designation בְּנֵי-חַיִל, "the sons of tumult," as rendered by modern critics.¹ From Moab the seer turns to their southern neighbour Edom, whose enmity to Israel, pre-figured in their progenitor Esau, occupies a large place in the later prophets. Next comes Amalek, who had already shown a marked hostility to Israel in circumstances which led Jehovah to proclaim eternal war against such enemies, (Exod. xvii. 8-16; Deut. xxv. 17-19.) Here their destruction is as explicitly announced by a prophet who had no connexion with the covenant people, as it had previously been in the *memorial* which Moses was directed to write (Exod. xvii. 14). The Kenites, too, who inhabited the fastnesses of the mountains, should share the same fate; though difficult of access, yet their dwelling-place should certainly be laid waste. In conclusion, it is announced that similar destruction awaited the enemies of the future, as well as those of the present; alike representatives of the same principles, they were appointed to the same end.

¹ See Hengstenberg, Balaam, E. T., pp. 475, 476; and comp. above vol. i. p. 264.

§ 6. *The Prophet like Moses* (Deut. xviii. 15-18).¹

The prophetic intimations revert to their usual channels after the abnormal interruption just noticed. The next proper Messianic announcement was made through Moses, shortly before his death. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me: unto him ye shall hearken; and according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb, in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him."

A prophet, in the Scriptural acceptance of the term, (Gen. xx. 7,) is one who holds direct intercourse with heaven, is made acquainted with the mind of God, and is fitted to impart, whenever necessary, the truths thus communicated to him, (Ex. vii. 1). The prophetic function was not limited to the prediction of future events, but comprehended also the disclosure of any important truths, and the inculcation of present duties. Moses in a remarkable degree discharged these functions, for while he is spoken of as a prophet, (Hos. xii. 3,) he is also in a manner separated from them, occupying an eminence peculiarly his own, (Luke xvi. 29, 31). He differed from all the succeeding prophets, not only in the access which he had to God, (Num. xii. 6-8,) but also in the commission with which he was charged to order all things aright in the house of God. This is noticed in the remark appended to the account of his death, (Deut. xxxiv. 10), "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face;" and in Heb. iii. 2, "Moses was faithful in all his house," (comp. Num. xii. 7). As the mediator of the Old Covenant, Moses had devolved on him the ordering of the

¹ Comp. Deyling, *De magno Propheta*: *Obss. Sacr.*, ii. 231, ff.—Reinke, *Die Verheissung eines Propheten*: Beiträge, iv. 291-354.—Kurtz, *Geschichte d. alt. Bundes*, ii. 513-522.

house of God; he therefore needed free communication with Him whose servant he was; and he so ordered it as to preclude any reconstruction of its laws and ordinances by the regular officers who should come after. But before his decease, he intimated the rise of another prophet entitled to universal respect and obedience. When Moses said, "like unto me." he doubtless referred to the terms in which himself had been spoken of by God, (Num. xii.). This qualification is an essential element in determining to whom the prophecy applies.

Various views have been held regarding the prophet here referred to. Hofmann¹ applies it to the Jewish prophets collectively, without any allusion to Christ. Hengstenberg² controverts the collective view, and finds here again his ideal person. "Moses," he says, "speaks not of a body of prophets, to which at the end Christ might belong; but the plurality of prophets is by Moses comprehended in an ideal unity, because on the ground of Gen. xlix. 10, and by the enlightenment of the Holy Ghost, he saw that the prophetic office would at last rise into an actual person in Christ." Kurtz³ applies it exclusively to Christ.

There is nothing to show that Moses here referred to the prophets collectively; on the contrary, the use of the singular מֹשֶׁה, and its related suffixes, is decidedly against it. So much is this felt by many who are unwilling to allow its Messianic application, that they are under the necessity of referring it to Joshua or to Jeremiah. It strengthens this argument to find that, immediately preceding this announcement, the priests, who might certainly be viewed more in a collective capacity than the prophets, are spoken of in the plural. But more decisive are the qualifications, "like unto me,"⁴ and "like unto thee." The prophetic office of Moses is, by these terms, described as peculiar. Wherein the peculiarity consisted, has been already noticed. Moses was entrusted with the supreme direction of affairs in the Israelitish community;

¹ Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. 253. Schriftbeweis, II., i. 83.

² Christologie, i. 124. Much in the same way, Fairbairn, Prophecy, p. 492.

³ Geschichte d. alt. Bundes, ii. 514.

⁴ Olshausen: "The words, *like unto me*, must have a decided reference to the legislative character which was exhibited in Moses, and afterwards appeared only in Christ."—Com. on Acts, E. T., p. 406.

he was the mediator between God and the people, their redeemer, leader, lawgiver, priest, and judge. There was no function, no side of the representation of God which, in the highest human instance, he did not discharge. But above all, he was the prophet whose office governed, gave form and life to, all these functions. Distinguished as Moses was in his prophetic office, there is the most obvious necessity to look for similar distinctions in the prophet of whom he here speaks. But none with such qualifications can be pointed to in the whole series of prophets, ending with Malachi; and therefore, if the prophecy has been fulfilled, it must have been in the person of some other.¹

But if it does not apply to the Old Testament prophets collectively, or to any one of them, with as little authority can it be referred to the prophetic office, or to an ideal unity realized in Christ. The argument of Hengstenberg,² that if this passage were limited to Christ, there would be wanting a proper sanction to the prophetic office, is fully disposed of by the consideration, that this office was exercised and acknowledged prior to the Mosaic economy; and that, in fact, it was prophecy which introduced and sanctioned the law, and not, as here assumed, the law that gave a sanction to prophecy.

It is true, as stated by Hengstenberg, that all the prophets after Moses were forerunners and heralds of the great Prophet to be expected, and that they were so regarded by the faithful; that the same Spirit—the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. i. 11)—spoke in them, that in its fulness dwelt in Christ himself; and that until His appearance there was need of warnings, lest men should, by closing their eyes on the light furnished from heaven, turn aside to the bewildering auguries and soothsayings of heathenism. But such warnings, with the specification of the signs of the true and false prophet, had no less respect to Christ's own appearance, as is evident from his exhortations, to beware of false Christs, and false prophets, which should arise and deceive many.

It will make the matter still more clear, to mark the reference in the prophecy to the special relation of Moses be-

¹ Kurtz, *Geschichte d. alt. Bundes.* ii. 515.

² Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, i. 123.

tween God and the people,—a relation demanded by the people's weakness and fear, and acquiesced in and even approved of by God. They desired a mediator, for they could not endure, as they felt themselves unfitted for, direct dealings with God. It was to carry out this arrangement more fully than could be done through Moses, or even through the institution of a priesthood in which one side of the idea was more largely expressed than in the prophetic office, that this Prophet is ordained, and when it is added, "from among their brethren," there was an intimation assuring the faithful that though the qualifications for the discharge of his office implied a higher standing than that of Moses, this prophet would, nevertheless, be of one nature, and of like sympathies with themselves. This truth, treated of in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in connexion with Christ's priestly office, is no less important in its bearing on his prophetic calling.

In this intimation of the rise of another prophet, who should complete the work of Moses, there was included a notice of the preparatory nature of the dispensation then established. A prophet, who should enjoy the intercourse with God which belonged to Moses, and be entrusted with equal administrative powers, must be called to some equally great work.¹ Like Moses, he must be a Redeemer of his people, the founder of a new covenant, which shall supersede the old. It lies in the nature of prophecy, and in the spiritual apprehension of it, that as it approaches its fulfilment it becomes clearer and more comprehensive; and so with the enlargement of the spiritual horizon by the ministry of the later prophets, a feeling of insufficiency in regard to the old, and a longing after a better covenant was increased. But all that was subsequently announced respecting that new covenant and its mediator—"the messenger of the covenant" (Mal. iii. 1) was entirely the development of this prediction of the Prophet like unto Moses.

It only remains to show how this prophecy was understood at the time of Christ's appearance, who "came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law and the prophets."

Of the testimonies on this point may be adduced, first, the belief of the Samaritans, as stated by the woman at Jacob's

¹ Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, i. 119. Kurtz, *Geschichte*, ii. 522.

well: "I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things" (John iv. 25). As the Samaritans received only the Pentateuch, their expectations of a prophet or Divine teacher, in the person of Messiah, could originate only in this prophecy. Of the Jewish belief, again, on this subject, there is evidence in Philip's remark to Nathanael: "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John i. 45). So also the popular feeling expressed itself: "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world" (John vi. 14). These references are too plain to need any remark, but an allusion not less convincing is found in the voice from heaven: "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him" (Matt. xvii. 5): compare "unto him ye shall hearken" (Deut. xviii. 15), Compare also John xvii. 8: "I have given them the words which thou gavest me," with Deut. xviii. 18: "I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Stephen also saw the prediction of the prophet like Moses fulfilled in Christ (Acts vii. 37); and so too Peter (Acts iii. 22, 23). Hofmann,¹ indeed, holds that "Peter does not say that Jesus was a prophet whom Israel should hear, but only lets the Jews infer, that as on the one hand Moses made faith in the prophetic word a duty, and that as on the other the words of all the prophets pointed to what came to pass in Christ, and so the relation it became them to hold to Christ, and the preaching of the apostles." But there can be no question from the fact that *προφήτης*, owing to the addition of *ἀκούειν τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου*, cannot mean all the prophets, and that Peter regarded the prophet spoken of by Moses as a distinct individual, and the person, as the context shows, of whom God had spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.²

¹ Schriftbeweis, II. i. 85.

² Kurtz, Geschichte, ii 519.

SECT. II. INSTITUTIONS INDICATING THE CHARACTER AND OFFICES OF THE REDEEMER.

Cramer, J. J.—*Theologia Israelis, qua Goelis officium ac mysterium proponitur.* Pars prior. Franc. 1705.—Deyling, *De Angelo Redemptore: Obs. Sacrae,* ii. 98-106.—Hottinger, *De victimarum integritate ac mysterio: Ministerium sol. Expiationum Diei,* pp. 508-566. Tiguri, 1754.

In addition to the verbal intimations respecting the promised Redeemer, noticed in the preceding section, there were institutions and ordinances which symbolically referred to the same important subject. All the symbols and ceremonies of the Old Testament dispensation, including therein as well the patriarchal as the Mosaic rites, for, in fact, the latter were only a more developed and orderly form of the earlier, pointed in one way or other to the work which God had purposed to accomplish for fallen man, either as regarded its nature or the manner whereby it should be effected. There were some ordinances and arrangements, however, which bore more directly on the character and offices of the great Agent in this work, and which properly supplemented those verbal prophecies which included notices of his person as well as of his character and offices.¹ The more important of these were, the office of Goel, or Kinsman Redeemer; the priestly institution; and the regulations respecting the quality of the sacrificial victims which occupied a very distinct place in the Levitical ritual.

§ 1. *The Hebrew Goel, or Kinsman Avenger and Redeemer.*

The views entertained in primeval times, as already shown, regarding the nature of the blessings to be secured to mankind by the promised Divine interposition, varied according to the circumstances of individuals—one seeing in the pro-

¹ Owen: "In the pursuit hereof (the promise given to Abraham) his posterity was separated to be a peculiar people unto God. Their church-state, the whole constitution of their worship, their temple and sacrifices, were all of them assigned and appointed unto the confirmation of the promise, and to the

explanation of the way whereby the blessed Seed should be brought forth, and of the work that he should perform for the removal of sin and the curse, and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness."—*Exercit. on Hebrews, Works,* xviii. 182.

mise life; another, deliverance from the toil and kindred troubles to which man was doomed; while a third recognised in it salvation, or deliverance from miseries, troubles, and fears. At the time when it assumed this last aspect, it also presented itself to the eye of faith under the character of *redemption*. The idea under this special form first makes its appearance in the blessing which Jacob, before his death, invoked upon the sons of Joseph. "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me (לְפָדוּתִי מִכָּל־עוֹלָם) from all evil, bless the lads," (Gen. xlviii. 16.)

The word פָּדָה, the participle of the verb פָּדָה, of frequent occurrence in Scripture in connexion with some special interposition of God on behalf of His people, appears here for the first time. The next occasion on which it is used is when God directs Moses to make known to the Israelites his purpose respecting their deliverance from Egypt. "Say unto the children of Israel, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem (פָּדֶה) you with a stretched-out arm, and with great judgments," (Ex. vi. 6.) It is the term also used to describe the redemption from Egypt in Moses' song, where it is distinguished from the mere exodus which ensued, (Ex. xv. 13.) It is, however, in reference to the redemption from the Babylonian exile, and in the writings of Isaiah, that this expression most frequently occurs. Thus, in Isaiah xliii. 1, "But now thus saith the Lord, that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, (פָּדֶה), I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine;" and so in numerous other passages. Accordingly, a common designation of God is יְהוָה פֹּדֶה, "Jehovah, thy Redeemer," (Isaiah liv. 8; xlv. 24; xlviii. 17); and the people who have thus experienced deliverance are styled יְהוָה פֹּדֶה, "the redeemed of Jehovah," (Isaiah lxii. 12.)¹

The expression in question is thus seen to denote primarily some special act of deliverance of which Jehovah is the author, and in which He sustains to His people some peculiar

¹ See Gesenius, Thesaurus, pp. 253, 254.

relation. That it is not any deliverance that is thus denoted, appears from the distinctions made in the above quoted passages relative to the exodus, particularly Ex. vi. 6. This passage is also important on account of the connexion in which it stands. It was on this occasion God made Himself known by his name Jehovah, or in his special character of Redeemer, to an extent which, as compared with any prior acquaintance with that name, made it to be regarded as a new revelation. It was further intimated that God's appearance in behalf of His oppressed people was on account of His covenant with the patriarchs (ver. 3-5), and that He was about to enter into a special relation with those now to be redeemed: "And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians," (ver. 7.)

The prior connexion of God with the Israelites through their fathers, and in consideration of which, as here intimated, He now appeared as their GOEL, receives much light from the prerogatives which pertained, not only according to usage, but also by various legal enactments, to any party who stood in the relationship denoted by that particular name. The office of the Goel, which God so frequently assumes to Himself in Scripture with respect to His people, had a distinguished and carefully defined place in the Israelitish constitution, though its origin belonged to a much earlier period. The Mosaic law recognises it as a well-known and acknowledged institution, and only regulates some of its functions, correcting abuses and bringing the whole into harmony with the law and the purposes therein contemplated.

The duties which devolved upon the Goel were various. They had respect both to the dead and to the living. The duties incumbent on the Goel, in the first of these aspects, comprehended two particulars. First, to avenge the blood of a murdered kinsman; and secondly, to marry the widow of the kinsman who left no issue, and raise up seed to the deceased. With regard to the living, again, it was the duty and the privilege of the Goel to succour his kinsman in any difficulties with respect to his person or property in which he might be involved.

To avenge the blood of a murdered kinsman was the first

duty of the Goel ; for which reason he was termed נֹאֵל הַדָּם, "the Goel," or "avenger of blood," (Num. xxxv. 19; Deut. xix. 6, 12). This was, and is still throughout the East,¹ accounted one of the most sacred of duties. The practice originated, doubtless, in a state of society not yet fully organised, and when, in the absence of proper authority to see to the administration of law and justice, and to protect the weak from the violence of the more powerful, families and individuals closely related had to combine for their own safety. The crime of murder had, from the time of Noah, been declared capital by an express Divine appointment: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" but no special directions were given as to the parties to whom this duty was entrusted; and before the establishment of regular officers and tribunals, it would devolve upon, or at least be assumed by, the heads of tribes or families, or the individual most nearly related to the murdered party. It would be the same also with respect to other injuries. Something of this kind may be discerned in the authority exercised by Judah in ordering the punishment of his daughter-in-law, Tamar, (Gen. xxxviii. 24). A case, however, more in point, is the vengeance taken by Simeon and Levi on the Shechemites for dishonouring their sister Dinah—they, of all the sons of Jacob, being most interested in the matter, as they were her full brothers, (Gen. xxxiv. 25). However the custom of blood revenge may have originated, it was deeply rooted among the Israelites. But in order to control its excesses, which otherwise would result in the most injurious consequences, as still frequently witnessed among Orientals, there was a provision in the Mosaic law which secured the right of asylum in the cities of refuge to such as were unintentionally the cause of death to another. The guilt or innocence of such as betook themselves to the cities of refuge was a matter to be determined by the judges, but in the event of their finding any party guilty, they were required to deliver him up to the Goel, the avenger of the blood of the deceased. It is from this point of view it is declared that Jehovah will avenge the blood of his servants, (Deut. xxxii. 43; comp. vi.

¹ See Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 305. Lond. 1853.

10). As their Goel, it is both His right and His duty so to act.

Another part of the Goel's duty with respect to a deceased kinsman was, as above noticed, that where there was a childless widow, he should marry her and raise up seed to his brother. This was a patriarchal custom, (Gen. xxxviii.,) but it was incorporated in the Mosaic law, under certain modifications. The nature of these, and the particular ends of this institution in respect to the preservation of families and the patrimonial inheritance, belong to another part of this work. It is only referred to at present as an evidence of the closeness of the ties which bound together parties who stood to one another in the relation of Goel.

But it was not merely with the deceased the Goel had to do. His duties extended also to the living, and it was incumbent on him to interpose in behalf of his kinsman who, through poverty, was reduced to difficulties in respect to his person or property. Nor was it a merely private concern; it was a privilege, the exercise of which the law recognised, and made due provision for such interpositions. Thus the Goel was entitled to redeem at any time the field or other possession which might be mortgaged; and to redeem the individual from the servitude into which he might have sold himself, or been sold by others, through inability to meet his pecuniary engagements, (Lev. xxv. 25, 47, 48). Further, the Goel had a right to have restored to him anything iniquitously taken from a deceased brother, by parties who, on expressing their repentance, were required to make restitution for the wrong committed, and to bring a trespass-offering to the Lord, (Num. v. 8).

In a word, the proper office of the Goel was that of a Vindicator or Redresser of wrongs or injuries, whether they affected the person or property of the individual on whose behalf he interposed. But what chiefly deserves notice is, that such an interposition was not of a merely optional character, or called forth simply by considerations of kindness or humanity, and the neglect of which amounted to nothing more than the omission of the ordinary charities of friendship, relationship, or other connexion. On the contrary, the exercise of the functions pertaining to the Goel was a matter of

special duty, the neglect of which, though not in all its parts met by express penalties of law, was yet in one particular made the subject of certain enactments involving disgrace, (Deut. xxv. 5-10,) while, no doubt, the direktion of any part of such duties as usage sanctioned, apart entirely from the superadded authority of the law, must have been viewed with disfavour. Anyhow, this was an institution which held a high place in the Israelitish community.

Nor was the office of Goel itself one of a voluntary nature, or originating in any stipulations between parties, or in overtures of friendship on the part of the more powerful towards their vassals or dependents, or, in general, to the weaker and less privileged orders in the State, as in the Roman connexion of patron and client, but was entirely based on the ties of consanguinity. It was this relation alone that imposed the obligation and invested the Goel with the privileges which belonged to his office. Thus Lev. xxv. 48, 49, after mentioning that the right of redemption (גֹּאֵל) shall belong to the Israelite who may have sold himself to a stranger, adds, "one of his brethren may redeem him," וְאֶחָד מֵאֶחָיו, discharge the office of Goel towards him; and then goes on to state that this may be done by "his uncle, or his uncle's son, or any that is nigh of kin unto him of his family." Indeed, the term Goel came thus to signify "a near kinsman,"¹ and is frequently so rendered in the English version, as in Num. v. 8; Lev. xx. 25. Thus also Ruth ii. 20: "The man is near of kin unto us, (קָרוֹב לָנוּ) one of our next kinsmen," קִנְיָנוּ. See also chap. iii. 12, iv. 4. So also in 1 Kings xvi. 11, אֶלְיָם, LXX., σὺγγενεῖς. It was this tie, as already remarked, that gave all his rights to the Hebrew Goel, and also imposed upon him his sacred duties.

The term Goel, then, though signifying "Redeemer," has yet, as must be seen, a more specific purport than anything that can be conveyed by that English expression, or its equivalents in Greek and Latin, or indeed in any other language, for the idea was peculiar to the Hebrew. The "kinsman-redeemer" would be the nearest rendering of the original

¹ Gesenius: Quandoquidem et redimendi jus et caedis vindicandæ officium proximi consanguinei erat, אֶלְיָם *consanguineum, propinquum* denotat. — Thesaurus, p. 254.

designation, but even this fails adequately to convey the deep significance of the Hebrew. A more exact definition would be, "a person related by blood, who, by right of consanguinity, lays claim to and redeems a person or thing, vindicates the rights involved, or avenges the wrong sustained."¹

It is easy to perceive how the institution of the Goel must have been productive of important benefits to the Israelitish community—how it acted as a conservating power in the State, by binding together various interests, and particularly by offering to the weaker and poorer members a protection against wrong, and the necessities which poverty frequently imposed upon them of parting with their patrimonial possessions or their personal liberties. An illustration of the working of the system is presented in the book of Ruth, which entirely turns on this subject. But it is in its spiritual aspect the matter chiefly deserves consideration. It was in this respect it was made the subject of so much solicitude in the law, and the very name assumed so frequently as a designation of the Divine Redeemer, and the relation which, as such, He sustained towards his people.

The fact that God was pleased to represent Himself in the character of Goel to his people, was suggestive of many important truths, besides the comforting assurance which it conveyed of their having not only a powerful, but prevalent Protector and Advocate. "Their Redeemer (Goel) is strong; the Lord of hosts is his name: he shall thoroughly plead their cause, that he may give rest to the land," &c., (Jer. l. 34). It also gave intimation of the personal ties by which they were connected with Him. This is expressed in various passages. Thus Isa. lxiii. 16, "Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, (Goel,) thy name

¹ Glass: Significat enim Ebræum vocabulum, proprie et accurate loquendo, ejusmodi assertorem et vindicem, liberatorem et redemptorem, qui jure consanguinitatis motus, causam propinqui sui interfecti asserit, ejusque sanguinem vindicat: vel qui bona a consanguineo proximo, donatione seu venditione, vel quoque modo devoluta, et contractu

quodam implicata, jure proprietatis pristinae ei rursus asserit et vindicat. Hæc vis illa vocis dictæ est: unde facile liquet, qualem Vet. Test. patres expectaverint exoptaverintque Messiam et Liberatorem.—Philologia Sacra, p. 236. Amst. 1694. See also Pfeiffer, Op. i. 269. Cramer, Theologia Israelis, i. 10.

from everlasting." This acknowledgment of the Church with regard to its origin or relation to Jehovah, who is and always has been its Goel, and who has borne that name from everlasting, is exceedingly important, and shows how this truth was viewed in the time of Isaiah ; but at present it is necessary to go back to an earlier period to trace the development of the idea.

How far Jacob, who, as remarked, was the first of whom mention is made as giving expression to the term Goel, understood its import, cannot be determined with certainty. It is unquestionable that the relation to be sustained by the promised Redeemer to the human race, and to the seed of Abraham in particular, was fully recognised in the time of Jacob. He had been clearly set forth as the Seed of the woman, and the Seed of Abraham, while in the prophetic language of Jacob himself, which closely followed the incident which is the subject of consideration, He is presented as Shiloh, who should come forth of the tribe of Judah. The humanity of the Redeemer at that time, or long subsequently, was not a subject of doubt. To a certain extent, also, the relation which as Jehovah he sustained to the Supreme God, the Creator, was recognised. But there is every reason to suppose that it was the Exodus, with its various antecedents and results, and then the enactments respecting the prerogatives, the rights and duties of the Goel, or kinsman-redeemer, that first set forth more fully the import of this great truth as respects the relation of the Redeemer both to God and to Israel, the character and extent of the work assigned to and undertaken by the Redeemer, and also the conditions on which the work should be accomplished.

With regard to the manner or the terms of redemption indicated by the functions of the Goel as prescribed in the law, it is to be observed, that with respect both to the person and property, the Goel was required to render satisfaction, or to pay down the price of that whereof he wished to recover possession. His office gave him a right which could not be legally resisted, to interpose in behalf of his kinsman ; but to effect his purpose, the full estimated price must be paid down. There must be no recourse to force or violence, though it was otherwise when the Goel appeared in his character of

avenger. The price of redemption was an essential element in the matter, whether the idea was expressed by the term **פְּדוּת**, or the more usual word, **פְּדָה**, applied to the various redemptions prescribed in the Mosaic law; as, for instance, that of the Israelitish first-born, and also of the firstlings of such animals as could not be sacrificed to the Lord (Num. xviii. 15-17; Ex. xiii. 13; xxxiv. 20). In all these cases reference is made expressly, or by implication, to a price paid, variously written **פְּדוּיִים**, **פְּדִיּוֹם**, or **פְּדָה**, LXX. *λῆστρον*¹ (Num. iii. 46; Ex. xxi. 30), "the price of redemption." That the idea of price entered into the redemption effected in the Exodus, and which was the foundation of the various redemptions required in the law, as also the type of the higher redemption of the Gospel, is declared in Ex. xv. 16, where the liberated Israelites are described as the people which Jehovah "purchased," (**עַמִּי קָנִיתָ**). This is further shown in Isa. xliii. 1. 3: "But now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not, for I have redeemed thee (**פָּדָאתִיךָ**), I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine . . . For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom (**פְּדִיָּתִי**), Ethiopia and Seba for thee." The redemption of which the Israelitish people were made partakers was secured by giving up other nations in their stead; and in particular, it was by the sacrifice of Egypt that the safety of God's people was maintained. The idea expressed by **כַּפֵּר**, (from **כָּפַר**, to cover, to cover sin), has been already shown² to have reference to a vicarious compensation, so that it here intimates that the Egyptians had been given up to destruction instead of, and in order to the redemption of the Israelites.

The author of the redemption from Egypt was in the most express terms shown to be no other than Jehovah; and there was also some intimation of the proper character and condition of redemption as such. This latter particular, however, was further illustrated by the various redemptions which, as already adverted to, were required by the law. But what served most impressively to keep before the mind of the Is-

¹ On the use of this term in the New Testament, see Pye Smith, *Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ*, pp. 196-198.

² See above, vol. ii. p. 176.

raelites the act which constituted them into a nation was its annual memorial in the feast of the Passover. Other truths connected with this subject were constantly presented by the institution of the Goel; and how it must have prepared for the advent of the proper Redeemer is evident, from the many allusions in the prophets, and more especially from the later Jewish distinction respecting the first and last Goel,—the first Moses, and the last the Messiah.¹

The intimations thus variously made respecting the nature of the work assigned to the deliverer and avenger of fallen man, and also with respect to his person and offices, particularly in his relation of Goel to the lost family of Adam, were gradually preparing a way for the announcements of the New Testament on this subject; while they even now impart a new significance to these latter declarations. Thus: “When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons” (Gal. iv. 4, 5). And so again: “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage” (Heb. ii. 14, 15). As the avenger of blood, the New Testament Goel slays “the murderer from the beginning” (John viii. 44), and, in accordance with the other part of his office, He delivers the life-long subjects of bondage; and not only ransoms their persons, but also their alienated possessions, and so reinstates his brethren, for he is not ashamed to call them such (Heb. ii. 11), in all the blessings and immunities lost through sin (Col. i. 12-14; John xiv. 3).²

§ 2. *The Aaronic Priesthood—The Personal Call and Qualifications.*

The Israelites must, unquestionably, have been familiar with the idea of a priesthood, and the prerogatives therewith

¹ Cramer, *Theol. Israelis*, ii. 219. Knowledge of a promised Redeemer, p. Schoetgen, *Horae Ebraicae et Talmudicae*, ii. 30, 251. Lips. 1733. Blom-

field, *Dissert. upon the Traditional* See J. S. L., Oct. 1859, pp. 106-109.

² Pfeiffer, *Dubia Vex.*, Op. i. 104.

connected, anterior to the establishment of the Levitical system. This appears, irrespective of other evidence, from God's promise to them, if they proved obedient to his covenant: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests" (Ex. xix. 6); for without some acquaintance with what constituted the character and privileges of the sacerdotal order, this promise, it is evident, must have been unintelligible. Their residence in Egypt, where, even as early as the time of Joseph, the priestly caste held one of the highest positions in the state, afforded the Israelites ample opportunities of learning generally what were the prerogatives of these ministers of religion. There is even mention of Israelitish priests in the transactions preparatory to the promulgation of the Sinaitic law (Ex. xix. 22), but without reference to any functions of a priestly character which they discharged. That the Israelites, if they ever practised sacrifice in Egypt, had discontinued it during the latter part of their sojourn, is evident from Ex. viii. 26, where such an act is represented as so opposed to certain Egyptian views, that it would be attended with disastrous consequences. It is probable, however, that having in view at the Exodus to offer sacrifices, they may have set apart some of their number for the performance of these rites. Or it may be, that the priests spoken of on this occasion were the elders, heads of tribes and families, who, according to patriarchal usage, offered sacrifices for their several households, as occasion required, and who still retained their designation, although their proper functions may have been in abeyance.

However this may be, with the institution of the Aaronic priesthood an entirely new system was introduced, or more strictly, the older practice received an important development and application. The various restrictions with regard to sacrifice, which originated with the law, have been elsewhere considered; as its limitation to one specific place, and to an official agency or priesthood, duly called and consecrated for that purpose. It is only the call, and the qualifications of such as were thus appointed to minister to the Lord, that form the subject for consideration at present.

Moses, whom the people besought to act as mediator for them in transacting with God,—a request which met the Divine approval,—combined in his own person all the media-

torial functions, prophetic as well as priestly. The former were based more especially on the ground of the arrangement adverted to, and the latter originated from the place which he occupied as the head of the community, just as Melchizedek discharged the offices of priest and king, as was common in the early ages of the world. The union of the priestly and prophetic functions in Moses was, however, only provisional. The former were transferred to Aaron, and made hereditary in his family. On the consecration of Aaron and his sons to their office by Moses, the sacerdotal acts of the latter terminated;¹ while, however, the prophetic functions were continued with him in all their integrity.

The selection of a whole tribe, as the Levites, for the service of the sanctuary, and of a family of that tribe for the department of sacrifice, with the further separation of the head of that family, as High Priest, for the highest duties of the office, was an arrangement which, while it secured the due performance of the various acts of public worship, now exceedingly numerous and complex, was intended to exhibit more fully, and in action, the mediatorial relation which the whole Israelitish community sustained. So palpable, indeed, was the connexion between the office which Aaron and his sons were called to discharge, and the intimations which God had previously made to the people in general: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation;" that it was upon these very words that Korah relied when, setting up an equal claim, he opposed the priestly pre-eminence of Aaron: "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them" (Num. xvi. 3). The spirit, however, thus manifested showed how inadequate were the conceptions as yet entertained of the qualifications required in such as would draw near to God in the discharge of mediatorial functions; and there was accordingly a necessity for the correction of this ignorance, and checking the temerity to which it led. The judgment on Korah and his confederates, while it had respect to the maintenance of public order, must have conduced to more correct ideas respecting the priestly office and functions, as intimated by Moses when he summoned Korah and his party to present themselves before the Lord: "The Lord will show who are

¹ Witsius, *Miscel. Sacra*, p. 469. Carpzov, *Appar. Antiquitatum*, p. 69.

His, and who is holy ; and will cause him to come near unto Him : even him whom He hath chosen will He cause to come near unto Him" (Num. xvi. 5).

There is here a description of the conditions requisite in such as would exercise the office of the priesthood. They are God's peculiar property ; they must have a character of holiness, and special separation to and consecration for the work ; and all this must rest on the Divine election and call, from which alone flows the right of approaching God. The passage thus contains a notice of the origin, the qualifications, and the privileges of the priesthood.¹

1. The institution of the Levitical priesthood, and its limitation to the family of Aaron, did not rest on popular choice or any assumptions on their own part, but absolutely on the election of God. The same was also the case in respect to the supreme civil magistrate, first in the appointment of Moses himself, but not less with regard to the subsequent king, (Deut. xvii. 15). It was a principle, indeed, which pervaded the whole dispensation, so far as it bears on the various offices of the one Mediator. With respect to the priestly office and calling in particular, it is seen at once that, whether it regarded the Israelites at large in their general mediatorial character, or the family of Aaron specially invested with this office, the appointment rested entirely on the Divine choice, and no reason whatever is assigned for the Aaronites being preferred before any of the other Israelitish families. The principle of a Divine election had been amply illustrated in the history of the origin of the Israelites themselves, as also in various incidents of primeval times, but it received its fullest confirmation in the Israelitish constitution ; for not only were the supreme and permanent offices of the State conducted according to this principle ; but even the appointment to special and occasional services proceeded entirely from God, as the call of Bezaleel to the construction of the sanctuary, and the selection of the persons sent to spy out the land of Canaan. But in no part of the Old Testament economy was the principle more marked than in the appointment of

Aaron and his family to the priesthood.¹ How fully this truth was understood in relation to the priestly character of the Israelite individually, appears from the language of the Psalmist: "Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts," (Ps. lxx. 4). So evident was it in the case of Aaron, that the Apostle Paul assumes it as an indisputable point in his argument on the priesthood: "No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron," (Heb. v. 4).

2. A qualification indispensable for the office of the priesthood was holiness. The law expressly enjoined with respect to the priests as a body, "They shall be holy unto their God, and not profane the name of their God; for the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and the bread of their God, they do offer; therefore they shall be holy," (Lev. xxi. 6). The holiness of God was not only that which necessitated this holiness, (ver. 8,) but was also the pattern to which the holiness of his people, and particularly his priests, was required to conform. And hence the exhortation of St. Peter to Christians in reference to this requirement of the law: "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy," (1 Pet. i. 15, 16.) And further, because in his official capacity Aaron represented this characteristic, he was termed by way of distinction, "the saint of the Lord," (Ps. cvi. 16.)

The primary idea of holiness, according to the etymology of the term in Hebrew, is a separation from everything that is profane or common, impure or polluted, and a consecration to the Lord and his service.² Thus Lev. xx. 26, "Ye shall be holy unto me, for I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people, that ye should be mine." In order to exhibit this fully, under a system which represented spiritual truths by outward forms and acts, very specific directions were given respecting the bodily qualifications of the priests,

¹ Litton: "It is a general principle—symbolized in all religions, the Jewish among the rest, by the limitation of a priesthood to a certain caste, or tribe—that no one is a self-constituted priest, that the office is of Divine, not of

human appointment."—Mosaic Dispensation, Bampton Lect., p. 121. Lond. 1856.

² Witsius, *Œconomia Fœderum*, p. 336.

the mode of their consecration to office, and the restrictions imposed upon them with respect to whatever seemed incongruous with their special vocation.

Thus, with respect to bodily qualifications, no member of the family of Aaron who had a personal blemish was permitted to take any part in the services of the sanctuary. "He shall not go in unto the veil, nor come nigh unto the altar, because he hath a blemish; that he profane not my sanctuaries, for I the Lord do sanctify them," (Lev. xxi. 17-24.) Whatever might be the moral qualifications of the individual, the circumstance that he had some physical defect was an absolute bar to his exercising priestly functions. The bodily blemish, though it did not involve any moral quality, yet, under a symbolic system, indicated something incongruous with the perfection and harmony of character required in the servants of the Holy One. That there was in this an association of ideas for which there was a natural foundation in the human mind, and that it was not arbitrarily introduced into the Mosaic law, is proved from the fact, that the same had a place in all heathen systems of worship where comeliness of person was reckoned indispensable in the servants of the gods, or such as on solemn occasions were called to the performance of public religious rites.¹

The various rites of consecration by which those otherwise duly qualified for the priesthood were set apart to their office, and the costly and curious sacerdotal robes provided for them, further exhibited the nature of holiness. The consecration of Aaron and his sons occupied eight days, and embraced various rites and ceremonies, as the washing of their persons with water, clothing them with their appropriate robes, and anointing them in various ways. "Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which was upon the altar, and sprinkled it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments with him; and sanctified Aaron and his garments, and his sons, and his sons'

¹ See Le Clerc and Knobel on Lev. iv. 2; Plut. *Quest. Rom.*, 73; Plin. *H. N.*, vii. 29).—Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq. art. Sacerdos*, p. 997. Lond. 1856.

xxi. 16.—"Bodily defects rendered at Rome, as among all ancient nations, a person unfit for holding any priestly office, (Dionys. ii. 21; Seuec. *Contror.*

garments with him." After these and other rites had been duly performed, and the priests had been set apart by ordinances which symbolically expressed justification and sanctification, Aaron was directed to offer sacrifices for himself, and afterwards for the people whom he represented, (Lev. viii., ix.,) an arrangement indicating the elements of human weakness, (Heb. v. 3 ; vii. 27,) and the imperfection of the consecration just performed. The sacerdotal garments which had, according to Divine directions, been prepared for Aaron and his sons, (Ex. xxviii.,) were sprinkled with the sacrificial blood and the anointing oil equally with their persons. In these garments only could they minister, and on the conclusion of the service they must be laid aside and left within the precincts of the sanctuary. But so imperfect was the consecration itself, and so liable were the parties to contract defilement anew, that there was needed a constant repetition of ablutions, and a restriction, particularly in the case of the high priest on his intercourse with the world, and even with the members of his own family in particular circumstances. Thus the high priest was not permitted to defile himself by contact with the dead, even were it his father or his mother ; but to the other priests some indulgence was permitted in this respect with regard to near relatives, (Lev. xxi. 1-12). In contracting marriage, again, the high priest was limited to a virgin from among his own people, (ver. 14). These various restrictions pointed out the priests, and particularly the high priest, as persons specially separated to the service of God.

3. The peculiar privilege of the priests was the access to God which they enjoyed. This they possessed in virtue of their call, and the qualifications thereupon induced. Indeed, a common designation of the priests is, "those who draw near to Jehovah," (Lev. xxi. 17 ; Ezek. xlii. 13 ; xliv. 13) ; while the distinctive priestly act consisted in "bringing near" (קָרַב) the sacrifice, or other offering to Jehovah. The priest, in his mediatorial capacity, had special access to God on behalf of those whom he represented, or for whom he was ordained. The Aaronic high priest represented the whole Israelitish community. This appears from the fact that he bore the names of all the tribes upon his breast and his shoulders, when he appeared before God ; this arrangement

importing that he acted on their behalf, and appeared for them. In like manner it is said of the heavenly High Priest, that "he appears in the presence of God for us," (Heb. ix. 24). Further, it was owing to the representative character which he thus sustained, that the high priest's sin was charged also to the people. Thus, in Lev. iv. 3, "If the priest that is anointed sin to the trespass or guilt of the people,"¹ and not, as in the English version, "according to the sin of the people." It is here intimated that when he sinned the people sinned; and therefore the sacrifice in such a case was of the same character as the public sacrifices which were offered for the whole community.

But though, as compared with the people for whom they acted, the priests had special access to God, yet even they, in order to mark the imperfection of their qualifications, and of the system under which they were constituted, must stand afar from the Divine presence. Only one of their number having a more complete consecration was allowed to enter the innermost sanctuary, and not even he at all times, but only on stated occasions, and with much ceremony; "the Holy Ghost thus signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing," (Heb. ix. 8). This, and various other truths connected with the Tabernacle service, and the character of its Ministers, would, there can be little question, be correctly deduced by the more discerning Israelites, even when they had no other commentary upon the system which they saw in operation among them, than that contained in the Pentateuch, rudimentary, as in many particulars it undoubtedly was, but continually added to, and so made more explicit, by every succeeding revelation.

To the believer under the Gospel the whole doctrine of the priesthood is put in a clear and impressive light. In the qualifications requisite for the occupants of the priestly office, he sees very marked references to Him who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," and as such was a High priest that "became us," was necessary for and suitable²

¹ Bush, Notes on Leviticus, p. 42.

² Pye Smith, Sac. and Priesthood of Christ, p. 85.

to sinners,—estranged from and guilty before God ; and also to His call to the work, and to the representative character which He sustained in it. Much of this may have been also apparent to the Old Testament believers who lived in the times of the later prophets, when the priesthood and atonement of the Messiah was presented so prominently by the disclosures of Isaiah and others. The question, however, at present is, are there intimations in the Pentateuch itself of the priestly office of the Redeemer, which serve to connect it with the Aaronic priesthood ?

There are some who, while admitting that there are references in the Pentateuch to the regal and prophetic offices of the Redeemer, deny that it contains any allusions to His priestly office. Such a limitation, however, is not warranted by the facts of the case. It may be admitted that the priestly office is not so explicitly referred to as the others. For this a sufficient reason may be found in the consideration, that it was undesirable, on the first institution of the Aaronic priesthood, to give express intimations of its shadowy and transitory character beyond the impressions naturally made on the mind by the inadequacy of its services and sacrifices to take away guilt. So far, indeed, from there being direct notices of the cessation or superseding of the Aaronic priesthood, it was expressly confirmed to Phineas, the grandson of Aaron, and to his seed, as “the covenant of an everlasting priesthood” (Num. xxv. 13 ; comp. Deut. xviii. 5). Nevertheless, the system, of which it formed a part, contained various elements of a transitory nature, which must have led to the correct interpretation of such promises as these. Accordingly, the general character of the Aaronic priesthood, as deduced from that of the general system, rendered unnecessary direct intimations of the priestly office of the Redeemer.

References with regard to this point, however, are not wanting ; and if less explicit than those which relate to the other offices, they are at least more numerous. There are first intimations of the general mediatorial character of the Redeemer. In the very first promise he was set forth as man’s representative and avenger. The mediatorial relation sustained by Shem, and afterwards by the seed of Abraham, even collectively, explained by their constituting a “kingdom of priests,”

and other arrangements, such as the institution of the *Goel*, must have made the idea of mediation, the most important element in the priestly office, familiar to the ancient Israelites, and thus facilitated, if they did not necessitate, its application to the Redeemer, already variously set forth as to his person, character, and undertaking. If, in the Destroyer of the serpent, the Ruler of his people, and the Conqueror of his enemies (Gen. iii. 15 ; xlix. 10 ; Num. xxiv. 17), the Redeemer from sin and evil, or the Prophet like Moses, or in these designations collectively, the Israelites could discern generally the part to be sustained by Him to whom reference was thus made, there would be little difficulty in detecting some indication to the same effect in the prescriptions as to the call, character, and other qualifications of those specially invested with priestly functions,—the most important in the scheme of reconciliation of any of the Israelitish institutions.

With the preparations thus abundantly furnished, a very simple hint would suffice to complete the application ; and more than one remark is contained in the Pentateuch bearing on this subject. Viewed alone and in themselves, they might be deemed doubtful ; but taken in connexion with the other features of the case, and considering, moreover, as above remarked, that it was not desirable, at the very commencement of the Levitical system, to raise doubts as to the Aaronic priesthood, they will be found of considerable importance for the present inquiry.

Something of this kind may be detected in the law which enjoined that the skin of the sacrificial victim became the property of the officiating priest : “ And the priest that offereth any man’s burnt-offering, even the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he hath offered” (Lev. vii. 8). This might seem to be nothing more than a notice of the perquisites which pertained to the priest, more especially as the context includes other matters of that description ; as that the priests should partake of the trespass-offerings, and the various meat-offerings (ver. 6, 9, 10). But further consideration shows that, even in these matters, the reference is not so much to the perquisites of the priests as to the disposal of those specified parts of the sacrifice, that being an essential element in the due performance of the sacrificial

rites. The proper specification of the priestly dues is contained in ver. 30-34; (comp. Deut. xviii. 3-5); it is therefore obviously with another intent the matter is referred to here. That the appropriation in particular of the skin of the victim to the officiating priest had respect to some higher object, is rendered probable by the fact that it formed a feature of other sacrificial systems, particularly that of the Greeks.¹

The truth represented by this Levitical ordinance has evidently some connexion with the incident in primeval history whereby clothing was provided for man's nakedness after the fall (Gen. iii. 21). The preparation of the coats of skin, as well as the investiture of the naked pair, is ascribed to the Lord God—Jehovah Elohim, who, as elsewhere shown, appears here in his character of Redeemer. He it was who, recognising the wants of the transgressors, directly provided for their necessities; the coats of skin were made immediately by Himself.² It is, therefore, probable that He officiated as priest at the sacrifice which provided the materials for this clothing, and that it was in that capacity He so appropriated the skins of the victims. If so, this connexion of the first sacrifice, and the rights of property thence accruing, with the promised Deliverer of the human race, when viewed in the light of that law which secured a similar right to the Levitical priest, must have indicated the relation which the Messianic priesthood sustained to that of Aaron.

The next particular bearing on the priesthood of the Redeemer is the remarkable appearance of Melchizedek in the history, and which, in conjunction with a reference to the same personage in Ps. cx. 4, is viewed in Heb. vii. as representing much that was typical of the person and priesthood of Christ. In considering the incident in Gen. xiv. 18-20, it may be observed that there was nothing peculiar in the fact that Melchizedek combined in his own person the regal and priestly offices—for such a combination was common in early times.³ Nor, viewed in itself, was there

¹ See Knobel, *Die BB.*, Exod. u. Lev. p. 406.

² See above, vol. ii., pp. 129, 130.

³ Comp. Virgil, *Aeneid.* iii. 80. "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum

Phœbique sacerdos;" on which Servius remarks, "Sane majorum hæc erat consuetudo, ut rex etiam esset sacerdos vel pontifex, unde hodieque Imperatores pontifices dicimus."

anything peculiar in the name of the King-priest. For if, as is generally believed, his seat Salem is to be identified with Jerusalem, there is a strong presumption that Melchizedek, or something nearly equivalent, was the common name of its kings, just as Pharaoh was the designation of the kings of Egypt, and Abimelech that of the Philistine rulers, inasmuch as the name of the king of Jerusalem in the time of Joshua was Adonizedek, that is, Lord of righteousness (Josh. x. 1-3), not differing greatly from Melchizedek, King of righteousness.

These particulars, however, assume an importance when once the typical place of Melchizedek has been determined. For settling this there is the noticeable designation, "priest of the most high God," given him by the historian—a character which Abraham had acknowledged by the significant act of his awarding to him tithes of all the spoil recovered from the enemy.

Another circumstance in Melchizedek's intercourse with Abraham, who himself possessed a typical character, and any transactions with whom must, in consequence, have been significant in that respect, was the blessing which he pronounced on the patriarch: "And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand." This blessing, with its recognition of Abraham's relation to God, was in itself eminently significant, but much more when taken in connexion with the promises made to those who thus acted towards him who had been really endowed with the Divine blessing. "I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee" (Gen. xii. 2, 3). In this way Melchizedek was invested with a special blessing; he henceforth stood in an intimate relation to the seed of blessing, and his fortunes were indissolubly connected with those of the Church. So also his priesthood, with the other incidents recorded of him; and even, negatively, the very scantiness of the information thus conveyed, his abrupt and unexpected appearance on the historic scene, and his equally abrupt withdrawal, his name,

and that of his kingdom, but, more particularly, the combination of the regal and sacerdotal offices, obtained at once an importance which promised further elucidation from the evolution of the Divine purposes. Thus Auberlen:¹ "We have before us one whom the Old Testament names 'priest,' to whom the name is first applied, who does not belong to the stock of Levi, upon whose origin, in fact, the Scripture lays so little stress as not to give it at all. But with priests under the law, so important was the matter of descent, that under Nehemiah, such as found not their register, were debarred from the priesthood. The Old Testament itself thus recognises a priesthood before and superior to the law, not grounded in fleshly ordinance, but resting on the free person and on his spiritual belief."

Such was the foundation laid in the Pentateuch for the announcement made by the Psalmist on this subject regarding the Messiah: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." That the Psalm which contains this statement is a composition of David, and therefore marks the very next stage of the development of the idea contained in the Pentateuch, is attested not only by its title but also by Christ himself (Matt. xxii. 43-45). Without adverting to the testimonies which the Psalmist here gives respecting the person and the mediatorial offices of Christ, particularly as to his being constituted a priest after the order of Melchizedek, and not after that of Aaron, which, under the Davidic and the immediately succeeding reign, was invested with greater splendour than at any other period of Israelitish history, it is enough to notice the intimation thus given of the abrogation of the Levitical priesthood (Heb. vii. 15) and the combination in this future priest of the twofold office of Melchizedek. To this latter particular a subsequent prophet alludes, "He shall be a priest upon his throne" (Zech. vi. 13)—a privilege, according to the New Testament, to be enjoyed also by his people (1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. i. 6).

Before quitting this subject, some notice must also be taken of the duration assigned to Christ's priesthood—

¹ The Eternal Life and Priesthood of Melchizedek; Bib. Sacra, xvi. 548. July 1859.

“thou art a priest for ever,” more especially as the same was predicated of the priesthood of Aaron.

The promise made to Phineas of an everlasting priesthood was a subject which, considering the intimations of a contrary import expressed or implied in other ordinances and arrangements of the system of which the priesthood formed a part so closely connected that, as the apostle concluded, a change of the priesthood necessarily implied a change in the law (Heb. vii. 12), must have given rise to various questionings in the Israelitish mind. In the time of David, the matter had evidently assumed a definite form; the everlasting priesthood of Aaron was seen passing over into the eternal priesthood of One who was constituted after the much older order of Melchizedek. This was not so much an abrogation of the Aaronic priesthood, to which not by a mere figure or exaggeration of terms perpetuity was ascribed, as the realisation of it—carrying out its various purposes, and raising it from outward and ceremonial relations to spiritual and eternal verities. The very promise, then, of perpetuity for the priesthood, when all the other parts of the system bore manifest indications of having only a temporary or provisional character, was itself a prediction of the rise of a priest in whom it would obtain a fulfilment which it was not possible to have realised in any of the priests descended from Aaron, whatever their qualifications and the extent of their consecration.

§ 3. *The Sacrificial Victims—their Necessary Qualities.*

The laws respecting the qualities of the animals allowed in sacrifice were very explicit. Not only must they be selected from the class accounted clean; the choice was further restricted to the domestic animals of the flock and the herd; or if birds, to turtle-doves or pigeons; to creatures which stood in the nearest relation to man and over which he exercised the right of property. In one case, as in the purifying of the leper (Lev. xiv. 4-7), it would seem that *sparrows* צִפְּרִי (comp. Ps. lxxxiv. 4; Prov. xxvi. 2) were used; but it may be that the term is used here as frequently in its generic sense of birds in general (Deut. iv. 17; xiv. 11). Besides, the purpose to

which they were applied in the present instance was not properly sacrificial, and the very idea implied by allowing the living bird to go at large may have required that it should not be of the domestic kind, which, when liberated, would at once seek its home.

In addition, however, to these general qualities, it was specially required that the actual victims should be free from every kind of blemish or disease (Lev. xxii. 17-25; Deut. xv. 21; xvii. 1). So important was the law on this subject, and so much did it concern all parties, that Moses was directed to make it known not only to the priests but to all the people; and that in no circumstances, whatever might be the nature of the sacrifice, and by whomsoever presented (כֹּל אִישׁ, every man, without exception¹ Lev. xxii. 18), whether by a native or a stranger in Israel, should any animal, having any of the blemishes enumerated, be offered in sacrifice to the Lord. It was repeatedly stated (ver. 20, 23, 25) that any such offering would not be accepted, and that to be accepted (לְקַבֵּץ) the animal must be perfect. It may seem at first sight that, with regard to a free-will offering, this rule was relaxed (ver. 23), but closer inquiry will show that such was not really the case. For in ver. 31 the rule is expressly applied to the free-will offering (קָרְבַּן), which must be in complete opposition to ver. 23, if the term קָרְבַּן have here the same import. The regulations in the two cases refer to entirely different matters; in the latter instance the reference is only to voluntary gifts in general dedicated to the service of the Lord (Ex. xxxv. 29), and of which the voluntary sacrifice was only a species (Lev. vii. 16).²

Not only did the rule which required completeness of parts and freedom from blemish apply to victims in respect to which the offerer had a power of selection; it extended equally to cases where selection was excluded naturally or by the stipulation of the law, as in the firstlings and the tithes, which were also claimed by the Lord (Lev. xxvii. 32, 33). The male firstlings of unclean animals must be redeemed, but those of the clean were given up directly to the Lord, so that they

¹ Gesenius, Heb. Gram., § 108. 4.

² Hottinger, De Victimarum Integritate, p. 533.

could not be applied to labour or purposes of profit, but must be used for food. It was only, however, when free from all blemish that they were sacrificed and eaten by the owner and his household at the sanctuary (Deut. xv. 19-22).

And then the particularity with which the several blemishes are specified deserves attention. First, it is prescribed generally that the animal must be **תמים**, perfect,—an expression, in a moral sense, used of God and His actions, to indicate absolute freedom from all imperfection (Deut. xxxii. 4; Ps. xviii. 6); and then of men whose life is in conformity to the Divine law (Ps. xix. 8; Deut. xviii. 18). The term is here opposed to **מום**, (ver. 21), which denotes whatever affects the bodily appearance (2 Sam. xiv. 25), or mars the perfection of the parts, whether naturally, or by disease, or any other cause¹ (Deut. xvii. 1). Then follows an enumeration of what constituted blemishes: “Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or scurvy, or scabbed” (Lev. xxii. 22). And again: “Ye shall not offer unto the Lord that which is bruised or crushed, or broken, or cut; neither,” as it is in the Eng. version, which has the support of the LXX., Vulg., and Onkelos, and is borne out by the context, “shall ye make [any offering] thereof in your land.”² The expression, “your land,” is emphatic; the holy land is contrasted with the heathen lands around, implying that whatever may be the practice in heathen offerings, every thing corrupt must be excluded from the sacrifices of Jehovah (ver. 25). Other defects are specified in Deut. xv. 21, as “lameness,” and in Mal. i. 8, 13, “sickness;” but these are rather expository of the law than proper additions to it.

The principle which lies at the foundation of these prescriptions respecting the nature and qualities of the sacrificial victims is the same as that met with already in the characteristics declared indispensable in the ministers of sacrifice. And there is this in common to the two cases, that the requisite characteristics are of an outward and physical nature, while it is further to be noted, that similar qualities were also required in heathenism, as well as in the Israelitish worship. This has been already noticed in the case of the priests, but it was the same also with respect to the victims which were reckoned

¹ Hottinger, *De Victim. Integ.*, pp. 515, 516.

² Knobel, *Die BB. Exod. u. Levit.*, p. 527.

acceptable to the gods.¹ Heathenism, however, did not pay that marked attention to the fundamental distinction of clean and unclean animals, so carefully marked in the Levitical system, and various animals were offered in sacrifice to heathen deities, which an Israelite would regard with abhorrence. This is to be accounted for from the various characters which heathenism recognised in its numerous gods;² but more especially from the fact that in none of these systems was the ethical element presented so clearly as in the Israelitish religion. Still there was a discrimination required in regard to the particular animals to be offered in every instance, and such as were selected were so, because considered the best of their kind. In some cases they must be such as had never been subjected to the yoke,³ or applied to any common use,—a circumstance which presents a parallel with the Mosaic law, forbidding the firstling devoted to the Lord to be used in the yoke, a matter to be also attended to in the case of the red heifer (Num. xix. 2), and that which forbade the shearing of the firstlings of the flock (Deut. xv. 19).

This practice, so carefully prescribed in the law, both as respects the priests and the victims, it is thus seen must have had, as already remarked, some foundation in nature, and was no arbitrary appointment. It originated in what the human mind viewed as suitable in the circumstances, and of this feeling the Divine Lawgiver took advantage, as in other matters, to inculcate, under sensible forms, moral and spiritual instruction. The primary idea embodied in these regulations, whether the dictates of the natural conscience, as in heathenism, or the ordinances of revelation, as in Mosaism, was the respect due to the character of God. As the Supreme Ruler, He was entitled to the best service and such gifts as best comported with His sovereign state. As earthly sovereigns desired comeliness of person in their attendants (Dan. i. 4), it would be incongruity should it be otherwise with those who waited on the heavenly King. In like manner, care must be taken

¹ Hottinger, *Die Victim. Integ.*, p. 543. *Outram, De Sacrificiis*, i. 9, § 3.

Art. *Sacrificium*, p. 990.

² "Each god had his favourite animals which he liked best as sacrifices."

³ Hottinger, *De Victim. Integ.*, p. 545.—Comp. *Virg. Georg.* iv. 540; *Æneid.* vi. 38.

—Smith's *Dic. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq.*,

as to the gifts appropriate to the King, and which would be an indication of the feeling of him who presented the gift. That this was the primary idea, appears from the terms in which the prophet Malachi charges his contemporaries for the neglect of these precepts: "And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts."¹ And again: "But cursed is the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing: for I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts, and my name is dreadful among the heathen" (Mal. i. 8-14).

The physical and sensible thus connected with the service of God, or of the gods, was, it must be apparent, only an expression of the moral and the spiritual, or the holiness required in the ministers of the sanctuary.² No doubt, as the corruptions of heathenism increased, and men's minds became darkened with respect to the Divine perfections, the sensible may have come to be the chief element, though the more discerning of the heathen themselves felt that the moral quality was the great object to be attended to in the service of the gods. In this respect the Israelitish worshipper, from the revelation of the spiritual character and perfections of the Godhead on which the law was founded, had an incomparable advantage over the most enlightened of the heathen world. However slow of apprehension, he could not but know, from the very first principle of that revelation, that "the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." And if on this principle the Lord refused Eliab, the son of Jesse, with whose countenance and stature the prophet Samuel was so pleased, when God sent him to anoint one of the sons of that Bethlehemite to be king over Israel, that he at once concluded, surely the Lord's anointed was before him, (1 Sam. xvi. 6, 7); and if God thus acted with respect to men, could it be supposed that He was otherwise than indifferent to the properties of irrational creatures considered in themselves? From

¹ Hottinger, *De Victim.*, Integ. p. 542.

² Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. 57. Fairbairn, *Typology*, ii. 263.

the very first, there was sufficient intimation that "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" and that, accordingly, those prescriptions with respect to outward and formal relations were intended to inculcate in the most forcible manner, by a constant appeal to the senses, the spiritual character and holiness requisite both in the servants and the service of the spiritual and Holy One.

The idea of a priest implied sacrificial duties. If the Redeemer was represented as exercising this office, some intimation must also have been given of the sacrifice which he was expected to present to God. "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer," (Heb. viii. 3). This is an indisputable truth flowing from the very nature of priestly functions. It might also be concluded that the sacrifice would be worthy of the occasion, or of the reconciliation to be effected, and also of the officiating priest; and as He was to be constituted after another than the Aaronic order, it might be reasonably inferred that his sacrifice should be other than mere animal oblations. Considerations of this kind must have been continually presenting themselves to the more reflecting Israelite, and if they did not originate correct conceptions on the subject, they were at least preparing the mind for the successive revelations of the Divine purposes. Leaving this, however, notice must be taken of the earlier intimations which, developed in the prophetic writings, prepared the Jew first, in the person of the Baptist, to welcome Christ as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, (John i. 29,) and more particularly to prepare the apostolic teachers of the gospel and their hearers for the announcement, not only that Christ "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," but also, in the very terms of the ancient law of sacrifice, that "he offered himself without spot (*ἄμωμος*, the very term by which the LXX. render *אִמְּוֹם* in Lev. xxii. 19, 21) unto God," (Heb. ix. 14).

The earliest testimony of the sacrifice of the Redeemer himself in connexion with his undertaking, occurs in the very first announcement of his coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, (Gen. iii. 15). Of course the truth there stated is con-

veyed in very obscure and general terms, as comported with the place of that announcement in the scheme of revelation, and taken by itself it would be difficult to deduce more from it than that, in some unexplained manner, the Conqueror of the serpent would be subjected to suffering in accomplishing the work assigned to him. But while this may have been all that was fairly deducible from the statement, if viewed apart from the sacrificial system, which there is reason to believe was then instituted, and was certainly in operation soon after, and which indicated the necessity of the substitution of the innocent in room of the guilty, in order to render satisfaction to the claims of justice through the shedding of blood, there is no good ground for considering it so very obscure when taken in its proper connexion, and in the light shed on it by the fire of the altar, as it consumed the first burnt-offering.

For the information which the sacrificial ordinances, in general, furnished on the doctrine of substitution, and on the character of the substitute adequate to the accomplishment of the purposes so imperfectly fulfilled by the animal oblations, it is enough to refer to the observations in an earlier part of this work on the plan of redemption, as disclosed in the institution of sacrifice. There is, however, one important subject of a sacrificial character, and yet differing in various particulars from the ordinary sacrifices, which deserves notice in this place as having a special bearing on the present subject. This is the Passover,¹ an older institution than the priesthood, and the ordinances respecting the Levitical sacrifices, and which presents some peculiarities distinguishing it from the proper institutions of the law, and more suggestive of particular points of doctrine.

The first feature observable in the Passover is the circumstance of its having a closer and more direct connexion with redemption, as represented in the deliverance not only from the bondage of Egypt, but primarily in the safety it afforded from the destroying Angel, than any of the subsequent institutions of the law. It was, properly, the great ordinance of

¹The sacrificial character of this ordinance has been denied, but on insufficient grounds. See Carpzov, *Ap- par. Antiq.*, pp. 396, 397. Magee, *Atonement*, i. 192-199.

redemption which was itself not obscurely shadowed forth in that striking interposition of God in behalf of his people, by which they were constituted a free community, and the peculiar property of the Lord their Redeemer. The series of judgments which preceded the death of the first-born of the Egyptians, was only a preparation for this last penal infliction. The typical character of this judgment appears from the fact of its being directed against the first-born, including the irrational creation as well as responsible beings, and that in consideration of the first-born of the Israelites and the firstlings of their cattle having been spared, these became the property of the Lord; while the preservation of the Israelites at all was due to the distinction made between them and the Egyptians through the sprinkling, by Divine appointment, of their houses with the blood of the Paschal lamb. Throughout the preceding visitations, Jehovah himself drew a line of demarcation between the Egyptians and the sojourners in Goshen, so that His people suffered no personal annoyance or loss of property by the plagues which desolated Egypt. Even the darkness which shrouded the land for three days was so bounded by Him who in the beginning "divided the light from the darkness," that "the Israelites had light in their dwellings." This incident itself had a deep significance in connexion with the redemption through blood which ensued, and to which there is probably reference in Col. i. 12, 15: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature." In this last judgment, however, a special demarcation was made by blood. It cannot be supposed that this was from any natural necessity, as that the destroying angel needed to be thus guided, seeing that the elements had, so to speak, shown sufficient discrimination, through the control under which they were kept, not to molest any Israelite, and when at this very time the brute creation manifested similar obedience. "Against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast; that

ye may know how that the Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel," (Ex. xi. 7).

The directions with respect to the Paschal lamb, and the sprinkling of its blood on this occasion, when the long-continued controversy between the God of Israel and the powers of heathenism, represented by Pharaoh, was hastening to its crisis, certainly indicated some important purpose. They must have been so regarded by the Israelites themselves when watching, it may be supposed, with the utmost intensity for light to direct them in their perplexities. Whatever may have been the precise views they may have entertained of this particular ordinance, its connexion with their redemption was a point on which they could have had no doubt.

Another feature in the ordinance of the Paschal lamb was its efficacy for the end to which it had been appointed. It was a service connected with a special event, and so completely did it answer its purpose, that it could not, and indeed needed not, be repeated. The Israelites not only saw its general relation to redemption, but also its causal connexion with the redemption of which they themselves were the subjects. It is true the Passover was made a standing ordinance of the Israelitish economy, but its subsequent celebrations had an entirely different object from that of its original appointment. The original purpose had been accomplished; the subsequent celebrations were of a commemorative character, and stood in the same relation to the primal act, as the observance under the Gospel of the Lord's Supper does to his death. No doubt the yearly recurring Passover, while commemorating the past redemption, was also prospective of the greater redemption reserved for the future, and its capacity in this respect depended much on the extent to which, as a commemorative rite, it succeeded in keeping before the mind its original connexion with a real, though temporal deliverance. It is the same also with the commemorative ordinance of the New Testament, which, no less than the older rite, has also a prospective aspect. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come," (1 Cor. xi. 26).

But not only was this ordinance more directly connected with redemption than any of the sacrifices of the law, it also

allowed a fuller expression to truths feebly or not at all exhibited in some of the other ordinances. Keeping to the original appointment, for subsequently modifications were introduced in order to bring it into harmony with the Levitical economy and some of its purposes subordinate to the great idea of redemption, it is observable that the Israelites were personally brought into closer contact with all that concerned the preparation and disposal of the victim than in any other sacrifice.¹ The head of every household was charged with the whole concern of this matter: he had to kill the lamb, to sprinkle the blood upon the lintel and door-posts of his house, and to complete all the other arrangements. (Ex. xii). A regular priesthood had at that time no existence, and the very absence of such allowed the idea of representation and substitution to be more prominently brought out. That this arrangement was not owing to the absence of a priesthood appears from the fact that even under the Levitical system the original practice was left very much untouched. The special priestly functions in connexion with the Passover seem to be referable to the sacrifices offered in conjunction with this feast, rather than to the Paschal lamb itself. However this may be, the chief duties in this case were committed to the members of the community themselves.

And then the rites of this ordinance differed from the usual provisions of the law. The lamb must be set apart for a season in preparation for the purpose contemplated. It must be taken away from its pasture and the company of its kind in the flock. This separation would be the more striking in the circumstances of the people at the time when the direction was given. Events were following one another with the utmost celerity and of the greatest magnitude, demanding preparation to be made for the journey soon to commence. Why such specific directions as to the selection of the lamb on the tenth, and keeping it up till the fourteenth day of the month? One object, doubtless, was to show that the time of their deliverance was determined, was absolutely dependent on God, and what to Him appeared to be "the fulness of time." But, if this were all, it obviously could be expressed in a

¹ Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. 632.

much simpler form. There were, however, other reasons sufficiently apparent to the New Testament reader, and, if not so plain before the appearance of the Antitype, the matter must have been at least suggestive of the ideas exhibited under the Gospel dispensation.

Peculiar also were the directions that the lamb should be roasted, and not like those portions of the other sacrifices allotted to the priests or to the offerers, sodden,¹ and more particularly that a bone of it should not be broken—a feature so peculiar that it led the disciples of Christ to discern a strong analogy between the Paschal lamb in this respect and their crucified Master. (John xix. 36). Notwithstanding all these peculiarities, the rule which applied to all other sacrificial victims must also be observed here—the lamb must be without blemish. Accordingly, as St. Paul connected this ordinance with the sacrifice of the Gospel: “Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us,” so another apostle declared with reference to redemption, which, as just remarked, had a close relation to the Paschal lamb: “For as much as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.” (1 Pet. i. 18, 19).

These conclusions, though more explicit, as deduced by the writers of the New Testament from the announcements and the economy of the Old, are no other than those arrived at long before by the Old Testament writers themselves. Without attempting to follow the course of thought as it gradually expanded in the visions of Isaiah or succeeding prophets, as they described the promised Redeemer “brought as a lamb to the slaughter,” or making “his soul an offering for sin,” (Isa. liii. 7, 10), notice must be taken of an intimation on this subject belonging to an earlier period in the history of revelation. Thus, in a Davidic Psalm, “Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is writ-

¹ This is specially noticed in 2 Chron. xxxv. 13, “And they roasted the pass-over with fire *according to the ordinance*; but the other holy offerings sod they in

pots, and in caldrons, and divided them speedily among all the people.”—See Witsius, *Œcon. Fœd.*, pp. 545, 546.

ten of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." (Ps. xl. 6-8). This testimony, though considerably posterior to the Mosaic age, is so closely related to the Pentateuch, being in fact expressly founded on statements of that work—"the roll book"—that it may be viewed as an exposition of the Pentateuchal doctrine on this subject, and so without much impropriety, as the next more direct statement of the Pentateuch itself after the announcement of the substitution and sufferings of the "seed of the woman."

The insufficiency of the sacrifices offered according to the law—nay, more, their rejection by Jehovah as things which, in themselves, afforded Him no pleasure, had been already intimated by the prophet Samuel to Saul: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." (1 Sam. xv. 22). This declaration must have powerfully operated on the mind of David, divinely elected in the room of the rejected monarch; and it is important to notice this connexion¹ in order to see how the Spirit of God was in various ways preparing for the reception of those communications which He made from time to time. To secure for himself acceptable service, God made special provision however:—אָזְנַיִם פָּרַתָּ לִי "ears hast thou dug to (or for) me." This the older expositors² took to be a reference to Ex. xxi. 6, which required that the servant who wished to continue with his master should have his ear bored through in testimony of his giving himself to his master all the days of his life—a view rejected by most of the modern writers, because the term פָּרַתָּ signifies *to dig*, and not to bore through; and by Delitzsch,³ also on account of אָזְנַיִם, instead of אָזְנֶיךָ. But these variations may be due to the poetical language of the Psalm, while Delitzsch after the Targum, and Hofmann hold that כָּרַת here means to bore through. However this may be, it is universally conceded that the expression implies a capacity for obedience. But more remarkable is the rendering of the LXX., σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, "but a body hast thou prepared for me"—a rendering which Hengstenberg admits does

¹ Hofmann, Weiss, u. Erfül. i. 158.

² Commentar zum Briefe an die

³ Pfeiffer, Du. Vex. Op. i. 314, 315. Hebräer, p. 459.

not alter the thought, and which is adopted in Heb. x. 5. The connexion is, since God did not desire offerings but obedience, and since He had given a capacity to the speaker to render such, the latter proceeds—"Then I said: Lo, I come," $\text{וָּאָנֹכִי בָּא, LXX. ἤνω,}$ not I am come, as Ebrard¹ suggests, for the preterite is here dependent on the preceding preterite—"in the volume of the book it is written of me," בְּסֵפֶר עָלַי. Hengstenberg,² who renders this, "it is prescribed to me," in his zeal against what he terms "the exposition of the Messianic interpreters," refers to Josh. i. 7; 1 Kings ii. 3, which have no bearing whatever on this construction, the only thing parallel to which is in 2 Kings xxii. 13, but even there the testimony in favour of "prescribing" is not decisive; and "written concerning," as it is there understood by the LXX., is the more obvious and consistent sense in both the passages where it occurs.

It is unnecessary to advert to the application made of this passage in Heb. x. 5-9, further than to observe that it afforded a strong argument to the apostle from the Hebrew Scriptures themselves of the views early entertained of the insufficiency of the Levitical sacrifices. The proposition: "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin," (ver. 4), is here shown to have been one which must have often presented itself to the minds of the Old Testament worshippers. But what chiefly merits attention is the reference to the volume or roll-book,³ the Pentateuch as itself testifying to the sacrifice which God himself was preparing—the sacrifice not of bulls or of goats, but of a moral agent who could with the utmost truthfulness declare: "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart."

It, indeed, thus plainly appears how such Israelites as David, who were meditating on the law day and night, were by the Spirit's teaching raised above the mere letter to contemplate the spiritual truths which were enfolded therein. Other ordinances of occasional or continued appointment might be referred to as variously testifying to the person, and espe-

¹ Commentary on Hebrews, E. T., p. 306. roll-book is the Pentateuch, which, from the first, was written on parchment."

² Com. on the Psalms, E. T., ii. 72. See further

³ Hengstenberg: "The volume or above, vol. i., p. 247.

cially the priestly office, of the promised Redeemer, and which, from the commencement of sacrificial worship, or at least from the time of its being systematised under the law, gave pre- intimation of the future identity of the priest with the victim when sacrifice would reach its completion. Enough, however, has been adduced to show not only in general that Moses in the law wrote concerning the promised Redeemer (John v. 46), and that, from the very first, expectations were entertained of his coming, but also that He was presented as discharging the several offices which, as Mediator, He is known more fully from the New Testament to execute personally in the Gospel economy.

CHAPTER V.

A FURTHER END OF THE PENTATEUCH—THE TRAINING OF
A PEOPLE FOR BEING THE MEDIUM OF REDEMPTION.

CONCURRENT with the intimations given in the Pentateuch, of the plan of redemption and of the person of the Redeemer, which prepared for the realization of the Divine purposes regarding fallen man, there were operations of another kind in progress contributing to the same result. These consisted in setting apart, by special arrangements, a portion of mankind, the descendants of one man, in order to constitute them the channels of blessing to the rest of the race. Such was the peculiar vocation of the Israelitish people as the seed of Abraham ; and it is in this respect that their remarkable constitution and polity, which forms so large a portion of the Pentateuch, must be considered, if its character would be at all rightly estimated.

In contemplating the various ordinances and arrangements affecting the Israelitish community, and which imparted to the earliest of their Scriptures, as a revelation of Divine truth, its peculiar form, historical and legislative, notice must, in the first place, be taken of such matters as respected the separation of this people and their conservation in the world, or the means which secured that social and national organization by which they were peculiarly distinguished, and next, of the means employed for their training, moral and religious, for the service to which they had by Divine providence been set apart. A consideration of these particulars will serve to exhibit the chief features of the relation, political and religious, formed between God and Israel, first designated by Josephus¹ a Theocracy or reign of God, and which, as well in its political as in

¹ Contra Apionem, Lib. ii. 16.

its moral and religious aspects, contributed to the one great purpose of Divine revelation, though some of the arrangements had respect more directly to various subordinate ends, indispensable, however, to the perfection of the scheme.

SECT. I. THE SEPARATION OF ISRAEL ONE END OF THE THEOCRATIC CONSTITUTION.

Warburton, *Divine Legation*, B. v. §§ 1, 2, vol. ii., pp. 418-468.—Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, chap. ii., pp. 109-156.—Duncan, *the Law of Moses; its character and design*, Part ii., pp. 145-186. Edin. 1851.—Bennet, *Aliens in Israel: Biblioth. Sacra*, xiii., 564-574.

As the channels through which, according to the intimations made to Abraham, the Divine blessing was destined to flow, Israel's virtual separation from the world, commenced with the call of their ancestor, and his migration into the land promised to himself and to his seed, although their actual separation was not until many generations afterwards, on the establishment of the theocracy, through the ratification of the Sinaitic covenant. The interval, however, was not unproductive of several important results. On the contrary, it was occupied with a series of preparations which (notwithstanding what must have appeared at the time to be to some extent in opposition to certain parts of the promise, and productive of tantalizing, if not unnecessary, delays) clearly show the continued operation of the Divine purpose declared in the calling of Abraham. The period required, even for the partial development of the scheme, was, indeed, considerable; but then it served, among other objects, to allow of those remarkable concurrences of events which, although they may have at first greatly perplexed even the faithful (*Gen. xlii. 36*), yet now clearly demonstrate how God overruled them for His own purposes.

The separation of the seed of Abraham from the world, considered here chiefly in its external aspect, was effected by a twofold process, consisting of various providential interpositions and arrangements, and also a peculiar system of ordinances and institutions; the former chiefly preparatory to, but partly contemporaneous with, the other.

§ 1. *Providential Arrangements for the Separation of Israel.*

The Biblical history, as a revelation of God's purposes, and a record of His acts antecedent to the establishment of the Theocracy, directly prepared for that constitution. Every word of promise, and every act of providence, especially from the time of the Abrahamic covenant, may be seen converging to some arrangement of this kind. Even family feuds and jealousies, seasons of fruitfulness and of famine, with innumerable other incidents of the most varied character, which compose the tissue, so to speak, of the great web of Providence, all combined to further the end contemplated in the theocratic ordinances and institutions, so far at least as regarded the isolating of a people for being the depositaries of a Divine trust. A few only of the more important particulars, however, can be here noticed.

1. The call of Abraham, being the very foundation of the theocratic constitution, is the first particular which calls for remark.

This, from the direction which it took, involving the disruption of the strongest natural ties and associations (Gen. xii. 1), with the circumstance of the selection of the patriarch's seed in a certain line of descent, after the successive excisions of the collateral branches, constituted the strongest possible line of demarcation between the covenant people and the world. It did so in various respects, but especially in this, that it furnished a most powerful foundation for unity among themselves. Unity of descent, or a common parentage, is, indeed, the strongest national tie, as it secures unity of language, of ancestral traditions, and to a great extent also of religion itself, with various other matters which conduce to a common interest in what respects both the past and the future, and thus form the closest bonds of brotherhood. These considerations, powerful even in ordinary circumstances, and where the original family connexion is doubtful or obscure, must have exercised a special influence in the present case, seeing that the relations between Abraham and his Israelitish posterity were of the most definite and momentous kind. The patriarch was no mythical personage, whose doubtful existence and acts were shrouded in the mist of ages. On the contrary, his

course was most clear and distinguished. He occupied a marked place among his contemporaries ; and in point of time he was not so far removed from his posterity who left Egypt but that vivid traditions of his person and character must have survived amongst them. Add to this, that he was the divinely acknowledged representative of principles, marked by a line of light extending from Adam downwards, and was infested in blessings which were expressly destined for his posterity, and through them for the world at large ; and a conception may be formed of the influence thus exerted in separating externally even the most gross and carnal of his descendants from the surrounding nations, and forming them into an insulated community.

The call of Abraham, and the origin of the Israelitish community as connected therewith, involved, however, higher principles than the mere furnishing of a ground of national unity ; for, in reference to this very matter, God at a subsequent period thus admonished the Israelitish community : "Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you : for I called him alone, and blessed him, and increased him," (Isa. li. 2). The Israelites are here pointed to a striking evidence of Divine power and faithfulness exhibited in the origin and growth of their nation ; and this no doubt would not have escaped the notice of the faithful among them, but would greatly conduce to unite them more closely to their God, and to one another. Other important truths were also exhibited in this origin of the Israelitish national life, which, however, need not be adverted to, as at present it is more the external separation of this people from the world than their spiritual apprehensions, that forms the subject of consideration.

2. The sojourn in Egypt was the next great arrangement of a providential character which served for the separation of the Israelites from the nations of the earth.

While a foundation was laid, in the call of Abraham, for the severance of his posterity from the world, various counteracting influences were meanwhile at work ; and that the isolation of the patriarch and his immediate descendants was not thereby at once nullified, shows that it was a purpose for the effecting of which Divine wisdom and power were engaged. After the scheme had made some progress, when the unity so

essential, politically and morally, to its proper basis was being developed into the no less essential and the promised multiplicity, the individual into the family, and this again into the nation, organised according to tribes and families, provision must be made to keep the individual elements sufficiently distinct, and to impart to them such a degree of coherence, during the intermediate and most critical stages of the natural growth, as would prevent them from being assimilated to or swallowed up in the populations around them, before they were properly consolidated, or had attained to a sufficient degree of power and independence to prevent such a result.

The line which separated and defended a single family, or a small but closely connected group of families, from the influences, in whatever aspect manifested, whether hostile or otherwise, of surrounding tribes, would be utterly insufficient for this purpose, when the relative positions of the parties were altered, as would be the case through any considerable increase in the peculiarly associated people. The principle witnessed in natural laws would clearly operate in a case like the present; for the central force diminishing with the enlarged area over which it extends, this again proportionally increases the opposite, and in this instance the preponderating power. At first too feeble to provoke hostility, a party may by its purely numerical increase, or in some other way, so excite a spirit of opposition, as to bring upon themselves the fate which Jacob feared would ensue from the conduct of his sons towards the Shechemites, (Gen. xxxiv. 30,) and even without any provocation of this kind to call forth retribution. The mere increase itself of the weaker party, indeed, naturally leads to fears and suspicions on the part of the stronger. An instance in point, though belonging to a subsequent stage of the history, is the feelings of uneasiness with which the Egyptians marked the rapid multiplication of the Israelites sojourning in Goshen, who, while weak, would be viewed, if not with favour, yet possibly with indifference or contempt.

At first, however, Egypt furnished a most suitable nursery for the infant church, ready to be crushed by the world-powers, aided by the jealousies and the rude dispositions of some of its own members. The dissensions, in particular, in Jacob's own family during the patriarch's lifetime, furnished

serious forebodings of what might be expected after his decease. It is unnecessary to advert to the remarkable combinations of providence which conducted Jacob and his family to Egypt, where they found safety from various imminent dangers, and particularly from the domestic troubles which, in their circumstances, were the most perilous of all. Apart entirely from the well-authenticated account of the origin of that connexion contained in the Hebrew history, it must be felt by all who have given attention to the subject, that it was no mere casualty which brought the Israelites to sojourn in Egypt, but was, on the contrary, part of a divinely-arranged scheme. Viewing this connexion with Egypt as commencing with the descent thither of Abraham, and rendered more intimate by that of Jacob and his sons, expressly invited by Pharaoh himself, until it terminated, though only externally, with the Exodus, for the hearts of the people constantly turned to this early home, Egypt exercised an influence on the life of the Israelites, and on the character of their literature, next only to that of Palestine itself. Nor is it without significance that even the Gospel history almost commences with an old Testament text, which might form an appropriate inscription to the history of Israel: "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," (Matt. ii. 15; comp. Hos. xi. 1). Without entering into a consideration of the various points here suggested, it is evident from this analogy that there was a moral and spiritual, no less than a natural fitness, for the sojourning first of the infant Church, and afterwards of its Divine Head, in the Land of Ham.

More particularly as regards the present subject, the favourable reception secured for the Israelites in Egypt, and the powerful protector who awaited them in the court itself, were matters, however, of little importance compared with the circumstance that indisputable authority would be exercised over the brothers by the new family head found in the person of the governor of Egypt. This was, in fact, their great strength and security. But instead of enlarging on this or similar features of the case, it will be more pertinent to consider some of the circumstances which rendered Egypt one of the most suitable localities for carrying out God's purposes respecting the Israelitish immigrants from Canaan, as well in

separating them from the nations of the earth, as for the other preparations which their case so greatly required.

Any fitness, however, which Egypt possessed for the object contemplated, it is almost needless to premise, was not owing to any sympathy whatever with the people now transported thither, or the principles which they represented. For anything of that kind, Egypt would have been one of the last countries selected. Between its inhabitants and the Israelites there was no common feeling, interest or aim; but in all respects they were the direct opposite of one another. The testimony of profane writers and their own monuments,¹ confirm the Biblical notices of the arrogance of the Egyptians, and the contempt with which they regarded foreigners, more especially if, like the Israelites, they belonged to the nomadic races. This, however, only subserved the purposes of Divine wisdom. In connexion with the arrival of Jacob and his family in Egypt, it is noticed, "Every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians," (Gen. xlv. 34); and as the Israelites were chiefly engaged in pastoral avocations, this very prejudice, on the part of the people among whom they came to sojourn, itself conduced to their obtaining a separate settlement in the district of Goshen, which was scarcely regarded as a part of Egypt. This was an arrangement of the first importance for keeping together the members of the rapidly increasing families, and was rendered still more effectual for that purpose by the entire bearing of the subjects of the Pharaohs towards strangers. No ancient people perhaps carried their exclusiveness to a greater extent than the Egyptians; and their religious ideas, even more than their social customs, formed a barrier to free intercommunications between them and the Israelites. But, indeed, it was this direct negation, if not opposition, in respect to all that more particularly interested and affected the Hebrew immigrants that constituted the chief elements which rendered Egypt so suitable a place for the temporary settlement of the covenant people, and which, doubtless, led to its being selected in the providence of God for that special purpose.

The seclusion thus socially secured for the Israelites was

¹ Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 41.

nearly as complete as if they had been cut off from the rest of the world by wide seas and impassable mountains, or other barriers of a physical kind; while the arrangement was, at the same time, of a nature to permit of their participating in the advantages derivable from proximity to a highly civilized society. This was an important feature in the case. Intellectual progress, order, and subordination to law, and various other lessons of importance to a people beginning a national existence, must have been greatly promoted by this arrangement. Had it been their seclusion only that was intended, that might have been secured in various other ways, as by the transportation of the patriarchs to some lone island or inaccessible shore, or by a catastrophe which would leave them like the Noachian family alone in the earth. But any such procedure would, apart from other objections, exclude the seed of blessing from intercourse with the world, which it was destined to renew, and would, it must be evident, so far contravene the ulterior Divine purpose to which the separation of the peculiar people was only a preliminary.

There were, however, many intermediate stages ere that purpose, never for a moment lost sight of amid the changes which intervened, could reach even its partial consummation. It required, in the first place, a wider field for its development than that presented in an Egyptian province, and a longer period than could evolve in connexion with a sojourn in that land. And then there was needed such a change in the dispositions of the people to the land of their sojourn where they so largely multiplied and prospered, as would induce them the more readily to quit it when ordered away to enter upon their proper vocation. Now, it is a noticeable fact in this history, that the favour, and afterwards the indifference, with which the Israelites had been treated by the Egyptians, at length gave way to jealousies and fears at their rapid increase, and these feelings originated various forms of oppression intended to diminish their numbers and break their spirits. These trials, however intended by their oppressors, were a necessary element in the training of the covenant people. How indispensable this discipline was in completing the severance with Egypt, appears from the reluctance with which, even when their burdens had become intolerable, they left what was emphatically

“a house of bondage,” and after quitting it, from the desires and attempts on any discouragement to return thither.

3. The sojourn in the Wilderness was another important element in the process, designed to impart a distinct character to the Israelitish community.

The purposes exhibited in God's dealings with the seed of Abraham, from the call of their ancestor to the Exodus, formed the ground of all the subsequent arrangements. The separation of the people, which commenced in Egypt, was further promoted by their forty years sojourn in the wilderness, preparatory to their taking possession of Canaan, a country, it will be presently shown, specially adapted for the same great object. In this, as in the arrangements already noticed, there is an analogy which strikingly shows how they formed parts of one great system, operating variously, yet to one common end.

The history of the Exodus, and still more of the wanderings in the wilderness, shows how unfitted the Israelites were, even for the blessings God immediately designed for them, and much more for the duties to which they had been set apart. God designed for them a distinguished place among the nations, a free and independent existence, and a soil specially furnished for their use; but it was soon apparent how unqualified they were for the enjoyment of such privileges. In Egypt they had increased in numbers, so as suitably to occupy their new settlements, but they were deficient in every other quality necessary to the greatness and stability of a nation, particularly to one called to such a duty as theirs. In their case slavery had produced its natural fruits, in a spirit which, though galled by the iron yoke, preferred its endurance to the exertions required for attaining and securing liberty. The entire history of this period shows what discipline was needed for transforming these Egyptian serfs into Israelitish freemen, and constituting them suitable instruments of the Divine will, even as to the externals of the kingdom which they had been called to form. It required a new generation to furnish such instruments, and a consequent delay of the conquest of Canaan for forty years; as the people who had grown up under the deteriorating influences of Egypt proved

so incorrigible that they must be rooted out from among the congregation.

Irrespective, however of this, the solitude and seclusion of the wilderness was needed, as it was indeed admirably adapted, for the national organization, and the establishment of such ordinances and institutions as were indispensable to a new community emerging so suddenly into manhood, and otherwise so peculiarly circumstanced. There was needed in any circumstances, but especially in this case, time and freedom from distraction, for the adjustment of the various parts of the constitutional system, and the functions of its several officers. For this and other requisites there were ample facilities in the Arabian desert. Here, shut out from the world as they had never been before—remote from its wild commotions—congregated together in their encampments under the eye of the lawgiver and the subordinate authorities, and having their various wants continually supplied in a way fitted to preclude all anxious solicitude, there were thus special means and opportunities to induce in the people submission to the enactments necessary in the circumstances. Indeed, the fitness of the scene for producing higher results than those now considered, had been shown in the case of the lawgiver himself. The wilderness was the school in which, on his first quitting Egypt, Moses was trained for his special work ; and so suitable did it prove, in respect both to him and to the people he now conducted thither, that it afterwards became descriptive of a state of salutary discipline : “ Behold, I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her. And I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope ; and she shall sing there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came out of the land of Egypt” (Hos. ii. 14, 15).

4. The settlement in Canaan, as that to which the previous arrangements directly tended, had still the same purpose.

This, as the immediate object set before the Israelites, was pointed out in the earliest promises made to Abraham and the other patriarchs. The seed of blessing was from that time in idea ever associated with the land of promise. It was this which moved Jacob, on his death-bed, to say, “ Bury me not in Egypt” (Gen. xlvii. 29), and which subsequently induced

Joseph to command the removal of his own bones from the scene of his earthly greatness and glory, for sepulture in the promised inheritance (chap. l. 24, 25). To announce their restoration to the land of their fathers was one of the first charges Moses received for his brethren (Ex. iii. 17). This, too, gave form to the special constitution established in the wilderness, and to the various arrangements by which it was preceded.

Accordingly, when the promised land, at length taken possession of, is surveyed in its geographical and physical features, and in various other relations, it is seen how admirably it corresponds to the design so clearly exhibited in the Divine promises and acts. Something of this kind presented itself to the entranced eye of Balaam as he exclaimed: "From the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him: lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations" (Num. xxiii. 9). It is the same correspondence which is also noticed in the blessing of the lawgiver himself: "Israel then shall dwell in safety alone: the fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine; also his heavens shall drop down dew" (Deut. xxxiii. 28). The entire theocratic constitution was formally adapted to this particular land. This may be seen, for instance, in the correspondence between the great festivals and the seasons in Palestine: "The times of the festivals were evidently ordained in wisdom, so as to interfere as little as possible with the industry of the people. The Passover was held just before the work of harvest commenced. Pentecost, at the conclusion of the corn-harvest, and before the vintage, the Feast of Tabernacles, after the fruits of the ground were gathered in. In winter, when travelling was difficult, there were no festivals."¹ Indeed, so close was the connexion between the law and the locality for which it had been framed, that some of its enactments were applicable to no other.

Without entering, however, into an examination of the effect of the various peculiarities of country and other local associations on the customs, modes of thought, and expression of a people, or, in particular, of the physical elements which contributed to make the Israelites what they appear in the

¹ Smith's Dict. of Bible, Art. *Festivals*, i. 617, 618.

Old Testament history, and so constituted a foundation for their moral and spiritual training, and indeed gave a character to their Scriptures which have rendered them intelligible in every land, it will be enough to notice some of the characteristics which made Palestine so suitable a home for the covenant people. Keeping in view the purpose, which, as such, the Israelites were designed to subserve, and which required, in the first instance, that they should be kept in a state of isolation until they attained a power which should operate as a leavening principle on the mass of mankind, Palestine will be found pre-eminently adapted for that as well as other ends of the theocracy.¹

(1.) The boundaries and natural defences of Palestine are in this respect particularly noticeable. These cut it off in a manner from all the earth, and rendered it a grand and unassailable fortress in the midst of the surrounding nations. Between the Israelitish community and the great empires of the East two obstacles were interposed; the desert, which protected the outposts of the little Hebrew state, while a second line of defence was provided in the vast Jordanic fissure. On the south, as a barrier between them and Egypt, stretched the "great and terrible wilderness." The west was only accessible by sea, and at the time of the Israelites' first settlement in Palestine, the Mediterranean or great sea was not yet the thoroughfare; it was rather the limit of the eastern nations, and on the north rose the mighty ranges of Lebanon.²

(2.) The limited area of the land, taken in connexion with its great fertility, further greatly contributed to the object for which it had been selected. It thus admitted of a large population within comparatively narrow bounds, and this proximity of neighbourhood operated in various ways favourably upon the population, imparting to them a stronger cohesion, and much more speedily, than if they had been dispersed

¹ Carl Ritter:—"Palestine was from the beginning an isolated country, and was intended so to be, just as Israel was ordained to be a peculiar people; and thus it happened that, for thousands of years, both remained unintel-

ligible as well as inaccessible to other lands and nations."—*The River Jordan and the Dead Sea: Jour. Sac. Lit.*, Ap. 1851, p. 337.

² Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, pp. 112, 113.

more widely in their various localities. This circumstance afforded, in particular, facilities for imbuing the population more rapidly with the theocratic principles, inasmuch as it rendered more tolerable several of the theocratic enactments, particularly such as required personal attendance at the central place of worship, including, besides occasional visits on the part even of females, the stated national assemblies which contributed so largely in giving an impress to the popular life. In a wide territory, these various attractions would be greatly diminished; the theocratic life would operate very languidly towards the extremities, even if its power were felt. At all events, the growth of the system would be necessarily slow; and its vitality might even perish through the many adverse influences to which it would be exposed ere it attained to proper maturity. Indeed, as will subsequently be shown, such an increase in the population as would necessitate greatly enlarged territories would overthrow the entire system, the provisional character of which was, from this very circumstance, apparent from its first institution.

(3.) The central situation of Palestine also, no less than its seclusion, deserves notice. In the time of Ezekiel, it was eminently true that Jerusalem was "set in the midst of the nations and countries that are round about her." (Ezek. v. 5). Though at present almost beyond the pale of civilisation, Palestine was then, it has been remarked, "the vanguard of the civilised world, and moreover, stood midway between the two great seats of ancient empire, Babylon and Egypt. It was the high road from the one to the other of those mighty powers, the prize for which they contended, the battlefield on which they fought, the high bridge over which they ascended and descended respectively into the deep basins of the Nile and Euphrates."¹ And yet, by a remarkable providence, which is clearly seen watching over the fortunes of the Israelites from the very first, and which, in another form, was hedging them round for the same purpose by a variety of laws and ordinances, they enjoyed a long immunity from foreign war and invasion, until the principles which they received and represented were so far matured that the partial dispersion of

¹ Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 116.

the people might be permitted not only with safety but with advantage, first among their eastern and southern neighbours, and afterwards among the nations of the West, their Scriptures being in due time rendered into the universal language of civilisation, and other preparations made for the preaching of the Gospel—the consummation of Judaism—among all nations, and for the missionary journeys which began at Jerusalem.

Thus, according to the greatest of modern geographers:¹ “The position which Palestine held with reference to the world at large became apparent, in its historical individuality, at an early period. Though surrounded on all sides by the capitals of the most flourishing and civilised nations, yet the country with its temple-city was little affected by the active operations of its neighbours; deserts and seas rendering it of difficult access in those times, and the rocks, ravines, and hills that guarded its frontiers, proving a competent barrier against such small temptations as a district but moderately adorned by nature, and poor withal, could hold out to foreigners. Thus, by perseveringly cultivating its poor soil, which however amply remunerated the labour bestowed on it, and by always falling back on its own patriarchal centre, there being no navigable rivers leading to the sea, nor other channels encouraging external commerce, the people of Israel were enabled to complete their internal development independently, and thus to arrive at a high degree of compactness. This it was competent to perform through what nature had portioned out to it—an insulated position on the globe; this it was destined to perform, by reason of its having kept itself undefiled by the heathen rites and idolatry of its immediate neighbours (of those tribes that were severally less powerful than the people of Israel, and that had not yet been incorporated with the great monarchies), from the time of Abraham, during 1500 years at the least, until Palestine had gone through the part it had to act as the home of one people, until it had fulfilled its prescribed mission exactly on that spot of our planet that was now to take its rank as the spiritual home of all the nations on earth. For when the time of the fulfilment of the law was

¹ C. Ritter, in *Jour. Sac. Lit.*, Ap. 1851, pp. 340, 341.

come, and when the isolation of Palestine had been put an end to by its incorporation with the great Roman empire, the paths towards every nation, to the Occident as well as to the Orient, were at once thrown open for the Gospel; and the very dispersion of the people, hitherto the most compact of all, consequent upon the destruction of Jerusalem, was instrumental in making those paths more practicable."

"This union of the most striking contrasts," the same writer goes on to say, "as to relative position on the globe—a most secluded retirement, along with the facilities for a most universal communication with every one of those nations that were foremost in civilisation in ancient times (through the medium of trade and languages, by sea and land), with the Arabian, Indian, Egyptian, Syrian, and Armenian, as well as with the Greek and Roman elements of civilisation; in the common central space of all these territories, yet not affected by them; in their common historical focus, yet not kindled by their beams. This union is what constitutes the characteristic individuality of the Promised Land, destined from the beginning to be the home of the chosen people."

§ 2. *Institutions and Enactments for the Separation of Israel.*

The arrangements just noticed were only a part of the system by which God separated the covenant people, and gave them a distinct place among the nations. They were but preliminary or subordinate to diverse laws and ordinances, all tending to the same end. The national existence of the Israelites was, indeed, a primary condition of the dispensation in which Abraham and his seed were so directly interested. The terms, moreover, in which, on the establishment of the theocracy, God declared his purpose with respect to this people, and the relation into which he then entered with them, clearly indicated the object of this arrangement, "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye 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 a holy nation," (Ex. xix. 4-6).

After calling the people's attention to the providence which had hitherto watched over them, and had delivered them from Egypt, God here declared the purpose for which they were thus set apart. It was intimated that they should constitute unto God "a peculiar treasure above," out of, or from among "all people;" and this was further explained by their forming to him "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." A kingdom necessarily implies a king; and this, it is evident, must be Jehovah himself, who assumes in his own person the rights and duties which among other nations are committed to earthly sovereigns. These rights comprise chiefly the supreme legislation, the ordinances designed for the internal government of the community, and also such as regulated their alliances and foreign connexions. The purpose of this peculiar constitution is further indicated by the character of the subjects of the theocracy—"a kingdom of priests." There is here a reference to the mediatorial relation which, as intimated in the promises made to Abraham, his seed should sustain to the nations and families of the earth; so that in the Sinaitic covenant there was an express transference to Israel, in a national capacity, of the promises made to their ancestor, and the principles involved in his call. The exclusiveness of the Abrahamic covenant still adheres to this: Israel is Jehovah's peculiar treasure out of all nations; but the destination of the covenant in its universality is expressly restated in the relation of Israel as the first-born of Jehovah, as intimated in the message which Moses was directed to communicate to Pharaoh, (Ex. iv. 22,) and which, conjoined with the declaration, "for the whole earth is mine," was a pledge that the other nations, as younger sons, were interested in the blessings which primarily pertained to the covenant people.

Further, the kingdom to be thus erected, it was stated, should be a "holy nation." The primary idea of holiness or sanctification, as remarked in connexion with the characteristics required in the priesthood, is that of separation. In its highest form, it is a separation from whatever is in any way opposed to God, and an entire consecration to Him

and for His service. Holiness was indispensable in the covenant people; to secure such a character in its subjects, was the great end of the theocracy; and, accordingly, the preliminaries of the covenant conclude with the promise, "Ye shall be to me a holy nation." All the other objects of the theocratic constitution were subordinate to this. All its ordinances were directed to promote, in its widest sense, the sanctification of Israel, and thereby secure the sanctification of the world at large, although their outward separation was the object primarily aimed at. But while viewing the theocracy even in its civil bearing, or with respect to the negative idea of sanctification, as respected the community or their external separation from the world, it must be observed, that in no institution or ordinance was that the only object contemplated. In other words, these ordinances had respect to more than civil order; they had also moral and religious aims. Indeed, such was the connexion between the civil and religious in the theocratic constitution, that the civil enactments were at the same time religious, and the religious were no less possessed of a civil character and sanction. The transgression of a religious command was an offence against the State, and despite to a civil ordinance was, on the other hand, viewed as sin.

The primary design of the theocracy being thus the preparation of a people designed as a medium for beneficially influencing the other nations of the earth, its efficacy for securing this end depended, it is obvious, on various conditions; such as Israel's retaining possession of Canaan, their maintaining a national existence, and acquiring a social, moral, and spiritual training. At present, however, it is only what more immediately affected their separate and distinct place among the nations that has to be considered.

Long before the establishment of the Israelitish theocracy, there were various institutions, ordinances, and customs, which prepared for its peculiar enactments. Of such, it is sufficient to mention the ordinance forbidding the eating of blood, and the distinction of clean and unclean in the animal creation—matters which lay at the foundation of the dietary regulations of the law; the rite of circumcision, and the levirate custom in marriage—particulars of great moment; the first two in

the separation of Israel at large, and the other in maintaining the distinction of families and tribes. The consideration, however, of the ordinance respecting the use of blood, will come under notice afterwards.

Circumcision, the practice of which commenced with Abraham in consequence of a Divine command, was essentially a religious ordinance, and as such respected spiritual more than civil relations; yet by its observance being made imperative on the whole covenant people, it formed a material line of demarcation around them. They were thus shut out very much from family alliances with people who were not circumcised—a circumstance which afforded a pretext in the deceitful scheme of the sons of Jacob towards the Shechemites. No doubt the practice was not limited to the Israelites. Ishmael as well as Isaac was circumcised, as indeed were all Abraham's dependents. Besides, the rite prevailed among other ancient nations unconnected with the Abrahamic races; still, and notwithstanding also the facility with which for interested purposes strangers adopted it, as is evident from the case of the Shechemites, to the Israelites it was the peculiar badge of the covenant, and as such distinguished them from all others. Judging from the language of Jacob's sons, which, however affected, involved some truth: "We cannot do this thing; to give our sister to one that is uncircumcised; for that were a reproach to us," (Gen. xxxiv. 14); and still more from the feelings, though at a time subsequent to the law, with which Samson's parents regarded his proposal to take a wife from among the Philistines, "Is there never a woman among the daughters of thy brethren, or among all my people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines?" (Judg. xiv. 3)—feelings in which afterwards originated the expression, "the uncircumcised and the unclean," (Isai. lii. 1)—and which, from the very nature of the case, were not limited to one side, but must have been mutually entertained, this distinguishing rite must, from the earliest period of the Israelitish history, have greatly contributed to form them into a distinct community, and so directly co-operated with the providential arrangements and interpositions already noticed.

In addition to this external separation of the Israelitish

community, there were also family and tribal distinctions, for the maintenance of which special provision was made, both in providence and legislation. These distinctions were carried out in the most precise form; they extended even to the family relation and the individual descent; so that the unity should be no mere aggregate of particles, but present the most definite combination of parts. The tribal divisions fully marked out, with their respective places for the future assigned to them in the blessing of Jacob, and subsequently of Moses, were rendered permanent by the distinct divisions of the territorial possessions, and the legislative provisions which regulated the tenure of property, and otherwise prevented with the utmost care the mixture or amalgamation of the tribes. These matters will form the subject of examination in the next section; but it may be here remarked that these precautions commenced at a very early period, if to such is to be ascribed the levirate custom, which existed as early as the patriarchal period, and was adopted into the Mosaic law.

It is, however, in the law itself, as was to be expected, that those considerations which respected the separation of the covenant people attain a prominent place. These, indeed, form one of its chief features, and influence more or less all its enactments. In particular, the laws which either directly or indirectly regulated the intercourse of individuals and the community with foreigners, were entirely of a restrictive character, whether they respected more immediately social or civil arrangements, or the exercises of religion. The influence of political alliances, and even of private and individual intercourse with foreign nations, so productive of change in the character and views of a people, and therefore, in the case of the Israelites, so counteractive of the purpose which required that they should occupy a distinct place of their own as regards character and institutions, was repressed by placing such intercourse under every possible restriction. Besides the general principles of the constitution, which tended to the encouragement of agriculture rather than of commercial or trading tendencies, there were various injunctions and ordinances of a social, civil, and religious character, which either directly or indirectly aimed at restricting the Israelite to his home, and shutting him out from foreign communications.

The whole system indeed, it may be shown, operated in the same way. The following synopsis must, however, suffice at present :—

1. *Personal, Family, and Social Arrangements.*—Of enactments of this kind having a tendency to dissociate the covenant people from the rest of the world, may be noticed—

(1.) Such as prohibited the Israelites from complying with foreign customs and manners, and which extended even to the regulation of their dress. To form a distinction in this respect may have been one of the purposes of the injunction to wear fringes¹ of blue on their garments, (Num. xv. 38 ; Deut. xxii. 12).

(2.) Every discouragement was put in the way of marriage with foreigners, and in certain cases it was absolutely prohibited (Ex. xxxiv. 16 ; Deut. vii. 3). But of more importance under the present head was—

(3.) The law which regulated the Israelite in respect to his daily food ; as well the kind of food as the mode of preparing it. In regard to all these particulars the law was most express. Of the animal kingdom a very large proportion was absolutely excluded as unclean and inedible ; even simply touching the carcases of such produced uncleanness (Lev. xi.) which subjected the Israelite to very great inconvenience. And even such animals as were permitted to be eaten required to be dressed in a particular way. The blood had to be entirely separated from the flesh (Lev. xvii. 10-13) ; the use of the blood as an article of food in any form being, in accordance also with an earlier regulation on the subject, strictly interdicted.

These regulations, especially the last mentioned, shut out the Israelites from all social communications with their Gentile neighbours, some of whom regarded as luxuries several of the articles which the Israelite must have held in abhorrence. Indeed, there could be no method more powerful for effecting the object aimed at than the restrictions which respected food. This, as remarked by an observant traveller,¹ “ must be obvious to every person acquainted with the East, where, on account

¹ Jennings's Jewish Antiquities, B. i. ch. 10, p. 311. Lond. 1823.

² Kitto, Pictorial Bible, Note on Lev. xi. 2. Lond. 1847.

of the natives regarding as unclean many articles of food and modes of preparation in which Europeans indulge, travellers or residents find it impossible to associate intimately with conscientious Mohammedans or Hindoos. Nothing more effectual could be devised to keep one people distinct from another. It causes the difference between them to be ever present to the mind, touching, as it does, upon so many points of social and every day contact; and it is therefore far more efficient in its results, as a rule of distinction, than any difference in doctrine, worship, or morals, which men could entertain." Such was its operation, that when, under the Gospel, the barriers between Jews and Gentiles were taken away, it needed a special vision to show to the Apostle Peter that these restrictions had ceased, before he could hold communion with the Roman centurion Cornelius—an act which afterwards led to his being accused of going in to men uncircumcised and *eating* with them (Acts x., xi. 3). And when, under the law itself, the conversion of the Gentiles was foretold, it was represented by their ceasing to drink blood and eat abominations (Zech. ix. 7).

2. *Civil Enactments.*—The restrictions on lending money for interest or usury, though applicable only in cases where the borrower was himself an Israelite, are so opposed to modern ideas, especially in trading and commercial nations, that they call for some notice. It was, as already remarked, a special object with the lawgiver, as best serving the purposes of the theocracy, to direct the natural energies to agricultural pursuits, and, on the contrary, to discourage trade and commercial enterprise. It is to this the laws respecting interest or usury are to be referred (Lev. xxii. 25; Deut. xxiii. 19, 20). And to the same purpose those enactments which required the remission of all debts in the seventh or sabbatical year (Deut. xv. 2); and particularly those also which excluded foreigners from obtaining or holding heritable property within the Israelitish possessions, by the stipulations that property of this kind was unalienable, reverting to the original owners unconditionally in the year of Jubilee, and was at all times subject to redemption. No doubt proselytes were permitted and even encouraged, as will presently be shown, to settle among the covenant people; but the inducements held out to strangers

in general to ally themselves with the Israelites, were more of a moral than of a material nature.

But, if inducements were given to the Gentiles to take up a temporary or permanent residence in Israel, where they were admitted to certain privileges, every obstacle, on the other hand, was placed in the way of an Israelite's associating with, or settling among strangers. By the Israelite's removal beyond the confines of his country, he was subjected to various personal and civil inconveniences; but more particularly, as will be shown under the next head, his religious privileges would be entirely in abeyance. Everything, in short, of a civil character, as the right of citizenship, the tenure of lands and other arrangements, was so ordered as to strengthen those natural bonds which connect man with the place of his birth, and maintain the best associations of country and kindred.

3. *Religious Restrictions.* The enactments already considered, which limited the intercourse of the Israelites with strangers, whether at home or abroad, had more or less of a religious character. Others, however, there were, in which the religious element was more prominent, and which, while bearing perhaps less directly on this matter, yet operated more powerfully in fixing the Israelite to his country than any of the ordinances already noticed. Such were the restrictions of all religious rites to one specific locality.

In considering the suitability of the promised land for the residence of the peculiar people, it was observed that the theocratic constitution was formally constructed for that soil; and it is certain at least that the chief services and ceremonies therein stipulated could be legally performed nowhere else. It was a fundamental principle of that constitution, that there should be but one place of sacrifice and public worship; although the precise locality might vary with circumstances, as its sacredness depended on the presence of the Ark of the Covenant, the symbolical meeting-place with God. Accordingly, persons at a distance from the sanctuary were greatly inconvenienced in respect to religious services, or it might be altogether excluded from such duties, stated or occasional, in which, even when not legally required, the pious Israelite would delight to participate. The feelings of David when, through the rebellion of Absalom, he was forced from Jeru-

salem, evince the nature of the deprivation thus endured (Ps. xlii).

Voluntary services, however, formed only a minor consideration in the case; for the performance of the chief acts of a theocratic character, particularly such as related to religion, was not a matter simply optional, or left to convenience or personal convictions, but was regulated by express statutes, which fixed the service and the precise time, as well as the locality where alone it could be duly discharged. Omitting the laws which enjoined individuals, in certain stated cases, to present offerings and submit to purifications, all of which required their personal presence at the sanctuary, there were general enactments which applied to the whole community, and necessitated repeated journeys, and at short intervals, to that locality.

(1.) First in importance, as respected the end under consideration, were the stated feasts and convocations. At three of these all the males were required to appear annually before the Lord, at the place which he should choose as the seat of the theocracy (Ex. xxxiv. 22, 23). With regard to one of these feasts—the Passover—there was a certain indulgence as to time in favour of such as were unclean, or on a journey on the particular day specified for its observance, such having it in their power to hold it on the corresponding day of the succeeding month; but in other circumstances its neglect on the day appointed involved the punishment of excision from the community (Num. ix. 10-13). This small indulgence, however, in favour of persons on a journey at the time of this annual celebration, shows most convincingly how such enactments must have interfered with travelling; and while rigorously enforced and strictly obeyed, must have precluded emigration and foreign residence to a very great extent, if not altogether.

(2.) The law with respect to the purification of women after childbirth also falls to be noticed here. The enactments on this subject had the same tendency, and were in that respect next in importance to the preceding regulations. Whether she had given birth to a son or a daughter, the mother was enjoined to offer a sacrifice at the usual place of worship, (Lev.

xii.) This she must bring in person, and it is therefore exceedingly obvious how inconvenient on such occasions residence at any great distance from the sanctuary, as involving a long and fatiguing journey, must have proved. For the notice of this ordinance, as observed by the mother of Jesus, see Luke ii. 22-24, which throws an interesting light on the subject.

By these, and various other arrangements, any disposition in the population to a migratory life was effectually checked, through the inconveniences which removal to a distance from the theocratic centre would entail upon them, if not altogether indifferent to their civil and political rights, as well as to their religious privileges. The people were thus, in fact, bound to the soil: and when to the foregoing arrangements is added a notice of the various regulations which tended to bind the community together by all the appliances of a social and sacred character founded on equal rights, equitable laws, and a common religion, an important point will be reached from which to discern some of the reasons which governed the Mosaic legislation, and the admirable adaptation of the means to the particular ends desiderated; which, in the first instance, was the separation of the covenant people from the nations of the earth, until the principles planted among them could bear to be transferred into a wider field.

§ 3. *Judaism not of an absolutely Exclusive Character.*

While thus one great object of the Mosaic legislation was the separation of the Israelites from the world, yet the dispensation in itself was not of an absolutely exclusive character, nor did it assume a position of antagonism to mankind. It was certainly, as befitted a Divine revelation of truth, intolerant of error and of all unauthorised religious rites and practices, whether of the native Israelites or the strangers settled among them. This some may account narrowness and bigotry, but it is enough to observe that similar charges may be brought against Christianity itself, and on much the same grounds. They are charges, however, which certainly do not call for vindication, whether as bearing on the one system or the

other. The allegations, however, of various heathen writers,¹ still occasionally repeated by ignorant or interested persons, that Judaism was hostile to mankind, to whatever degree they may have been countenanced by the character or claims of some of the Jews themselves during the later periods of their national existence, (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 15,) have no foundation whatever in the system itself. On the contrary, they are opposed to some of the most express provisions of the law, which viewed mankind as one great brotherhood.

It is true, in the communication to others of its own peculiar benefits, Judaism did not manifest any actively aggressive principles. The law did not make it incumbent on the Israelite to endeavour to extend the blessings in which he himself participated to his heathen neighbours. No doubt a course of conduct was inculcated which should conduce to direct the attention of the nations to the excellency of the theocratic laws, (Deut. iv. 5-8); but this is widely different from the aggressive principle of Christianity embodied in the parting commission given by its Founder to His apostles when He charged them to preach the Gospel to every creature, (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). Such a charge was entirely foreign to the character of the Mosaic system, and would, in fact, be subversive of its object. The subjugation of the Edomites by the later Jews, and their forced submission to Jewish rites,² though it might afford a precedent to Mahomet, and be in accordance with the precepts of the Koran, was as opposed to the principles of Mosaism as to those of Christianity itself.

There were also, it must be observed, cases of special exclusion from the congregation of the Lord,³ and the full rights of Israelitish citizenship; and the grounds of which were either personal or national. Although the latter only is the subject of consideration, yet the former ground of exclusion is important, as showing the principle on which the regulation rested. Thus a person mutilated in particular members was excluded, (Deut. xxiii. [1] 2); the circumstance of bastardy

¹ Tacitus: "Adversus omnes alios hostile odium."—Hist. v. 5. See also Juv. Sat., xiv. 103, ff.

² Josephus, Antiq., xii. 8, § 6; xiii. 9, § 2.

³ On the import of the expression, "entering into the congregation of the Lord," see Jenning's Jewish Antiquities, B. i., ch. 3, pp. 96, 97.

afforded a ground of exclusion, even to the tenth generation, (ver. 3). It was the same also with respect to an Ammonite and Moabite, the reason in their case being their hostile disposition to Israel during the wilderness journey, (ver. 4, 5). And it is also added, "Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity, all thy days for ever," (ver. 7). On the other hand, with respect to the Edomites and the Egyptians, it is stated in the same connexion: "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land. The children that are begotten of them shall enter into the congregation of the Lord in their third generation," (ver. 8, 9). The primary ground of these various exclusions was Israel's relation to the Lord, by which they became His congregation, *קְהֵל יְהוָה*, "the congregation of Jehovah," intimating the consecration and sanctity of their position, the invasion of which was regarded by the pious with disquietude, (Lam. i. 10). When, however, the outward and the typical should terminate, these disqualifications, it was expressly declared, should cease too, (Isa. lvi. 3-7).

With these exceptions, and the command for the extermination of the Canaanites, which had respect to another great principle of the Divine administration, the Mosaic law enjoined the most liberal policy towards strangers.¹ It strongly inculcated the exercise of kindly feelings towards such, by reminding the Israelites that they themselves had been strangers. "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." Again, "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger; for ye know the heart of a stranger," (Ex. xxii. 21; xxiii. 9). More particularly it was enjoined, "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself," (Lev. xix. 33, 34)—a precept solemnly inculcated, on the

¹ Bennet: "From the first, the Hebrew commonwealth maintained the most liberal policy towards foreigners. It would seem natural that two millions of slaves, bursting at once, and with supernatural demonstrations, from the tyranny of a race that held foreigners in abhorrence, would have excluded

most carefully, from sharing their conquests, all but their own nation, especially their late taskmasters. But at the outset, before the passage of the sea, Moses lays down the law on this subject in the language of comprehensive benevolence."—*Aliens in Israel*, p. 565.

ground that "God loveth the stranger," (Deut. x. 18, 19). Moreover, special provision was made in various ways for the necessities of the stranger, as well as of the widow and fatherless, as in the laws respecting the gleanings of the harvest, the olives, and the vintage, (Lev. xix. 9, 10; xxiii. 22; Deut. xxiv. 19-21).

Nor did the law confine itself to a merely benevolent supervision of strangers, it also made provision for their admission as proselytes to all the privileges of the covenant people, the sole condition being a compliance with the ordinance of circumcision. The great national feast of the Passover might be celebrated by the stranger who had conformed to the initiatory rite of circumcision; for he should then be deemed in all respects "as one born in the land," (Ex. xii. 48). No term of previous residence or extended probation was required; no expense or delay need be incurred in obtaining admission to the fullest rights of an Israelitish citizen, while many privileges were open even to such as had not conformed with this rite, which was never made compulsory as a condition of residence.

Indeed, these and other provisions relative to other than the descendants of Abraham, were intimately connected with the intimations made to the patriarch of the mediatorial standing of his seed, and afforded some foretaste of the blessings which, through them, should extend to the rest of the world. And it deserves particular notice that though, as just stated, the Moabites were subjected to special disqualifications, yet there was no obstacle whatever to the reception of individuals of that nation, as witnessed in the case of Ruth, who was welcomed as coming to put her trust under the wings of the Lord God of Israel; and not only so, but though an alien by birth, yet Ruth, being the widow of an Israelite, could claim, according to law and custom, her husband's kinsman in marriage (Ruth ii. 12; iv. 5). Nor is it without deep significance to observe how the same Divine providence, which, long prior to the actual establishment of the Mosaic economy, was making preparation for the seclusion of the seed of Abraham, by drawing round them more completely successive lines of demarcation, was even, from its very commencement, introducing one after another from the outfield of heathenism, as

Rahab and Ruth, to form distinguished links in the great chain of blessing, (Matt. i. 5.)

Not only was this the case, but the very lines of circumvallation were again gradually withdrawn when their purposes had been sufficiently accomplished to permit of this being done with safety. The Babylonian captivity and the subsequent revolutions in the Israelitish history, predicted by the Lawgiver himself, while they were the direct consequences of the people's sins and of their unfaithfulness to the covenant, nevertheless gave occasion for the fulfilment of the Divine purposes and the very ends contemplated in the Mosaic economy.

The interruption for seventy years of all that distinguished the Levitical system, and the fact that, on the resumption of its services, they were shorn of much of their original glory, must have awakened serious thoughts as to the character of the whole system. During the exile, the Israelites were undergoing a training, but in quite a different direction from that marked out for them at their first national establishment. Then every incident in their history tended to dissociate them from the world, while the main provisions of their economy linked them to the very soil of Palestine. The connexion thus formed between the people and the land on which, by remarkable providences, they had been planted, was broken by the exile, after which it was never fully restored. The old associations were interrupted, the ancestral properties were in a great measure lost, and the very language of the law and the prophets ceased to be the living tongue of Canaan. The pursuits of commerce gradually supplanted those of agriculture, and, in consequence, the Jews were largely dispersed among the trading communities of the ancient world, either occasionally visiting or permanently settled at the great marts of nations, still, however, retaining that distinct and detached place, socially and morally, into which they had been brought by their old constitution and training.

It is important to notice how, when the character of the people was sufficiently formed to admit of their dispersion in the world, even the older walls of separation were, one after another, removed. Not the least was the disuse of the Hebrew language, which, though a branch of the great She-

mitic stem, had entirely a local character, corresponding to the system which it propounded, and the acquaintance formed by the Jews beyond the bounds of Palestine, especially in Alexandria, with the Greek tongue in particular, and which led to the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew writings, which marked an epoch in that providence which watched over the progress and the diffusion of divine revelation, and prepared the way so largely for the preaching of the Gospel¹—a system as diffusive and aggressive as Judaism was the reverse. It was not, however, until the new system was fully inaugurated, that its diffusive character was fully apparent. Until Judaism had completed its course, the preaching of Christ and his apostles must conform to the original order; their message must be directed to the lost sheep of the house of Israel: the apostles were forbidden by their Master to go to the Gentiles, or even to enter any city of the Samaritans; nevertheless, as in the Mosaic law itself, such were even then welcomed whenever they made the smallest advances in the way, and it deserves notice that one of the most remarkable cases of persevering application to the Saviour of sinners recorded in the Gospels, is that of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mark vii. 2-6; Matt. xv. 22)—a representative of the very Canaanitish nations doomed long before by the law to destruction.

SECT. II. THE CONSERVATION OF ISRAEL FOR THE PURPOSES OF THEIR CALLING.

Craig, *Theocracy, or the Principles of the Jewish Religion and Polity adapted to all Nations and Times*, pp. 191-293. Edin. 1848.—Wines, *Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews*, pp. 393-574. Philadelp. 1859.—Blaikie, *Old Testament Light on our Social Problems: Essays by Ministers of the Free Church of Scotland*, pp. 39-73. Edin. 1858.

The purposes contemplated in the calling of Israel required not merely that they should be separated for a time from the nations, but that they should be so moulded as to preserve a

¹ B. F. Westcott: "Outwardly and inwardly, by its effects both on the Gentiles and on the people of Israel, the Dispersion appears to have been the clearest providential preparation for the spread of Christianity."—Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, Art. *Dispersion*, i. 441.

distinct place, even when dispersed abroad in the world which they were destined to bless. The attaining of such a character could only be through a process which evidently demanded time, were it only to secure a sufficient cohesion among the individual particles so as to prevent their being inextricably mingled with the mass of heathenism. This condition of the system was regarded from the very first. The future set before the Israelite was one very remote. Abraham was expressly told that four hundred years must intervene before the promises should be so far realized as to put his seed even into possession of their land. To Jacob the fortunes of the tribes appeared connected with "the end of the days." And Balaam, too, contemplated the advent of the great King of Israel as a remote event; while Moses himself made distinct mention of the various and long-continued revolutions in his nation's history (Lev. xxvi.), the consummation of which should reach to "the end of the days," (Deut. xxxi. 29). With this fully agree the provisions of the constitution itself, which show that the state of separation, to secure which it had immediate respect, was to be of some continuance, and during which law and order were necessary not merely for the higher training contemplated, but also for the safety and preservation of the community.

Until the principles committed to Israel attained to sufficient maturity, it was necessary that the people should be secluded from the strifes and commotions, and other hurtful influences of the world without, as the idolatries and other vicious practices of heathenism, to some of which throughout their early history they had manifested strong predilections. For attaining this end, nothing could so much conduce as the peculiar constitution and polity under which it pleased God to place His covenant people in conjunction with the remarkable physical characteristics of the land provided for them. The constitution itself was complex and peculiar, but it was so owing to the special purposes which its Divine Author contemplated, and which, as the whole subsequent history shows, have been fully attained. While training Israel to a direct participation in the blessings of the covenant, God was also training them to be a blessing to the nations; and notwithstanding that, through carnality and obstinacy, they showed

at various times how little they esteemed the covenant blessings, God's purposes have in nowise failed (Rom. xi.) If they have been partially broken off and rejected, those who were viewed as aliens, and indeed as outcasts in Israel, have, through the blessing of Abraham, been received into the covenant of God.

Whatever differences of opinion may be entertained regarding some of the principles, or the practical working, in particular aspects, of the Mosaic legislation, there can be no question that its general tendency was, in a national point of view, highly beneficial. The national prosperity promised as a divine blessing attendant on obedience to the precepts of the law, and actually enjoyed to a great extent at some periods of the Israelitish history, was not a mere arbitrary bestowal, but a consequence of the adaptation of the principles of the law for securing that end; and so also with regard to the miseries which resulted from disobedience. The natural effects of a wise and equitable system of jurisprudence were indeed never more marked than in the case of the Israelitish community. In particular, it may be remarked, that, notwithstanding the opposition rendered to its precepts, the Mosaic legislation was instrumental in consolidating the national life and character, to a degree never attained by any other system. The very position of the people in the world at this day is irrefragable evidence of its efficacy in this respect. The principles and enactments by which such a result, distinctly recognised and provided for in the law itself, has been produced, must be taken into account in judging of the system and its adaptation to the requirements of the case.

§ 1. *Principles in the Israelitish Polity productive of Unity.*

In judging of the value of a national constitution and polity, it must be viewed not in the abstract, but in connexion with the purposes it was designed to effect both relative and absolute, as a provisional or more permanent institution, and also with the character, habits, and other circumstances of the people subjected to its operation. These conditions require to be particularly attended to in estimating the Mosaic legislation. The primary object of that system was to consolidate and train

to habits of government, a community, numerous indeed, but of recent growth, and which, instead of enjoying the rights and blessings of freedom, had been long subjected to the worst influences of a most crushing servitude, until suddenly restored to liberty, not by any efforts of their own, but by an external interposition. While, however, as necessary in any well arranged scheme, the Mosaic laws were immediately intended for the condition of things existing at the time of their institution, and the necessities of individuals and of the state, it will appear that, in no case, even when a civil character predominated, were they strictly limited to a social or political aim, but embraced moral and spiritual objects. Some of the enactments exhibit this more clearly than others, but they all, more or less, had respect to moral no less than civil relations. However diversified in form and character, all the parts of the system constituted one connected whole; having one basis—the covenant into which God entered with his people, and one object, the furtherance of the terms of that covenant, first in their outward or formal, and next in their more essential aspects and relations.

Everything indicated a unity in the system; and in nothing was this characteristic more fully exhibited than in those arrangements which variously co-operated to promote the unity of its subjects. The whole economy possessed a strongly conserving, and, at the same time, humanizing character.

This appears first from the principles of the constitution itself. The legislative functions being in a theocratic constitution a Divine prerogative, prevented all organic changes, and so secured a permanency in the various institutions otherwise unattainable. Within certain limits, indeed, a modification in the form of government was allowable (Deut. xvii. 14, 15), but only so far as it did not encroach on the character or foundation of the government itself. This permitted a certain adaptation to changes incident to every human society, without contravening the principles of the theocracy and its purposes, which required the highest stability of rule. With respect also to the form of the executive institutions, there is nothing specific in the Pentateuch, so that there was thus a discretionary power in matters which did not fundamentally affect the State, but which must necessarily harmonise with its

natural growth, so as to secure the well-being of the individual and the community. Still, provision was made for entrusting the executive functions to proper officers, and strict charges were given them for the execution of the law. Judicial functionaries were also appointed (Deut. xvi. 18), and it deserves notice that no punishment could be awarded without previous judicial investigation, and a conviction arrived at only on sufficient evidence. And further, the punishment due to any particular offence was prescribed in the law, and was not left to the arbitrary determination of the judge.

Thus, every precaution was taken constitutionally to maintain established order, and to ensure a consistent and equitable administration of justice. This itself was a most potent principle in securing respect for the law, and so promotive of its objects. But it was the character of the law itself, as affecting person and property, rights and privileges, and the management of national affairs, that formed the great bond of Israelitish society. How largely the constitution was charged with conservating elements will be conspicuous from the care with which it watched over life, liberty, and property, and whatever else concerned the well-being of society.

1. The safeguards to life, liberty, and property were of the most ample kind.

(1.) Murder was a capital offence, and admitted of no commutation of punishment (Num. xxxv. 31). This law was older than the Mosaic economy (Gen. ix. 6), but here it was sanctioned anew, and its execution made incumbent on the proper authorities. In cases where the murderer was unknown, expiation must be made for the crime by the elders or public representatives of the city nearest to the scene of the murder (Deut. xxi. 1-9)—a proceeding well calculated to inspire a salutary horror against the perpetration of such crimes. Even homicide by the merest inadvertence was made culpable, and subjected the party to a kind of exile or imprisonment in the city of refuge specially provided for such cases (Num. xxxv. 25.) To the same end were the severe enactments with respect to deeds of violence resulting in injury to the person. (Lev. xxiv. 19).

(2.) Again, as regarded personal liberty, no Israelite could be reduced to or detained in slavery, and severe punishment

was awarded to any one found stealing a Hebrew in order to sell him to a foreigner (Lev. xxv. 42; Deut. xxiv. 7). Individuals reduced to poverty might part with their own liberty, or that of their children, and the debtor unable to satisfy his creditors, or the thief who could not make restitution as required by the law, might be sold, in order to satisfy those legal obligations, but the right thus acquired by the buyer did not extend to their persons, but only to their services, and that for a terminable period (Lev. xxv. 39; Ex. xxi. 7; 2 Kings iv. 1; Ex. xxii. 3).

(3.) The rights of property, too, were exceedingly definite, and any violation of them was severely punishable (Ex. xxii. 1-14), and even when the injury was accidental, restitution or recompense must be made. This, added to the fact that the chief element of property was an interest in the soil, in which every citizen participated by an indefeasible title, afforded the highest inducements to the maintenance of public order and the supremacy of the law. To this, however, and the complementary provisions, which, by making overgrown wealth and extreme poverty equally impossible, removed the great sources of ambition and revolutionary schemes, further reference will presently be made.

2. The laws regulating domestic relations were also of a character to contribute largely to order and stability.

(1.) Marriage being the foundation of all domestic relations (Gen. ii. 24), the Hebrew law manifested great anxiety regarding it. It solemnly forbade all promiscuous intercourse, and enjoined the union of one man with one woman. This union was indissoluble, except in the case of adultery. Divorce for other causes was not enjoined, but was merely suffered, because of the hardness of the people's hearts (Matt. xix. 8); while some check on such proceedings, whether originating in the impetuosity of passion, or want of due reflection, was supplied by a provision of the law, which made it necessary to write out a deed of separation (Deut. xxiv. 1); and in the fact that it seems to have been irrevocable, at least no reunion was allowed, if the divorced wife had in the interval been married to another husband, though afterwards separated from him (Deut. xxiv. 4). Another restriction, in this respect, was that a priest could not marry a woman that had been divorced

(Lev. xxi. 7). This enactment would foster a right public opinion on the subject, by branding divorce as an impropriety which produced such a disqualification in its subjects.

Polygamy also had no legal sanction ; it was simply tolerated, and on the same ground as the practice of divorce. It was, moreover, accompanied with every kind of discouragement. In some cases, as taking two sisters to wife simultaneously, there was an express prohibition, (Lev. xviii. 18,) and the high priest was expressly restricted to one wife, (Lev. xxi. 13). Another check to polygamy was the prohibition of favouritism in disposing of the inheritance to the prejudice of the first-born whose mother might not be the favourite wife, (Deut. xxi. 15-17).

(2.) The parental authority, so important an element in right government, was particularly recognised. The authority of a father was of the highest kind ; and the severest punishments were allotted to disobedient children, (Deut. xxi. 21).

3. The laws affecting masters and servants had an equally beneficial tendency.

It was required that the hired servant or day-labourer should be paid his wages in the evening, (Lev. xix. 13,) and that the Israelitish bought servant should be liberated on the return of the sabbatical year, (Ex. xxi. 2 ; Lev. xxv. 39-43 Deut. xv. 12-18) ; except in the case where the servant publicly intimated before the proper authorities a desire to continue permanently with his master, (Ex. xxi. 5, 6). In all cases the master was enjoined to treat his servants with kindness and consideration, (Lev. xxv. 43). Injuries by the master to the person of the servant, or even foreign slave, entitled such to manumission, (Ex. xxi. 26, 27). And in every instance when the servant left his master's house, on the expiration of the legal period of service, he must not be dismissed empty, but be liberally supplied from his master's goods, (Deut. xv. 12-15).

There was, indeed, no condition of life or relation to which the law did not extend its friendly regard. Its spirit breathed universal love and benevolence, in direct opposition to the perverted anti-socialism of later Judaism. The love of neigh-

hours was specially enjoined, (Lev. xix. 17, 18); and not merely fellow-countrymen, but strangers and even enemies, were to be regarded with affection, (Deut. x. 17-19; xxiii. 7). It was incumbent to render to such every act of kindness; and even their cattle must be considerately treated, (Ex. xxiii. 4, 5). Such, indeed, was the comprehensive sympathy of the Hebrew law, that it did not overlook the brute creation, which was expressly specified as objects to be tenderly dealt with. The ox and the ass were not to be yoked together in the plough—ill-matched in size and strength, (Deut. xxii. 10); nor must the ox be muzzled when treading out the corn, (Deut. xxiv. 4). The young and its dam were not to be killed the same day, (Lev. xxii. 28). Even the bird in the nest, sitting on her eggs or on her young, must be allowed to escape when these were taken, (Deut. xxii. 6).

4. There were various other principles and arrangements of the Mosaic system which no less tended to bind together the several members of the community, and otherwise promote the best interests of the State. Some of these were of a civil, and others of a religious character.

Among the former, notice may be taken of certain circumstances which show that it was a principal aim of the law-giver to discourage aggressive or foreign warfare. Thus no provision was made for a standing army. The citizens were the only soldiery recognised in the Mosaic constitution, and having other avocations, as cultivators of the soil, which must be duly attended to in their seasons, they would not be readily disposed to undertake military service, further than was required for purposes of defence or other special exigencies. The use of cavalry was strictly prohibited, (Deut. xvii. 16). Among nations which aimed at conquest, horses, whether mounted or in chariots, always constituted a chief force. The prohibition of such by Moses shows that he designed the cultivation of peace among his people, rather than military pursuits. A more specific reason, however, may be discerned in this enactment: "In all ancient nations, where cavalry was employed, the horsemen, being necessarily the wealthier members of the community, became also the more powerful. The system threw the chief political power into the hands of a few rich citizens, who could afford to mount and bring into the

one God, one sanctuary, one altar—was the great bond of union which so remarkably resulted in a nationality to which there has been nothing similar in the history of man.

Even as regards minor points, the Mosaic laws were fitted to cherish the best feelings of the heart. The general equality produced among the community favoured a manly and independent bearing; while the impartiality required of judges and magistrates gave confidence to the innocent and oppressed; and, again, the punishments awarded to the guilty discountenanced all unnecessary cruelty. Torture to extract a confession was never resorted to, perjury in witness-bearing was subjected to the highest penalties (Deut. xix. 16-20)—informers were discountenanced (Lev. xix. 16), and the most indubitable evidence was required before conviction. No degrading punishment was permitted in any circumstances (Deut. xxv. 2, 3); and even the dead bodies of malefactors must not be unnecessarily or too long exposed (Deut. xxi. 22). In short, everything was so ordered as to maintain personal respect, one of the strongest restraints to crime and disorder, and, accordingly, one of the most valuable safeguards of the State.

§ 2. *Compensatory Principles of the Law.*

The best governmental system is liable to disorder. The slightest variations, if not met by a counterpoise, will in time so accumulate as to interfere materially with the working of the scheme, if not to suspend its action altogether. When a nation has so far outgrown the original provisions of the constitution and polity, that ordinances and arrangements which originally had a beneficial tendency, cease to be operative, if, in the altered circumstances, they have not even assumed a totally different character, a natural check of its development is the immediate consequence, and this leads to decay and disorganization. Hence, in every well conducted government, the acknowledged necessity of continually adapting the legislation to the exigencies which successively emerge, by the abrogation of old statutes, or their replacement by new provisions. To a certain extent the Israelitish constitution admitted of an adaptation to altered circumstances; but all organic changes were absolutely prohibited, as incompatible with the

character and still more with the purposes of the theocracy. But, indeed, the constant emendations incident in all human legislation were not only inadmissible, they were for the most part unnecessary in this case, owing to those compensatory principles originally ingrafted on the law itself, which checked the evils and irregularities that must otherwise have ensued, especially under so rigid and complex a system.

One of the most important provisions, as regarded the interests of the community, and the stability of the State, was the statutes regulating the tenure of landed property, which constituted the very foundation of the commonwealth next to the theocracy itself, and most materially affected all their more special relations as an agricultural community.

The land which God bestowed upon his people, and which they held directly from Himself, was by express directions to be divided into tribal allotments, which were to be subdivided into as many parts as there were families in the respective tribes,—the tribe of Levi being excluded from this arrangement, having been otherwise provided for, (Lev. xxv. 23.) The whole landed property of the country was thus portioned among all the citizens; and in a country so productive as Palestine, whatever may have been the precise extent of the original holdings, they must have at least yielded a comfortable maintenance, even when they had, in the course of generations, undergone various subdivisions. The permanency of the original division, so essential to the distinction of tribes and families, and other interests involved in the special objects of the Israelitish constitution, was, by various enactments, secured from the changes to which all such arrangements are exposed in the reverses of fortune, the failure of heirs and other circumstances connected with the lapse of time.

The original properties could, under no circumstances, be alienated from the family. They might be temporarily mortgaged, but in no instance for a period exceeding fifty years; for, on the return of the jubilee, the whole property reverted, free of encumbrance, to the original owner or his representative; while it was subject to redemption at any time, (Lev. xxv. 10-24). This arrangement was productive of many important consequences to the social system. It not only preserved the agricultural character of the nation; it also effec-

tually precluded that accumulation of property in the hands of a few individuals resulting from the dispossession of the many, and the sure tendency of which is to reduce the latter to the condition of serfs and vassals.

Subservient also to the object contemplated by the law of tenure, and especially designed for maintaining distinct the several tribal possessions, was the enactment with respect to the marriage of heiresses. Such were allowed to marry only within their own tribes, this restriction having for its object to prevent the transfer of the property from one tribe to another (Num. xxvii. 1-9; xxxvi. 1-11; comp. 1 Chron. xxiii. 22).

While these arrangements, however, prevented the alienation of the original possessions, either from the tribe or family, they would, it might be feared, be productive, on the other hand, of hurtful consequences, especially through the operation of the law of succession. This required that on the death of the father the property should be divided among his sons. The natural consequence of this would be an endless and so a ruinous subdivision of the soil, which could no longer afford maintenance to its now impoverished proprietors. For this, however, there was some check in the law of succession itself, in the provision that the first-born should have a double share of all the property (Deut. xxi. 17). And, though there be no express stipulation on the subject in the law, it would seem that the first-born was permitted to retain the whole of the landed property by paying to the other heirs the value of their shares; or that the father himself, in his lifetime, might, on the desire of any of the younger sons, pay them their respective portions (Luke xv. 12, 31). Another compensation was, that, on the failure of direct heirs, or on marriage with an heiress, two or more properties would come into the possession of a single family. A process of this kind must have been continually going on, and so counteracting the natural consequences of the subdivisions.

But the subdivision itself would for a long time be highly beneficial. It would conduce to energy and activity in reducing to cultivation the whole available soil, and drawing out all its resources. This, indeed, is no mere supposition; it is a fact attested by the appearances still presented in Palestine,

affording evidence of its once high cultivation, which provided support for a numerous and thriving population. This fact serves better than any theory, as a test of the working of this part of the Mosaic law.

Equally important with the arrangement which prevented the accumulation of property, was that which precluded the accumulation of debt. The incurring of unnecessary debt would be greatly restricted by the fact that the lender of money had no pecuniary inducement to part with it: he could not extort an exorbitant usury, or even a moderate interest from a needy or spendthrift borrower, and there was also the consideration that, unless he recovered payment within six years, the seventh would see him deprived even of the principal (Deut. xv. 12). And, on the other hand, what a restorative was this septennial extinction of all personal debt to the poor and honest Israelite, who, through adverse fortune or other unforeseen cause, was brought into embarrassed circumstances from which no industry or economy could extricate him. By this provision, however, he was once more a free man, and able to begin the world anew.

This arrangement, which, while it extricated from a trying and sometimes otherwise hopeless position many members of the community, acted no less as a preventive to their entering on a course which, in general, ultimately leads to such results. It was a great preventive of pauperism. Still, as in the ordinary administration of providence, there will be cases of poverty, notwithstanding all the remedies that may be applied to the social system; the next object of the law was to relieve such, and in a way the least hurtful to the feelings of the recipients (Deut. xv. 7-11). In nothing, as already remarked, was the law more distinguished than in its regard to an individual's self-respect. Positive provisions for the wants of the poor were made by the assignation to them of the gleanings of the harvests, of the vineyards, and the oliveyards (Lev. xix. 9, 10; xxiii. 22; Deut. xxiv. 19-21); a right to eat on the spot of the grapes in the vineyard and of the corn in the fields (Deut. xxiii. 24, 25); a share with their brethren in the provisions at the feast of tabernacles (Deut. xvi. 9-11); and a participation with the Levites in the tenth of all the produce of every third year (Deut. xiv. 22-29; xxvi. 12).

Connected with those principles of the constitution, by which, in the year of Jubilee, the original owner resumed possession of his mortgaged inheritance, and by which, on the septennial year, the debtor was released from his obligations, was that which secured personal liberty throughout all the land, and to all its inhabitants. The great statute to this effect was: "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you, and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family," (Lev. xxv. 10). This ensured liberty in its most comprehensive aspect. The regulation respecting the sabbatical year procured liberty to the Hebrew bond-servant; but the Jubilee had respect to all classes and conditions without distinction; every one held in servitude was an object of its regard.¹ Both in this particular, and in matters of property, the Jubilee was the great restorative of the equilibrium of the social system.

These, and other minor regulations of a similar tendency, were admirably adapted to secure the immediate objects at which, as already stated, the Hebrew lawgiver aimed. From the want of some compensating principle in connexion with their Agrarian laws, Greece and Rome, which adopted the scheme of an equal division of land among their citizens, were exposed to fluctuations and inequalities of property, the effect of which was perpetual contests between rich and poor, which finally led to the overthrow of these states. Indeed, any division of property, however just and equitable, would be speedily subverted by power and cupidity on the one hand, and weakness or indiscretion on the other, unless fenced round by some principle which acted alike as a check and a remedy, and the application of which depended on universal and strictly defined rules. Among the Israelites, as well as others, there were those who, in their covetousness, would "join house to house, and lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth," (Isa. v. 8). Here, however, was an effectual bar to such injurious aggran-

¹ Cheever. Judgment of the Old Testament against Slavery; Biblioth. Sac., xiii. 378.

disement, but without interposing any obstacle to the enlargement of the original patrimony by the application of skill and capital, or the expulsion of the Canaanites. The arrangement with respect to succession, moreover, was an admirable mean between the evils of the law of primogeniture and those arising from a continued subdivision of the soil. But if these regulations respecting property were the foundation and a chief stay of the social system, those which so carefully watched over the liberty of the subject constituted its crown. If the one prevented the formation of a class of paupers, the other no less effectually excluded a system of hereditary slavery, which is fitted, more than anything else, to lower the character of the free population, and subvert the best institutions of the State.

§ 3. *Certain Provisions of the Law liable to Misconception.*

Some notice has been already taken of the charges of exclusiveness and intolerance preferred against the Mosaic law; and it has been shown that they have no reality, but rest entirely on a misconception. The charges in question are, in the first place, highly exaggerated; and next, so far as they have any foundation in fact, they formed a necessary part of the system. It has also, in respect to its judicial and criminal enactments, been denounced as severe and Draconian.¹ But allowing—which, however, is far from the truth—that such epithets are applicable, before they can in anywise discredit the law, the objector must first prove that such characteristics were unnecessary in the circumstances, and that measures of a much milder character would equally or more readily accomplish the desired end.

It is the same, also, with regard to the objections of an opposite character, that in many particulars the law was too tolerant to the prejudices and practices of the people; and that it allowed, if it did not sanction, things on which Divine revelation might be expected to pronounce a decisive condemnation. Now, with respect to this, it should be observed, that

¹ In answer to this, see Field, *Humane Features of the Hebrew Law*: Biblioth. Sac., x. 340-366.

a wise legislator considers what have been the past habits of the people, what they will bear, and to what they can be trained. What to an ordinary moralist might seem a perfect policy, would to a Divine mind appear the reverse, on the ground that it would defeat its object, and would, besides, diminish the sense of obligation. Even Rousseau admitted the force of these considerations, and that the excellence of any particular legislation does not always consist in its being the best in itself, but the most suitable for the state for which it was framed. More particularly, however, it will be found, with respect to the Mosaic law, in almost every instance to which exceptions are taken, that a judgment is actually pronounced, if not directly and in the law itself, yet somewhere in the volume of which it forms a part.

1. Such is distinctly the case with respect to the law of marriage; the principles by which it should be governed being clearly established in the account of the origin of the institution at the creation; and even though the law admitted a kind of toleration in regard to polygamy and divorce, every practical mean was taken to check these declared abuses of the divine institution.

An illustration of this, in addition to those already noted, occurs in the salutary restraint to which the law subjected the rude usages of war with respect to female captives, every precaution being taken to protect them from the insolence and brutality of the conquerors, (Deut. xxi. 10-13.) The regulations on this subject served to check that licentiousness which the practices among other nations tolerated by keeping the soldier in a state of restraint for thirty days, during which his captive was unadorned. This allowed the first impulse of passion to subside, and it also respected the grief of the captive for her kindred and the loss of her liberty. A further check was imposed on the fickleness of the captor, by the enactment that any one thus taken to wife, should, if repudiated, be absolutely liberated. How different this from the custom of the heathen, who not only offered every violence to their female captives of war, but, when tired of them, either sold them, or gave them over to their slaves.¹

¹ See Virgil. *Æneid.* iii. 326.

2. It was much the same in the case of slavery. The Pentateuch taught in the most express terms the unity and natural equality of the human race, and the participation of the whole in the blessings to be bestowed through the seed of Abraham. Even the law, which is frequently regarded as so exclusive, looks upon all mankind as brethren. On these grounds, slavery was plainly condemned. But the law went even further than this. Holding property in man was so sanctioned by the usage of the times, and so deeply rooted among the Israelites, that a direct prohibition would be unavailing for the immediate suppression of the evil, and would, in the circumstances, form a mere dead letter, and as such would, as indeed in all similar cases, only injuriously affect the majesty of the whole law; still the enactment on man-stealing (Ex. xxi. 16, 17) forbade slavery in its primary source, and pronounced its condemnation in every aspect;¹ while a most complete and practical remedy for hereditary servitude was supplied by the universal manumission connected with the year of Jubilee.

These and other features of the Mosaic law, so far from being open to objection, or presenting evidence of weakness or imperfection, were, in fact, a proof of its wisdom. This adaptation directly to the circumstances of the people constituted the real strength of the law, while its fundamental principles were fitted to elevate the moral standard and tone of the people to a degree at which the evils would gradually cease of themselves. In a word, the Mosaic law, it thus clearly appears, was not designed for an ideal community, or as a mere theory, but for a peculiarly circumstanced people, subject to the common feelings and weaknesses of humanity, and in addition to all the strong prejudices and passions of Oriental nations.

Evidence of this latter trait in the Israelitish character, and the provision which required to be made for it in the law, is afforded in the regulations on the subject of blood-revenge, and still more in the remarkable ordeal in the case of the

¹ Slavery and the Old Testament: system of slavery." P. 131. So also Jour. Sac. Lit. Ap. 1853, pp. 125-145. Cheever: "This law, in connexion with the other provisions in the Hebrew system, would render slavery impossible."—Bib. Sac. xiii. 43.

a wise legislator considers what have been the past habits of the people, what they will bear, and to what they can be trained. What to an ordinary moralist might seem a perfect policy, would to a Divine mind appear the reverse, on the ground that it would defeat its object, and would, besides, diminish the sense of obligation. Even Rousseau admitted the force of these considerations, and that the excellence of any particular legislation does not always consist in its being the best in itself, but the most suitable for the state for which it was framed. More particularly, however, it will be found, with respect to the Mosaic law, in almost every instance to which exceptions are taken, that a judgment is actually pronounced, if not directly and in the law itself, yet somewhere in the volume of which it forms a part.

I. Such is distinctly the case with respect to the law of marriage; the principles by which it should be governed being clearly established in the account of the origin of the institution at the creation; and even though the law admitted a kind of toleration in regard to polygamy and divorce, every practical mean was taken to check these declared abuses of the divine institution.

An illustration of this, in addition to those already noted, occurs in the salutary restraint to which the law subjected the rude usages of war with respect to female captives, every precaution being taken to protect them from the insolence and brutality of the conquerors, (Deut. xxi. 10-13.) The regulations on this subject served to check that licentiousness which the practices among other nations tolerated by keeping the soldier in a state of restraint for thirty days, during which his captive was unadorned. This allowed the first impulse of passion to subside, and it also respected the grief of the captive for her kindred and the loss of her liberty. A further check was imposed on the fickleness of the captor, by the enactment that any one thus taken to wife, should, if repudiated, be absolutely liberated. How different this from the custom of the heathen, who not only offered every violence to their female captives of war, but, when tired of them, either sold them, or gave them over to their slaves.¹

¹ See Virgil. *Aeneid.* iii. 326.

2. It was much the same in the case of slavery. The Pentateuch taught in the most express terms the unity and natural equality of the human race, and the participation of the whole in the blessings to be bestowed through the seed of Abraham. Even the law, which is frequently regarded as so exclusive, looks upon all mankind as brethren. On these grounds, slavery was plainly condemned. But the law went even further than this. Holding property in man was so sanctioned by the usage of the times, and so deeply rooted among the Israelites, that a direct prohibition would be unavailing for the immediate suppression of the evil, and would, in the circumstances, form a mere dead letter, and as such would, as indeed in all similar cases, only injuriously affect the majesty of the whole law; still the enactment on man-stealing (Ex. xxi. 16, 17) forbade slavery in its primary source, and pronounced its condemnation in every aspect;¹ while a most complete and practical remedy for hereditary servitude was supplied by the universal manumission connected with the year of Jubilee.

These and other features of the Mosaic law, so far from being open to objection, or presenting evidence of weakness or imperfection, were, in fact, a proof of its wisdom. This adaptation directly to the circumstances of the people constituted the real strength of the law, while its fundamental principles were fitted to elevate the moral standard and tone of the people to a degree at which the evils would gradually cease of themselves. In a word, the Mosaic law, it thus clearly appears, was not designed for an ideal community, or as a mere theory, but for a peculiarly circumstanced people, subject to the common feelings and weaknesses of humanity, and in addition to all the strong prejudices and passions of Oriental nations.

Evidence of this latter trait in the Israelitish character, and the provision which required to be made for it in the law, is afforded in the regulations on the subject of blood-revenge, and still more in the remarkable ordeal in the case of the

¹ Slavery and the Old Testament: Jour. Sac. Lit. Ap. 1853, pp. 125-145. "Very clear it is that Moses regarded slavery with aversion. He who put the man-stealer to death seems, by the act, to declare his disapprobation of the

system of slavery." P. 131. So also Cheever: "This law, in connexion with the other provisions in the Hebrew system, would render slavery impossible."—Bib. Sac. xiii. 43.

wife who was suspected by her husband of unfaithfulness, (Num. v. 11-31.)

3. This latter particular, which it will be well to notice first, has been the subject of frequent animadversion ; and though seemingly of a different character from, if not opposed to, the spirit of the law, as exhibited in its other ordinances, it yet occupied an important if not a necessary place among those enactments.

Clearly proved adultery it must be remarked was punishable with death. But cases would occur in which the husband might suspect the fidelity of his wife, without being able to establish her guilt. In these circumstances the parties would live miserably together, or else the husband, acting on his suspicions, perhaps unfounded, would repudiate his wife, who, in any case, was subjected to annoyance, and, if innocent, to injustice, besides having no means whereby she could vindicate her innocence, and remove the suspicions which haunted her husband and destroyed their mutual happiness. To meet such cases a trial was instituted, by which the innocence or guilt of a suspected wife was established beyond all question. The trial of a case of only suspected guilt, and incapable of proof in the ordinary way, could not be other than an ordeal ; and there can be no doubt that the process here instituted, whatever may have been its evils or inconveniences, had a salutary effect in preventing crime, and it is scarcely credible that the really guilty would brave the results here announced, rather than make confession. Another consideration is, that this ordeal, awful as it was to the guilty, was harmless to the innocent, which is more than can be said of many of the practices, as the rack and torture of ancient and even of comparatively modern times, employed for extorting confession. And, finally, as the jealousy of the Orientals has at all times induced them to resort to expedients of the most monstrous and unfair character for the purpose of testing female chastity, it is not at all improbable that the test here prescribed was intended for restraining such practices, as might have sprung from the native superstitions of the Israelites, or they might have learned from the Egyptians. The test may have been retained, because it was unsafe to abolish altogether the safe-guard which in some respects it undoubtedly supplied ; but it was

strictly divested of the cruelties which may at any time have belonged to it.¹

4. With regard to Blood-Revenge again, it was, as already noticed, a usage much older than the law; and although productive of many evils, and altogether opposed to the spirit of Christianity, it was not without a beneficial influence in the early ages of the world, and in an unsettled state of society. Those who have watched the working of this usage in countries where it still prevails, do not hesitate to declare that it is more conducive in checking bloodshed than any other law or institution whatever. Thus, one of the latest travellers in the East: "One of the most remarkable laws in force amongst the wandering Arabs, and one probably of the highest antiquity, is the law of blood, called the 'Thar,' prescribing the degrees of consanguinity within which it is lawful to revenge a homicide. Although a law, rendering a man responsible for bloodshed by any one related to him within the fifth degree, may appear to members of a civilized community one of extraordinary rigour, and involving almost manifest injustice, it must nevertheless be admitted, that no power vested in any one individual, and no punishment, however severe, could tend more to the maintenance of order and the prevention of bloodshed amongst the wild tribes of the Desert. As Burekhardt has justly remarked, 'this salutary institution has contributed in a greater degree than any other circumstance, to prevent the warlike tribes of Arabia from exterminating one another.'"²

The aim of all legislation on the subject has been to limit private feuds of this character. Indeed, there are certain conditions strictly observed by the Arabs, which tend to mitigate this stern usage. In the Koran also are laid down regulations to the same effect. But in no code or custom is there any thing that can be compared to the provisions of the Mosaic law. One important feature was, that it made a marked distinction between the wilful murderer and the involuntary shedder of blood, and provided an asylum, with easy access to it (Deut. xix. 3), from the avenger, until the case was judicially determined, when, if the act was found to have been

¹ Pictorial Bible, i. 391.

² Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, pp. 305, 306.

unpremeditated, the homicide was suffered to continue in the city of refuge. Among the modern Arabs, "three days and four hours are, by immemorial custom, allowed to the fugitives before they can be pursued. Frequently they never return to their friends, but remain with those who give them protection, and become incorporated into the tribe by which they are adopted." But in these cases, "any person within the fifth degree of blood of the homicide, may be legally killed by any one within the same degree of consanguinity to the victim;"¹ whereas the Mosaic law limited the authorized avenger of blood to the nearest relative of the deceased, nor was he allowed to carry the retaliation beyond the actual offender (Deut. xxiv. 16). This latter provision prevented the feud from perpetuating itself, or becoming hereditary, as is the case among the Arabs, where, according to Burekhardt, "the lineal descendants of all those who are entitled to revenge at the moment of the manslaughter inherit the right from their parents. The right of blood-revenge is never lost; it descends on both sides to the latest generation."²

5. On the law of retaliation in general, as presented in the Pentateuch (Ex. xxi. 23, 24), it will be necessary to make a few remarks, as, like other parts of the system, it has been frequently misunderstood.

This has been objected to as productive of hatred and revenge. It might be so only, however, if left to the exercise of private individuals, instead of being, as it really was, a rule of official judgment, by which to apportion the punishment due to personal injuries. Its vindication is found in the circumstance, that it is based on natural equity, and is, indeed, as remarked by Olshausen, "an eternal law in the government of the world." This is seen in the fact, that it accords with the usages of all ancient nations, not only the rude and barbarous, but also the civilized, as the Athenians, and in the Roman laws of the Twelve Tables.³ The law, as it stands in the Mosaic code, is not merely to be regarded as the declaration of a general principle, that whoever has done an injury to another is bound to make suitable reparation for the wrong

¹ Layard, Nin. and Bab., p. 306.

³ Smith's Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq.,

² Notes on the Bedauins, p. 85. Art. *Talio*, p. 1095.

which he has committed,—a principle essential to the safety and good order of society, and, indeed, without which society could not exist,¹ but as announcing the fundamental nature of punishment.² Our Lord's observations on this point (Matt. v. 38, 39) referred not to the equity of the law, but to a perversion of it by the Pharisees, who made it an excuse for revenge and uncharitableness. Christ, in the spirit of love, which is the spirit of the Gospel, pressed on his hearers rather to forego their legal rights than harbour a feeling of vindictiveness.

SEC. III. ISRAEL'S TRAINING FOR THEIR VOCATION.—i. DIRECT INSTRUCTIONS—THE SINAITIC LAW.

Kurtz, *Geschichte des alten Bundes*. ii. 280-295.—Kalisch, *Hist. and Crit. Commentary on Exodus*, pp. 338-376. Lond. 1855.—Fairbairn, *Typology*, ii. 86-195.—Tudor, *The Decalogue viewed as the Christian's Law*. Camb. 1860.

The civil and political exigencies of the Israelitish people were not the only, or even the chief, object of the theocratic constitution—their moral and spiritual training was a more essential element; and it was owing entirely to the relation of their secular institutions to that object that God directly concerned himself with such matters, and that He caused them to have a place in the volume of revelation. It was a chief distinction, and indeed a peculiarity of this constitution and polity, that the moral law constituted its very foundation.

¹ Wines, *Commentaries*, p. 272.

² Thus a public journalist:—"We emphatically protest against the assertion, that the penalty of death is a 'relief of barbarism.' The very reverse is the fact. Nothing is more remarkable in primitive codes of law than the tenderness with which homicide is treated, and the almost universal recognition of the 'wehr-gelt,' by which the worst of crimes was compensated by a sum of money. Private vengeance then did the work of the executioner, and the law was content to compound with the avenger of blood, so as to prevent the death

of one citizen being expiated by that of another. A juster reverence for personal security, and a more comprehensive economy of human life, have led to a return towards the Mosaic jurisprudence. It is utterly vain to trump up a philosophy of punishment, in which the principle of retribution shall have no place. Whatever may be said for the rival theories, it is the idea of retaliation which most readily presents itself to the mind of the criminal, and which justifies his sentence in the eyes of the public."—*TIMES, Leading Article*, Nov. 20, 1860.

This showed that when Jehovah became the temporal King of Israel He did not relinquish his eternal claims to obedience as a moral Governor. He also thus declared, that the object of this relation was something far higher than any temporal benefits to be procured by the subjects of the theocracy. The distinctly moral portion of the law, apart from those enactments which have an indirect moral aim, is particularly important in showing the precise design of the system, in which it occupied so fundamental a place.

§ 1. *Circumstances attending the Promulgation of the Law.*

In the Exodus, and from that to the giving of the law, Jehovah manifested Himself chiefly as the Redeemer of his people, delivering them from the Egyptian bondage, and the difficulties of the Red Sea and the Wilderness. But henceforth He will be their Lawgiver, as well as Redeemer. As Redeemer God had shown his faithfulness and grace, as Lawgiver He will make known his majesty and holiness. The trials to which the people had been exposed, and which were intended to make known to them both their own character and that of God, brought out in strong contrast their natural obduracy and God's truth and grace; but there was needed a further and different trial, lest they should falsely ascribe to their own worthiness God's merciful dealings with them. Hence the Sinaitic manifestation of Divine holiness and majesty, and which, though accompanied with tokens of grace, was so unendurable, that it awakened in the Israelites the first proper feelings of their need of a mediator (Deut. v. 24).¹

It was the same Divine Being who had conversed with Moses at the burning bush (Ex. iii. 2, &c.), who had brought the Israelites out of Egypt, and had hitherto led them by the cloudy pillar (Ex. xiii. 21), that now spoke from Sinai. Moses, in reference to this appearance of Jehovah, afterwards remarked: "He came in the midst of his holy myriads" (Deut. xxxiii. 2). The narrative in Exodus mentions only thunders and lightnings, and the sound as of a trumpet; but whether in these natural causes, employed by Jehovah for announcing his presence, Moses discerned the operations of the heavenly hosts,

¹ Kurtz, Geschichte, ii. 282.

or whether there were other indications of their presence, is uncertain.¹ Yet it is expressly stated in the New Testament, that the law was spoken by angels (Heb. ii. 2), through whose agency it was brought to the people (Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19). But beyond this they had no share in the matter. The *διατάσσειν τὸν νόμον*, the arranging or establishing the law, was exclusively God's affair; all its injunctions proceeded directly from Him,—“And the Lord spoke to Moses;” though He employed the instrumentality of angels. The mediator between God and man was Moses himself; for the words *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου* (Gal. iii. 19) refer to the position which Moses occupied, and of which he himself says: “I stood between Jehovah and you,” (Deut. v. 5). The fact that the law was given by the hand of Moses as a Mediator, proves that the law was not in itself a revelation of the way of obtaining the Divine favour; it rather showed man's alienation from God.²

§ 2. *The Names and Design of the Law.*

The law spoken from Sinai in the audience of all Israel, and afterwards written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, is frequently styled “the ten words,” *עֲשֵׂרֵת הַדְּבָרִים*, (Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13, &c.), from the number of its distinct precepts; and, as the covenant-deed, it is also named “the words of the covenant,” *דְּבָרֵי הַבְּרִית*, (Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13), also “the testimony,” *הָעֵדוּת*, (Ex. xvi. 34; xxv. 21); because, according to Hengstenberg, a revelation of God's judgment against sin, but more probably a testimony of the whole Divine character, perfections, and purposes.³ In the New Testament it is called *ἡ ἐπιτολὰς*, Luke xviii. 20.

That the purpose for which the law was given was one of great importance, may be concluded, not only from the circumstances in which it was promulgated, distinguishing it from every other divine communication ever made to man, but also and chiefly from the care shown as to its authenticity and preservation. With this view it was written, not on the

¹ Hofmann, *Weis. u. Erfül.*, i. 136.

² Brown, *Exposition of Galatians*, p. 152.

³ See above, vol. ii., p. 151.

ordinary materials which sufficed for the other enactments, but on tables of stone, which, for safe keeping, were to be lodged in a receptacle specially prepared for the purpose, and to be kept in the inmost sanctuary.

The primary design of the law, as appears from its being designated "the testimony," was to serve as a revelation of God. This, which was the fundamental object of all Scripture as a record of God's dealings and communications with man, is particularly apparent in the special record on the tables of stone, which may be regarded as the quintessence of Scripture, at least in one great department, a "testimony" of God, and also for Him. As a testimony of God, it made known the kind of dispositions and conduct which He approves of or is displeased with; what He requires and prohibits in his responsible creatures at all times and under all circumstances; and so far it forms the "testimony" of God's own moral character.

It may be admitted that the revelation now given comprehended nothing that was strictly new, or of which man was not cognizant from the beginning, although the principles had not been as here formally enunciated. Indeed, however expressed or arranged under distinct heads, so as to adapt them to man's exigencies or ignorance, arising from a perverse disposition to forget God, the principles are not only invariable, but incapable of addition. They may be forgotten, or greatly perverted by custom and false education, but they cannot be totally obliterated from the human heart. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts," (Rom. ii. 14, 15). In a word, the law showed what God, as Lord over all, required and must necessarily demand of all his moral creatures; at the same time showing them what would secure His favour, and so constitute their own happiness by the right exercise of the powers with which it pleased the Creator to endow them.

As drawn out into the several precepts of the Decalogue, the moral law was exhibited in its specific application to man, and the various relations in which he stands to God and to his fellows; but in itself, and in its essential principles, it

applies equally to all moral creatures, whatever may be the relation which binds them to one another. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself," are rules of permanent and universal application when the relations of parent and child, husband and wife, and the possibility of injury to person, property, or reputation, shall have ceased. But as addressed to the Israelites more directly, the law showed that they, as the covenant people of God, were specially called upon to conform to the righteousness of God, (Rom. x. 3,) and that such was the end of all His dealings with them.

In revealing God's righteousness, the law also revealed man's unrighteousness. It was a testimony for God, as well as of Him, and against the sinner. It was as truly a revelation of man as it was of God. While urging the righteous claims of God on the fallen creature, who, though refusing, and in fact incapable of, true obedience, yet could not be released from the claims preferred, the law exhibited only more clearly the estrangement of the heart from God. "By the law is the knowledge of sin," (Rom. iii. 20). When it comes into contact with the sinner's consciousness, he feels not only his inability, but also his unwillingness to conform to the Divine requirements. While therefore the primary, and indeed the proper design of the law, as testifying of God and His righteousness, is to check sin and all innate tendency to transgression, such is the perverseness of man's will, and its indisposition to submit to restraint, that the commandment only excites sin into exercise, while at the same time it condemns, by an appeal to conscience enlightened in respect to duty through the law. Instead, therefore, of being a testimony to which the possessors of the law could appeal as evidence of their having implemented their calling, it was a witness against them, awakening a consciousness of guilt, and of the inadequacy of all human efforts to satisfy the Divine claims.

This, indeed, was plainly intimated by Moses to the people trembling before Sinai, and entreating that henceforth God would speak to them only through a mediator: "Fear not: for God is come to prove you, and that his fear may be before your faces that ye sin not." (Exod. xx. 20.) The feelings produced in

the people of their unfitness for direct communication with God, the natural consequence of the law, would have taught them the import and necessity of the charge given before its promulgation. "And the Lord said to Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day," (Ex. xix. 10, 11). This, again, prepared for the ceremonial ordinances, which were superadded to the law.

It was thus, as revealing man to himself, making known to him his true character and his relation to God, who, he was powerfully reminded, was entitled to love and obedience, that the law was a preparation for the further discoveries which God was pleased to make of His own character and of His intentions to fallen man.¹ And hence the terms in which St. Paul characterises the law as "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones," and "the ministration of condemnation" (2 Cor. iii. 7, 9), in his own case productive of death (Rom. vii. 9), and yet serving as a "schoolmaster (*παιδαγωγός*) to bring us to Christ" (Gal. iii. 24). As a testimony against sin and sinners, the whole law is thus spoken of by Moses: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness (*ᾠμῶν*) against thee: for I know thy rebellion," (Deut. xxxi. 26, 27).

While, however, thus condemning the transgressor, and demanding perfect and universal obedience, which it made no provision to secure, there were also, though not in the law itself, yet in the circumstances in which it was promulgated from Sinai, if not a provision for its fulfilment, yet, at least, certain intimations of such. This appears, first, in the introductory statement, in which God declares his relation to Israel, and recounts what in that relation He had already done for them: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Ex. xx. 2). This deliverance was but a means to a higher end, and that again was no other than the realisation in the Israelites of the privileges and corresponding duties implied in the

¹ Keil, Bib. Archäologie, § 21, p. 112.

relation sustained by those whose God was Jehovah—the Creator and Redeemer of his people.

That there was a provision of grace connected with the law is further apparent from the directions subsequently given regarding the receptacle in which the law should be deposited. “And thou shalt make a mercy-seat (כַּפֹּרֶת) of pure gold. . . . and thou shalt put the mercy-seat above, upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony (עֵדוּת) that I shall give thee; and there 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” (Ex. xxv. 17, 21, 22). The truths symbolically exhibited in this arrangement have been considered in another connexion. It is enough to add to those observations that by the depositing of the law in the ark within the sanctuary, the ceremonial institutions were connected with the moral requirements in a manner which plainly declared not only the import but the necessity of the former as a gracious provision for man's shortcomings with respect to the latter. The “law of commandments contained in ordinances,” as the ceremonial law is styled (Eph. ii. 15), was concentrated in the sanctuary, and this itself was further concentrated in the ark of the covenant and its relative parts, which formed the very resting-place and security of the law as a testimony for righteousness by an arrangement which showed that an agreement had been effected between the matters regarding which the law testified, however irreconcilable they may have antecedently appeared. There was thus evidence that “there is forgiveness with God that He may be feared,” and that He is “just while justifying the ungodly.” Without anticipating the consideration of this, which will form the subject of a subsequent section, it may be observed that the ceremonial institutions were thus partly subservient to the righteousness required of the Old Testament worshippers, and partly conducive to the ulterior end of directing them to Him who, according to the New Testament, “is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth” (Rom. x. 4).

§ 3. *The Perfection and Spirituality of the Law.*

Besides the recension of the Decalogue in Ex. xx., there is another, somewhat varied, in Deut. v. The differences, however, are only of a formal character. Thus, the fourth commandment, in Deut. v. 12, begins with זָכוֹר, instead of זָכוֹר; reference is made in ver. 12, 15, 16, to God's command, as formerly given, and so it is made apparent that the object of Moses here was not formally to recapitulate the law, but rather to recal attention to it. Further, the reason for the Sabbatic institution is in Deuteronomy the Egyptian deliverance, instead of the rest of God in creation (Ex. xx. 11). But the two reasons are not essentially different. "The Sabbath of Israel connects itself with the redemption from Egypt only so far as by this act Israel, freed from the dominion of the world, is made the peculiar property of Jehovah, and therewith, even amid the trouble and labour of the world, participates in the holy rest of his God."¹ In the fifth commandment, ver. 16, there are two additions: the one a reference to the first promulgation of the law; the other an enlargement of the promise given at Sinai. The chief variation, however, is in the tenth commandment, ver. 18, but it is not so much in substance as in the arrangement.

The division of the law as to its precepts, and the two tables, is a point of much difficulty, and has led to considerable diversity of opinion. 1. The first commandment has been taken to be the words, "I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt;" the second commandment, to include the prohibitions against other gods, and serving images; and the tenth, the two clauses relating to covetousness. This arrangement, which was known to the emperor Julian, is commonly recognised by the modern Jews. 2. The first commandment is the precept against idolatry; the second, that against image worship; the tenth, that with respect to covetousness. This division was received by Philo, Josephus, and Origen, and by all the Greek and Latin fathers down to Augustin, and is that generally adopted by Protestant

¹ Baumgarten, Theol. Commentar, ii. 443.

theologians. 3. The precepts against idolatry and image worship are conjoined to form the first commandment; while that against covetousness divided into two forms the ninth and tenth. Traces of this division appear in Clement of Alexandria; but its proper defender was Augustin, whose influence procured it acceptance in the West. It is, in a modified form, the arrangement of the Romish and Lutheran churches.

It is fatal to the first of these divisions, that the introductory words contain nothing in the form of a command, and that to constitute a precept at all, they must be connected with the succeeding sentence: "Thou shalt have no other God before me." The advocates of the other views rely much on their accordance, as they respectively hold, with the most ancient Jewish and Christian tradition. But this evidence is, on either side, very indistinct. There is nothing in the Old Testament indicative of a numerical designation taken from the order of the precepts in the decalogue; and although there are intimations of this kind in the New Testament (Matt. v. 27, 28; xix. 18, &c.; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20; 1 Tim. i. 9, &c.; Rom. vii. 7; xiii. 9), yet they are not decisive. The Masoretic arrangement of the Hebrew text into paragraphs is equally unsatisfactory, for on this point the MSS. are exceedingly conflicting.

The only resource is the internal evidence supplied by the character of the Decalogue itself. The first question is, Did the worship of other gods, and of images, constitute, in the view of Moses, one or two distinct ideas? It is generally held that the command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (עַל-פָּנַי), refers to the worship of other gods, as Baal; while the words, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image (פְּסִלִים), or any likeness which is in heaven . . . thou shalt not bow down to them (וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּה לָהֶם, to worship), nor serve them," forbid the worship of Jehovah under the image or symbol of any creature. But Kurtz, from his Lutheran point of view, maintains that, however the ideas may have been separated in theory, it was otherwise in practice; and therefore that it does not follow that the law did not comprehend such image worship with idolatry proper in one command-

ment. No doubt it would be an erroneous assumption to limit the latter precept to a prohibition of symbolical images of God, to the exclusion of images of idols; but the chief distinction between the two precepts is, that the former is universal, and strikes at the root of idolatry, the latter refers chiefly to the various forms in which it manifests itself, and sometimes ostensibly as the worship of Jehovah. The only argument of any weight which Kurtz adduces is, that the announcements of a curse and a blessing (Ex. xx. 5, 6) upon children and children's children would, if ver. 4 begins an independent precept, be limited to one particular,—the worship of images, and not embrace idolatry in general, which they plainly concern.¹

This and other points, however, must yield to the preponderating evidence in favour of the unity of the precept forbidding covetousness. Viewed externally, the repetition of the words, "Thou shalt not covet," in Exodus twice, לֹא-תַחְמֹד, in Deut. לֹא-תַחְמֹד, and לֹא תַתְאָוֶה, conveys the impression of their being two commandments, but this is quite opposed to the contexts. That the idea expressed by the terms, "Thou shalt not covet," however multiplex the objects of desire, is essentially one, is shown by the fact, that these objects are differently arranged in the parallel passages. If the order in Deuteronomy, where the "wife" is first, were, as assumed by Augustin, the original and authentic one, the view that there are here two commandments, would receive some countenance from the general arrangement of the Decalogue as respects its second table, where injury to a neighbour follows in this order,—injury to his person, to his marriage-state, to his property; next is forbidden injury by word, affecting character; and finally, irregular, sinful desires, whereby a man may be disturbed in the possession and enjoyment of the things bestowed upon him by God. The sinful desire is parallel to the injury done in act to a man's rights; but of the three objects against which a wicked act may be directed,—person, marriage, property,—only the two latter can, from the nature of the case, be regarded as objects of covetousness. The ninth commandment, in this arrangement corresponding to the sixth,

¹ Geschichte d. alt. Bundes, ii. 288.

forbids any desire after the conjugal rights of another; and the tenth, corresponding to the seventh, every desire after his rights of property.

The order in Exodus is decisive against this argument; for as the properly statutory recension it must have unconditional preference. The very fact, then, that the order of the objects of desire differs in the two passages, is itself decisive that the precepts relating to them, form but one commandment. In Exodus, *house* is the universal, comprehending the whole family and household concerns. To this Kurtz objects: "That the house is not here viewed in the wider sense, but in its proper signification, appears from this, that in the wider sense it frequently and often exclusively includes objects, sons and daughters, which cannot be objects of forbidden desire, or of endeavour to become possessed of them."¹ But this rests on an entire misapprehension of the nature of the sin forbidden. St. Paul sums up the whole commandment in the words: "I had not known lust (sinful desire) had not the law said, Thou shalt not covet." (Rom. vii. 7.) Again, after the precept, "Thou shalt not bear false witness," the same apostle adds, "Thou shalt not covet," (Rom. xiii. 9), thus comprising, as plainly as words can express it, the whole subject of covetousness in one commandment.

The division of the Decalogue, according to the two tables, is also variously taken. That the first table embraced the duties owing to God, and the second those that relate to man has never been questioned. The only dispute is how far the first class really extends—Philo divided the law into two pentades, including in the first the precept requiring the honouring of parents—a view still taken by many,² on the supposition that parents were regarded as the representatives of God, as was certainly the case with respect to rulers (Ex. xxii. 27, [28]). It is also urged, that as the sum of the second table was, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," (Matt. xxii. 39), this cannot have included the precepts as to parents, since they do not belong to the class of neighbours which denotes equality.

In opposition to this, it may be remarked—1. That in the

¹ Geschichte d. Alt. Bundes, ii. 291.

² Hengstenberg, Authentie, E. T., ii. 496; Fairbairn, Typology, ii. 97.

commands which respect God, there is no direct promise annexed, while particular notice is taken of the fact that the precept enjoining the honouring of parents is "the first commandment with a promise," (Eph. vi. 2.) 2. The relation which governed the second table, was the universal one—"Ye are the children of the Lord your God," (Deut. xiv. 1,) which not only included the parental relation, but also gave a higher sanction to the duties incumbent on children to their parents, (comp. 1 Tim. v. 4.)

The preceding observations on the arrangement of the Decalogue bear partially on its perfection, which, however, both as a revelation of God and as a rule of conduct, requires further illustration. The excellency of the law in these respects appears, First, in the fact, that by its discovery is presented the true nature and foundation of moral obligation. This is a subject which has given rise to innumerable and conflicting theories, both in ancient and modern times. In the Pentateuch, however, and in the promulgation of the law from Sinai, all disputations are set aside by reference to an infallible standard, which is clearly shown to be the will of the Supreme Governor, the principle which pervades the volume of revelation, presenting in this, as in other instances, the utmost harmony, expressed in such statements as, "sin is the transgression of the law," (1 John iii. 4), and "where there is no law there is no transgression," (Rom. iv. 15)—a principle no less agreeable to reason and sound philosophy.¹ It was the character of the Lawgiver that determined the law, which is thus a reflex of the Eternal Mind in its delights and desires.

The perfection of the law is further shown in its full and explicit declarations of the duties owing to God and man. With regard to its fundamental character and its comprehensiveness, our Lord, after summing up the moral law into the two principles of love to God and love to man, remarked: "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," (Matt. xxii. 40); while in His sermon on the Mount He expounded the depth of meaning in the several commandments, and vindicated them from the superficiality of the Jewish expositors, in a way which demonstrated not only that the law was of God, but that He Himself was the promised

¹ Wardlaw, *Christian Ethics*, p. 119. Lond. 1852.

Teacher sent from God, the Prophet like unto Moses, seeing that he penetrated so deeply into the spirit of the old legislation.

The perfection of the law was symbolically represented by the fact that the second exemplar, or the writing on the renewed tables, was an exact copy of the first, without addition or amendment, nor was there any lowering of its standard in consideration of the proved weakness of the people. (Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. x. 2). The breaking of the first tables symbolized Israel's breach of covenant, while God's willingness to renew the writing was a token of His readiness for reconciliation, in accordance with the announcement which preceded the act, (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7).¹

The great perfection of the law, however, was its spirituality. The allegation that only external conformity was required under the Mosaic economy, however confidently urged, is destitute of all foundation. That it appealed to man's moral constitution, and regarded the inward affections no less than the outward and overt acts, is proved by the Decalogue having been made its entire foundation, and the spirituality of which is beyond controversy.

The sanction of the Decalogue is entirely Divine. There is no reference in it to human instrumentality for enforcing its observance. No doubt, in one aspect, many of the precepts regard crimes which necessarily come under the cognizance of the civil power, and are treated as such in express statutes. This is common, indeed, to all administration, although, from the peculiar nature of the Israelitish constitution, it extended its care to such cases of transgression farther than is practicable, or indeed justifiable, under any other system. But in the Decalogue itself not a single reference appears to any punishments or promises, save those of God. On the contrary, it expressly makes the fear and love of God the foundation of obedience. On the creature's relation to God as Creator and Redeemer, the preamble rests the obligation of all the commandments, (Ex. xx. 2); *love* to God is declared to be the keeping of the law, (ver. 6); while the ground of

¹ Other conclusions have been deduced from this transaction, (Dove, Edin. 1856,) but they are very questionable. Logic of Christian Faith, pp. 359-364.

transgression is stated to be hatred of Him, (ver. 5). With this fully agrees the testimony of Christ and his apostles. The morality of the Gospel, whatever may be alleged to the contrary,¹ is not different from or superior to that of the Decalogue. Christ came not to abrogate or supersede the law, but to fulfil it, (Matt. v. 17-19), and he declared that perfect obedience to this law would have secured eternal life, (Matt. xix. 17-19); whereas if the law were not spiritual, it could have no bearing on salvation. St. Paul states distinctly that "the law is spiritual," (Rom. vii. 14); and that it is not through any defect in the law that it cannot bestow salvation, but only from the sinner's incapacity to fulfil its requirements.

Not merely the Decalogue, or moral law properly so called, the entire Mosaic legislation, which may be regarded as its exposition and application, has pre-eminently a moral aspect, notwithstanding its apparent outwardness. The two commandments of love to God and man are shown to comprehend all the rest. The *command*, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," occurs in Lev. xix. 18; and the other, to love God, is reiterated in Deuteronomy as the fulfilling of the whole law, (Deut. vi. 4; x. 12; xi. 1, 13; xiii. 3; xxx. 16, 20). If, then, everything in the law is thus based on love, it is plain that a dead outward service cannot comport with its spirit. Transgression of the law is, on the other hand, said to arise from "an uncircumcised heart," (Lev. xxvi. 41; comp. Deut. x. 16,)—a figure of deep significance to an Israelite, from its connexion with the initiatory rite of the covenant, and the national constitution.

Besides, there are numerous passages in the law inculcating kindness and brotherly charity not merely to fellow-Israelites, but also to strangers and aliens, and all who were in distress, which are entirely of a moral character, having no judicial value. The whole of Lev. xix., where the command, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," is developed in particulars, is in a high degree of a purely moral character. And even the

¹ Thus Whately: "Not only does the Gospel require a morality in many respects higher and more perfect in itself than the Law, but it places morality, universally, on higher grounds."—Essays, 2d Ser., p. 121. 6th Ed., Lond. 1849.

judicial law contains largely elements of this kind. "Everything judicial is much more moral; and the moral, which is also judicial, is connected with that which is not heard at the tribunal of a human judge, so that the judicial retains no mere statute-like character."¹ But apart from all other considerations, the presence of the one command, "Thou shalt not covet," alone distinguishes the Mosaic code from every other system, and determines alike its Divine origin and purpose. There was no such restriction in the ordinances of Lycurgus or Solon, the Twelve Tables, or the Institutes of Justinian, or any other since their times, because the secrets of the heart are not cognisable by human tribunals.

§ 4. *The Perpetuity of the Law.*

From the nature of the law as an expression of the will of God, and of his unalienable claims upon his moral creatures, its perpetuity follows as a necessary consequence. This, however, various parties would set aside, on the ground of some statements in the New Testament on which it will be necessary to remark.

Christ and his apostles express themselves no doubt variously about the authority of the law, but their statements admit of easy reconciliation. Thus Christ declares: "Think not that I am come to destroy (*καταλῆσαι*, as used of law, "to repeal," John x. 35) 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 (even its apparently unessential parts) shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled," (Matt. v. 17, 18). No testimony, especially in the circumstances in which it was given, could be stronger than this to the perpetuity of the law. At the time these words were uttered, there was a general feeling that something new was manifesting itself, that a Prophet and Lawgiver had appeared; it was therefore highly important for Christ, in order to prevent misapprehension, to indicate precisely his relation to the older economy. "Hence," as Olshausen remarks, "Christ here declares the intimate connexion between the Old and

¹ Hengstenberg, *Authentic*, E. T., ii. 501.

New Testament in a manner which must have excluded all mistake on the point. First of all, the Old Testament is described as inviolable in itself; then the New Testament is regarded as the completion of the Old; and lastly, in this completion the law is declared to be of Divine and eternal authority." Much to the same effect are various apostolic statements; as the exhortation, "not to speak evil of the law, or to judge it, but to fulfil it," (James ii. 1, 2); and in answer to the question, "Do we then make void the law through faith?" the reply, "God forbid; yea, we establish the law," (Rom. iii. 21). But then there are other statements in apparently different terms. St. Paul intimates, for instance, that believers are in a different state with respect to the law from those who lived under the former dispensation. "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter," (Rom. vii. 6); and he speaks of the law as "not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient," (1 Tim. i. 9).

For reconciling these statements nothing is gained by making a distinction between the moral and the ceremonial or judicial law; and assuming that the passages which ascribe a permanency to the law relate to the former, while those which speak of its abrogation apply only to the latter. No doubt the term "law" has various significations in the New Testament: being used of the law proper, or the moral law, and in a wider sense, of the judicial and ceremonial law, or the system of which these were parts. The specific import of the term can therefore be settled only from the context; but there is no question that in the passages which it is alleged intimate the abrogation of the law, the whole law is meant, and in particular the moral as the more important part of it. This is clearly the case in 1 Tim. i. 9, where the specification of various transgressions of moral duties shows that the statement had not reference solely, if at all, to the ceremonial, however it may apply to judicial ordinances.

It is on the distinction as to the mode of the law's obli-

¹ Bialloblotzky. Cyc. Bib. Lit., Art. the Law: Essays, Second Series, pp. 112-134. To the same effect are the views of Whately. The Abolition of

gation, and not as to its matter, that those conflicting testimonies turn; but still the distinction is not between its *nomothetical* and *didactical* power. To say that only in the latter character has it a place in the Gospel, is virtually to abolish its character as law. It were to "judge the law," and not to fulfil it, if men are free to refuse obedience to it, save so far as its precepts approve themselves to their judgment and moral consciousness. This reduces the authority of "the law" very much to the level of mere human legislation: if it does not even make man's views paramount in the matter.

The source of this and other mistakes consists in, (1.) Assuming that the law given to Israel was new, or unknown before its promulgation from Sinai, whereas it was as old as the moral creation itself, forming the very order of being in such a creation. (2.) Confounding what was merely formal in the law as given to Israel, and put into a covenant form, whereby new motives for obedience were superinduced on its original and universal sanctions, with its essential principles and necessary claims. In the words, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt," which precede the legal formula, "Thou shalt," &c., there is an additional claim to obedience; but this by no possibility annulled the original obligation. It was not a new motive substituted for an old and obsolete one; it was in reality a further obligation to that which arose from the relation of Creator and creature. This additional claim on obedience is of the same character as the additional and specific promise made to obedience in the fifth commandment. (3.) Confounding the motives to obedience with the claims which exact it. Thus it is said: "The characteristic of the doctrine of Christ does not consist in new laws given, but rather in the forgiveness offered for past transgressions, and in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, promised to his true disciples. The authority of the Holy Spirit is described in the Gospel of John, and in the Epistle to the Romans, as superior to the letter of the law. Whosoever is filled with this Spirit is not under the law, although he fulfils the holy aim and intention of the law."¹ The fallacy here seems to be, that increased motives to, or capacities for, obedience, suspend or abrogate the claims of the

¹ Cyc. Bib. Lit., ii. 233.

law, instead of, as is really the case, honouring them. There can be, it would seem almost unnecessary to remark, no authority superior to the declared will of God; though there are agencies apart from the law for inducing compliance to that will; and certainly the highest agency is the Spirit, but not irrespective of, or in antagonism to, the law, but commending it to the conscience as not only "holy, just, and good," but as the will of a heavenly Father.

A complete refutation of all such errors will be found in the language in which the Scriptures determine the nature of sin and its relation to the law: "Sin is the transgression of the law," ἡ ἀνομία (1 John iii. 4). "The expression," Müller observes, "stands in the connexion of an argument against the low opinion, which regarded the obligation to keep the divine law in general, but at the same time made allowance for many sinful practices, because perhaps they did not happen to be expressly forbidden in the letter of the Ten Commandments. Against this impure disposition of mind the apostle inculcates in the preceding words, 'Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law,' the truth that the law is not satisfied with a half obedience, but demands a perfect purity of will and conduct. The blameworthiness of everything sinful, as opposed to the ἀγνόν εἶναι, ver. 3, he brings to light, by showing it to be in contradiction to the divine law. When John adds to the sentence, 'Whosoever committeth sin also transgresseth the law,' this other one, 'and sin is the transgression of the law,' he intends thereby to determine the notion of sin—'and the nature of sin consists in this, that it is recusancy against the law.' The first clause, taken alone, might be understood to say, that the separation from the law was only one individual moment in the notion of sin; the second clause, therefore, determines the thought more exactly, by making the two ideas exegetical of each other."¹ The other Biblical designations of sin are to the same effect. Besides ἀνομία, which means "lawlessness," or "violation of law," and then sin or iniquity (Matt. xxiii. 28; Rom. iv. 7; vi. 19), there is ἀμαρτία (1 Cor. xv. 3; Heb. iv. 15), and παράβασις (Gal. iii. 19); and in Hebrew חַטָּאת (from חָטָא, *i. q.* הִטָּא, to turn

¹ Doctrine of Sin, E. T. i. 40.

aside), "transgressors" (Hos. v. 2), and its Aramaic form, מִטְּוִי, (Ps. ci. 3); חַטָּאִי (from חָטָא, to err from the way), which, however, in the law, denotes only a particular kind of sin (Lev. iv. 2); Num. xv. 27) So also חָטָא and חָטָאָה, from חָטָא, to miss the mark; and חָטָא (from חָטָא), the crooked, perverted, as deviating from the right rule of the law.

In apostolic times errors of a dangerous character prevailed respecting the nature and design of the law, threatening the very foundation of the Gospel, and the correcting of which was the object evidently aimed at by the terms of disparagement applied to the law. Nor is it to be overlooked that, as plainly shown in the New Testament, the law had various ends, and sustained a different relation to those who rejected its authority from that in which it stood towards the obedient. Now, it is conceivable that believers, who, through Christ their Head, have satisfied all the law's demands, may be viewed in another relation to it from that occupied by others; and this is, in fact, what is stated in the passages alleged to intimate the abrogation of the law. Thus it is that believers are said to be dead to the law, and the law dead to them. "I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God" (Gal. ii. 19). "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, to him that is raised from the dead; that ye should bring forth fruit unto God. . . . But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held" (Rom. vii. 4, 6). Here is a complete cessation from dependence on the law as a ground of justification, and a persuasion that through union with Christ the law had no condemnatory aspect to believers. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13).

Another aspect in which believers are represented as free from the law, or in which they are not under it, but under grace, respects the means of their sanctification. With this, more than any other, is associated misconceptions as to the obligation of the law. "Sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Rom. vi. 14). In sanctification the law is the rule but not the

source of holiness. Believers are placed not in a covenant of legal obedience, which can hold out no help save the bare command, the only effect of which is to convince of sin, but in one of justification by faith, and with the promise of the indwelling Spirit, and are thus the subjects of a higher law—that of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (Rom. viii. 2); higher, not because more authoritative, but because a living agency empowered to help all infirmities and heal all diseases. Grace as distinct from the law operates in the way described, inasmuch as it puts and maintains the believer in possession of the promises which furnish strength against sin and temptation (2 Pet. i. 4). Further, it makes such discoveries of the nature of sin and of holiness as induces hatred to the one and delight in the other. And, above all, it keeps the soul in union with Christ, the source of life and holiness. But though brought under the law of love, and so raised above the law of terror, still it is a state “not without law to God, but under the law to Christ” (1 Cor. ix. 21). It is a state in which the law is no longer felt to be a restraint or an abridgment of liberty; and, consequently, there is no desire to be relieved from it, even were that possible. The soul is above the law when thus under it, so free is its motion amidst the precepts, that it may be said that the law was not made for such a one. It must not be overlooked, however, that the law had an important part in producing such a result.

Other passages which speak of the “disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof” (Heb. vii. 18), or, in similar terms, appear from the context to refer only to the ceremonial law, which is characterised as “a carnal commandment” (ver. 16), “the law of commandments contained in ordinances” (Eph. ii. 15), “imposed until the time of reformation” (Heb. ix. 9), and “abolished in Christ’s flesh” (Eph. ii. 15). In respect to this class of statements there is nothing of an opposite character—nothing to indicate that the law referred to was other than preparatory to a better dispensation. But it is otherwise with the notices respecting the moral law; for however express the alleged intimations of its abrogation may seem, there are others of an opposite character, corroborated moreover by all the considerations deducible from the nature of law in general, and the

response which it finds in the conscience: so that the apparent contradiction in these statements is plainly referable to the various ends of the law.

The law which remains, and that which was abolished, were closely connected in the Israelitish economy, but still essentially different as to their origin and design. The ceremonial law originated only with the fall and the Divine provision for the restoration of man. It pointed to and terminated in Christ. Not so the law of creation, which the fall violated, but could not annul. That event neither changed the law's character, nor lessened its claims upon the sinner: and when God mercifully interposed, it was not by reducing the law to the level of the transgressor, but by raising him to a position where he could cheerfully render obedience to all its requirements; and if in the kingdom of the blessed law will be in a manner unknown, it is because, from the full spontaneity of its subjects to the will of God, feelings of an authoritative restraint are entirely unknown.

§ 5. *The Penalty of the Law.*

Law, in order to maintain its authority, must be accompanied by a penalty for transgression. It is this which gives a character to law as distinct from a mere advice or exhortation, and the nature of the penalty indicates the Lawgiver's estimate of the rule which he has established. Laws of a purely arbitrary character, not founded on the natural distinctions of right and wrong implanted in the human constitution, can, of course, have only an arbitrary penalty, and so may fail in convincing the transgressor of wrong. But however this may be in human legislation, the laws of God are not the arbitrary expressions of will, but the reflection of His own unchangeable character in the constitution of the physical and moral creation. The transgression of any of these laws is an infringement on the order of the universe: the adjustment of the parts of which is such that violence done to one extends into all its relations. As the minutest perturbation, if unchecked, would, ultimately, produce utter confusion in the physical system, so similar results, though not so appreciable to human calculations, would, from one act of sin, follow in the moral econo-

my; for it is only in subordination to the universal law that any creature can answer the end of its being, whether it be a material atom, or a reasoning mind. And as in the physical world transgression brings directly along with it its necessary punishment without any extraordinary intervention of the Lawgiver; so also in the moral world sin is not only the transgression of the law, but is in itself the penalty of transgression. When Scripture declares that "the wages of sin is death," this is no arbitrary sanction, but a necessary truth; so that those who cavil at this penalty only manifest ignorance of the subject; while its defence should be rested not on the principle that sin is an infinite evil, because committed against an infinite Being, but on the Scriptural view that death, as the punishment of sin, is not a foreign adjunct but a natural consequence of departure from the law of being; and so was the penalty of transgression under all the dispensations.

Death was the penalty of transgression from the commencement of moral law on the earth. To the words, "Thou shalt," and "Thou shalt not," which first announced the operation of that law, there was added an intimation that disobedience should inevitably and instantaneously be followed by death. The declaration, as befitted the character of the Lawgiver, and the occasion on which it was uttered, was explicit, and at the same time a considerate premonition of the danger of any departure from the path of rectitude. That it exhibited no unfriendly disposition towards the party addressed, must appear at once when it is seen that transgression, from its very nature, would produce the same result irrespective of any formal preintimation of the penalty. When, on the violation of this charge, the state of innocence ceased, and God interposed to avert the evil incurred, the law, in order to preserve its integrity, must have attached to it the same declaration even in the state of grace: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," (Ezek. xviii. 4), only expressing in general terms what had originally been addressed to the representative of the human race. And as in the Levitical, so also in the Christian, dispensation, "the wages of sin is death," (Rom. vi. 23), showing that, as there could be no modification of the law itself, there has been no mitigation of its penalty.

When death is spoken of in this connexion, it must be understood primarily, not in a physical, but spiritual relation, for only in the latter aspect is it the direct result of transgression; physical death being only superadded by an after arrangement, applicable only to man, whereas death as the penalty of moral transgression, extended to all moral creatures. Death, in the Scriptural sense, is the estrangement of the soul from God—a disruption from the central source of light and life, and a consequent exposure to all the consequences of that abnormal state. On the disruption of the ties which connected the creature with the Creator, other relations ensued; so that it is not merely the deprivation of all good, but also exposure to all evil, which constitutes the death of a moral being; many of the latter elements, however, being accidental,—dependent on time, place, or other circumstances. Such may, in a measure, be the character of man's physical sufferings, which, though the effects of transgression, are not altogether of an absolutely penal, but in part of a remedial character; yet so intimate is the relation of the physical and moral in man's constitution, that it is only in a limited sense that his physical disorganization can be termed other than necessary.

While, however, the very existence of law necessarily implies a penalty on transgression, it is not absolutely requisite that pre-intimation should be given of the specific punishment which disobedience merited. Where obedience is rightfully due, it should be yielded on that consideration alone, and not from a calculation of the evils to result from disobedience; still a government careful of the safety of its subjects will provide for the proper promulgation of its laws, and of the evils attaching to their violation. This was particularly shown in God's procedure with man; and it is from an entire perversion of the matter that the monstrous objection is advanced against the Biblical narrative of the fall, that the primal threatening itself was partly responsible for the sad result, because so pointedly reminding of the imposed restraints.

Man was created a moral being, and so placed under the restraints of that law; obedience was required, and recusancy would be punished, though he might never have heard of any express command or any specific penalty, otherwise than from the monitions of conscience, while the penalty would, under any

circumstances, be death. That the obedience was to be tested by a particular object—the mere avoidance of a very indifferent act, and that the consequences of disobedience were so fully set forth, showed only the benevolence of the Lawgiver, however it might be perverted and made subservient to the temptation. That the penalty was independent of its previous announcement, follows, not only from the considerations already referred to, but from the fact that in the republication of the law from Sinai, no mention is made of the penalty, although it is repeatedly referred to in the accompanying legislation. There are indeed one or two expressions of God's disposition towards particular kinds of sin and acts of obedience, but with this exception the law merely enjoined compliance with its several commands, without stating the consequences which should result from its transgression.

These considerations have an important bearing on the question as to the primary sanction of the theocracy, which is often erroneously assumed to have been only temporal rewards and punishments. These had respect, however, as already shown,¹ solely to the community which, as having only a temporal existence, it is plain could be affected in no other way; and, therefore, in a system of law occupied so largely with such relations, they came more prominently into view. As respected the individual and a personal relation to that law which formed the foundation of the theocracy, the spiritual and eternal sanction was, if not so explicitly stated, by no means doubtfully implied. The whole previous revelations of God, exhibiting the walk and the reward of faith, were embodied in the theocratic code, and the ideas of death and life were seen from the earliest experience to extend beyond things present and temporal. And under the theocracy itself is not the question put beyond doubt by such a statement as this: "Ye shall do my judgments, and keep my ordinances, to walk therein: I am the Lord your God. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments; which, if a man do, he shall live in them: I am the Lord?" (Lev. xviii. 4, 5; comp. Rom. x. 5, Gal. iii. 12)—a charge to the community urged by the very sanction which properly applied to the individual.

¹ See above, vol. ii., pp. 119, 120.

SECT. IV. ISRAEL'S TRAINING FOR THEIR VOCATION.—ii. THE INSTRUCTION CONVEYED BY THE THEOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND ORDINANCES.

Hottinger, *Juris Hebræorum Leges CCLXI.* Tiguri, 1655.—Lowman, *A Rational of the Hebrew Worship.* Lond. 1748.—Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus.* Hagæ, 1686.—Witsius, *Ægyptiaca.* Amstel. 1683.—Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus,* 2 vols. Heidelb. 1837, 1839.—Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses.* E. T. Edin. 1845.—Kurtz, *Beiträge zur Symbolik des alt-testamentlichen Cultus.* Leip. 1851.—Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters,* Pt. iv. Camb. 1859.

That the Israelitish constitution had in its various ordinances and arrangements, chiefly a religious aim is so self-evident, as not to need discussion. Nor is this, indeed, questioned by the most strenuous impugners of the system. On the contrary, the complaint is, that every thing else is subordinated to religion, which is continually made to lend its sanction to matters exceedingly unimportant, if not altogether trifling. Waiving for the present the consideration of such objections, there is in this evidently religious purpose one reason, at least, why the system should claim to be the product of revelation. Mere social and civil institutions needed not, it is conceivable, a special Divine interposition to originate or recommend them; their fitness, in the peculiar circumstances of the people, would, it may be supposed, be easily recognised. Nor is this less applicable to the great principles of moral obligation, which, originally written on the human conscience, were legible by the light of reason, notwithstanding its gross perversion; though even in respect to this the framing of such a document as the Decalogue, so orderly, so brief, but comprehensive, was a work which obviously demanded more than ordinary powers. But it is in regard to religious truths in the stricter sense, and the mode of worship suitable to God, that there is, it will be allowed, special need of Divine guidance. This is evident, were it only from the various and revolting forms of heathenism. It is also a principle fully recognised in Scripture itself, from the first notice of Divine worship (Gen. iv. 4) down to the close of the volume (Rev. xxii. 9); while in the Theocracy it produced a system in which almost every act was regulated

by statute, and was otherwise so complex and rigid as to have occasioned various prejudices with respect to that economy. An examination of the system itself in its essential features, and of the causes to which it owed its peculiar form, will be the best corrective of such opinions.

§ 1. *The Principal Religious Features of the Theocratic Law.*

It was seen already that the separation of the Israelites from the heathen and idolatrous nations around them, and their formation into a distinct community by themselves, was a necessary condition in their calling. Notice was also taken of the various restraints which it is evident were required for securing an isolated position of this kind in the world, especially for a people like the Israelites, in such close geographical proximity to neighbours more powerful than themselves. But this external separation was only a subordinate object. It was to be completed in the internal sanctification of the covenant people. This clearly appears from the terms of the promise made to Abraham respecting his posterity as the channels of the Divine blessing, and also from the preliminaries of the Sinaitic covenant ratified with the people themselves; but still more from the promulgation of the moral law, which constituted the proper foundation of their entire constitution and polity.

The Israelites were repeatedly, and in most express terms, told that they were called to be a holy people to their God. This was required, from the holiness of God's own character. Moses was directed to declare in God's name to the whole congregation: "Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy," (Lev. xix. 2). To enforce this, and to produce in the people a conviction of the holiness of the Divine character indispensable to the realization of the same in themselves, was, accordingly, a primary object of the Theocratic legislation. This it effected in various ways, more or less direct. One of the purposes of the promulgation of the Sinaitic law was to produce conviction of sin by presenting God's dread majesty in close proximity to a guilty people; while the very temporary character of the impression thus produced, as seen in the almost immediate lapse of the Israelites into idolatry,

showed most distinctly that other and more continuous appliances were needed for producing any abiding effects. There must be presented to the view of the Israelite constant memorials of the holiness of God. Of this he must be reminded not merely in his reading of the law—a duty which might be neglected, or very inadequately performed, but also in acts and ordinances kept constantly before his eyes, and of which there was no possibility of evasion, if he would retain his position as a member of the community. And not only so, but these institutions, as well of ordinary and every-day life, as of a more directly sacred character, spoke a language intelligible to the lowest capacity. Holiness and purity, with other dispositions and relations of a like character, were seen, from the various forms under which they were presented in the law, to be realities acceptable to God and beneficial to man, while the opposite qualities led to consequences directly the reverse.

i. First of all, it was made evident that God required holiness and purity in his worship. His service must be in every respect a pure service. Accordingly, there was a strict prohibition against any practice which might be, or even seem to be, of a contrary character. Not only what was in itself really impure, but what was suggestive of impurity, or any way associated therewith, must be carefully avoided.

Thus the Mosaic system was marked by an entire freedom from whatever could in any way countenance those cruel rites which, in the form of laceration of the person, as in the service of Baal, (1 Kings xviii. 28,) and other modes of self-torture, entered so largely into heathen worship, in the belief that such acts were acceptable to the gods. Again, the offering of human sacrifices, whether as self-immolations, or of infants, as in the rites of Moloch, was so utterly abhorrent to the law, that it was made a capital crime, (Lev. xx. 1-5). In such cases it was not merely the idolatry itself which was condemned, but also the practices by which it was accompanied.

Equally alien to Judaism were the loose and licentious customs which were not only tolerated in heathenism, but sanctioned, and even consecrated to religion. Of these there are indications in the notice of the worship of Baal-Peor, par-

participation in which brought severe judgments on the Israelites in the wilderness, (Numb. xxv.) Nor was it a mere tacit or general condemnation of such and similar practices that satisfied the Hebrew lawgiver; the most express and solemn enactments were directed against the indulgence of rites they may have witnessed in Egypt, or which were practised by the Canaanites, of whose land they were about to take possession, (Lev. xviii. 3,) or by neighbouring nations. Thus, in Lev. xix. 29, reference is made to the practice of women prostituting themselves in the heathen temples as an act of devotion. This was usual among the Babylonians; and even a heathen historian¹ pronounced it a "most shameful custom" of that people. But, indeed, it was to some extent followed at Athens, and is still kept up in India. In Deut. xxiii. 18, another of the abominable customs of heathen worship is indignantly interdicted.

How largely the practices thus condemned prevailed among the nations bordering on the Israelites, and further, how prone they were themselves to imitate the most cruel and abominable of these rites, fully appears from various incidents in their history. The worship of the golden calf was probably connected with some licentious practices, (Exod. xxxii. 6; comp. 1 Cor. x. 7). Such was certainly the case in the affair of Baal-Peor,² (Numb. xxv. 1, 9; 1 Cor. x. 8). In subsequent times, so strong was the tendency of the Israelites to indulge in practices of this kind, notwithstanding the solemn and repeated condemnations pronounced in the law, that the consequences were such as afforded matter of complaint and lamentation to the right-minded members of the Theocracy who cherished its pure and heavenly principles. Thus the Psalmist, describing his countrymen: "They were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols; which were a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and they shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan: and the land was polluted with blood. Thus were they de-

¹ Herodotus, i. 199. See Rawlinson's Note, vol. i., p. 341.

² See Creuzer, Symbolikund, Mythologie, ii. 411.

filed with their own works, and went a-whoring with their own inventions: therefore was the wrath of the Lord kindled against his people, insomuch that He abhorred his own inheritance," (Ps. cvi. 35-40).

The sad picture thus drawn by a national poet, and confirmed in all its features by the national history, whatever other lesson it is fitted to convey, proves unmistakably that the Mosaic legislation, at least in the matters referred to, was not derived from any pure and hallowed principles or tastes which distinguished the Israelites, as a nation, from their heathen and idolatrous neighbours. On the contrary, the law in these, as well as in numerous other particulars, was clearly opposed to the very bent of their nature, which indeed, it is evident, entirely corresponded with the spirit and practice of the times. This, again, shows the necessity there was for such checks and correctives as were furnished in the law; and further, that these were not too numerous or stringent for the purpose to which they were applied.

Connected with the service of the Theocratic Head of the nation there were other provisions of a more positive character, intended to exhibit and inculcate holiness. In fact, all the arrangements and ordinances, as well those which respected the camp and even the Israelitish dwellings, as those which more directly concerned the sanctuary, had this object in view. Some of these have been considered in another connexion, and it is, therefore, only necessary briefly to recapitulate the more important of them with such supplementary observations as will tend to elucidate the present subject.

The sanctuary, in particular, as the residence of the Theocratic King, was a special object of holiness. Those who were privileged to approach it, and conduct its service, must possess a consecration for the purpose, and in a degree proportioned to the nature of the duty to which they were severally called. No unconsecrated person was permitted to touch or enter the sanctuary; such a desecration would be punished with death (Numb. iii. 10, 38), and, indeed, any impropriety on the part of those who were duly qualified, would involve a like penalty (Lev. xvi. 2; xxii. 3).

That holiness was indispensable for the performance of

priestly functions was declared by various provisions.¹ 1. There must be a personal freedom from all natural blemish. 2. In addition to the family connexion with Aaron, to whose posterity the office was expressly limited, and the other personal qualifications, there was the consecration and clothing with the official garments, specially prepared for the purpose, and which could not be worn without the precincts of the sanctuary. 3. Of the garments common to the sacerdotal order, one part is very noticeable. This was the linen breeches in which the officiating priest must be arrayed. Thus Moses was directed by God: "Thou shalt make them linen breeches to cover their nakedness, from the loins even unto the thighs they shall reach: and they shall be upon Aaron, and upon his sons, when they come in unto the tabernacle of the congregation, or when they come near unto the altar to minister in the holy place; that they bear not iniquity and die: it shall be a statute for ever unto him and his seed after him" (Exod. xxviii. 42, 43). This provided that the priests should be decently covered, whatever gesture of body might be used in their duty, and so prevent any indecency, either through accident, or superstitious design, as the Jewish writers, Maimonides and Kimchi,² allege was the case in the worship of Baal-Peor. 4. To the same purpose was the charge: "Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon."³ (Exod. xx. 26).

ii. In addition to these regulations as to the services of religion and the sanctuary, there were others of a similar character applicable to the camp and the congregation.

1. It was made imperative that all lepers, and such as were otherwise unclean, should be excluded from the camp. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Command the children of Israel, that they put out of the camp every leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is defiled by the dead: both male and female shall ye put out, without the camp shall

¹ See above, vol. ii. pp. 253-255.

² See Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, i. 5. § 3.

³ By a similar law the Roman Flamen Dialis was forbidden to ascend more than three steps of the altar unless it

were of the Greek form, enclosed from every side (Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* x. 15; Servius ad *Æneid.* iv. 646).— See Kalisch, *Com. on Exod.* p. 381.

ye put them; that they defile not their camps, in the midst whereof I dwell" (Numb. v. 1-3). So strictly was this law enforced that even Miriam, the sister of Moses, when struck with leprosy, must conform to it, though, out of respect, the people intermit their journey until she is restored to society. "Miriam was shut out from the camp seven days: and the people journeyed not till Miriam was brought in again" (Numb. xii. 15). 2. All material impurities within the camp were also prohibited, and the exposure of such, even in the open field, was no less strictly forbidden (Deut. xxiii. 12, 13). The reason for this was: "For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee; therefore shall thy camp be holy: that He see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee" (ver. 14).

iii. The individual Israelite, too, in all his personal and family arrangements must study purity and propriety, not only in regard to things of a moral character, but to such also as might suggest or symbolise moral relations.

1. Most explicit directions were given regarding various objects from which defilement might be contracted, and contact with which, therefore, must be carefully avoided. (1. The regulations with respect to diet were very specific, as well with regard to the admitted articles of food, as to the mode of preparing them. The animals reckoned unclean were on no account to be eaten, (Lev. xi,) and even such as were clean were equally interdicted in certain circumstances, as when the animal died of itself, was torn by wild beasts, or was deprived of life in any way which prevented the separation of the blood from the flesh, or if the latter happened to touch anything that was unclean, (Lev. xxii. 8; Exod. xxii. 31; Lev. xi. 34). (2.) In like manner all incongruity in dress must be carefully avoided in respect to materials, (Lev. xix. 19,) and the garments appropriate to the respective sexes, (Deut. xxii. 5). This law touching incongruity extended also to the labours of the Israelites in the fields and vineyards, (Lev. xix. 19); and its neglect rendered the produce "defiled," (Deut. xxii. 9,) so that it could not be legally consumed.

2. In respect to family and social intercourse, the Israelite must be no less careful as to associating with the unclean.

The watchfulness to be observed in these matters will be apparent from an enumeration of some of the occasions of impurity, and the inconveniences to which defilement subjected the individual. The law recognises many species of uncleanness of a positive nature, arising chiefly from the natural secretions of human beings as well in health as through disease, and also from the touch of various animals, and as defilement was communicated not only to persons, but to clothes, utensils, and dwellings, which again defiled the person, (Lev. xii.-xv.) it is evident that the sources of uncleanness were exceedingly numerous and varied. Defilement was produced through various natural causes, as diseases, the leprosy in particular, and even through the office of child-birth. The touching of an unclean object, especially a dead body, whether through inadvertence or necessity, as when friends and relatives discharged the last duties which the living owe to the dead, produced uncleanness.

Nor were the inconveniences thus occasioned of little moment, for they involved for a time, proportioned to the nature of the defilement, interruption of the theocratic privileges, while the wilful neglect of the means of cleansing was regarded as one of the highest theocratic crimes, to be punished by the exision of the offender from the community, (Lev. xv. 31; Numb. xix. 20).

If, however, the causes of impurity were numerous and varied, so also were the provisions for its removal.

In the majority of instances, the simple ablution of the body and the clothes was all that was required. In other cases, various other ceremonies were applied. Thus, for the cleansing of such as had been defiled by touching the dead body of a man, there were the ashes of a red heifer prepared with great ceremony, and which, mixed with water, were to be sprinkled on the unclean on the third and seventh day, after which he should "purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water," (Numb. xix. 18, 19). In the cleansing of the leper, again, still greater formalities were observed, (Lev. xiv. 1-32). Without entering into particulars, it is observable that in this and other cases, where the impurity arose from natural causes, (Lev. xii., xv. 13-15, 29,) the cleansing must be followed by sacrifices.

It is unnecessary, however, to enter into further details. Enough has been adduced to show the importance which the law attached to purity, and the minuteness with which it regulated the various relations of the Israelites in this respect. Such, indeed, is its stringency on these and other points, that a question arises, Were regulations of this character worthy of the Supreme Being, or of a legislation which lays claim to a Divine origin? This is a subject, it may be remarked, which has occasioned considerable difficulty at times, even to such as are disposed to view it in the most favourable light. The minute and multifarious ordinances of the law are no doubt at first sight apt to excite prejudices, as if in several points such a system were unworthy of God, derogatory to his character, as if He would be acceptably worshipped with formalities, many of which, though in themselves exceedingly trivial, were invested with all the importance which belongs to moral actions and relations, and the neglect or transgression of which was as severely censured as the violation of any of the commands of the Decalogue. A comprehensive survey of the law in all its relations, would contribute materially to the removal of such difficulties.

To judge correctly of any system, it must be viewed as a whole. Several of the enactments adverted to above, as well as many other regulations, may, if only considered in themselves, perhaps appear trivial; nevertheless, they may be found indispensable to the completeness and efficiency of the law. Every properly adjusted constitution, even of human contrivance, and much more in that which has had a Divine origin, has parts the character of which is not at once apparent to the observer. The physical, and especially the organic, adjustments on the earth, for instance, present a combination of parts and a variety of processes which, if viewed without reference to their place in the system, might be deemed exceedingly unimportant; but in which a careful study discerns the most perfect adaptation. Even in mere mechanical contrivances, there are various, and some of them minute, and, withal, complex appliances for regulating and changing the direction of forces, and otherwise controlling the machine, and yet none of which could be easily dispensed with. It is the same, also, in the social and moral system, in the training of the individual

and of the community, and inducing habits of order and right government. On these grounds alone it might be concluded, with regard to the Mosaic ordinances, that such as are seemingly the most trivial, may, for aught that appears, occupy a very important place in the economy.

Further, it will be necessary to obtain a correct idea of the object which all these acts and arrangements contemplated. Even for this purpose the system must be viewed in all its bearings, for that only can be the correct view which harmonises all the results, whether arrived at from an examination of the connexion of the several parts, or from those verbal descriptions which, in numerous instances, accompany the enactments, and thus serve as a key to explain their object.

Proceeding in this way to the examination of the Mosaic law, it will be found to embody in its diversified enactments several principles so closely related that there can be no difficulty in concluding that they properly supplement one another, and constitute parts *of one system*. After the remarks already made on such parts of the economy as have been more fully considered, such as sacrifice, the central rite of the Israelitish worship, the qualifications of the priesthood, and the perfection required in the victims presented, in all of which were seen spiritual truths, symbolised under outward or material relations, it may be safely assumed that the defilements and the purifications noticed at present had no less a symbolic significance. If, however, proof were needed on this point, it would be found in the terms by which several of the enactments are introduced, and which have special reference to the holiness of God, with which He would thus have His people be in harmony (Lev. xi. 43, 44). It is also evident that it was in this light the matter was viewed by the Israelites themselves. For instance, the rule which required the priests to wash their hands and their feet before they entered the tabernacle or approached the altar (Exod. xxx. 19-21), is thus rendered by the Psalmist: "I will wash my hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Lord" (Ps. xxvi. 6). Nor is it without interest in this respect that ablutions similar to those of the law were practised by all ancient nations, and with a like object.¹

¹ See Bähr, Symbolik, ii. 465-476.

Taking, then, these ordinances of the law as symbolic, the following truths, among others, were thus very clearly announced. 1. That God, the Holy One, requires holiness in His creatures, and that the absence of it exposes the person to His wrath. 2. That man is destitute of that principle; that he is in himself, and by birth, unholy, and is surrounded by objects which would defile him even were he purified; and 3. That God has made abundant provision for removing man's original and acquired pollution, so as to allow him to enjoy communion with Himself. With regard to the first two points, the ordinances referred to served only to deepen the convictions arising from the moral law and its continued testimony to the character of God on the one hand, and of man on the other. It is as respects the third point, however, that the ceremonial law was distinct from, or properly supplemental to the Decalogue, by its giving symbolic form to the promises and other direct intimations of God's gracious purposes in behalf of fallen man.

Principles with respect to guilt were exhibited in the law of sacrifice essentially identical with those which, by the required ablutions, were taught on the subject of impurity; and it is worthy of consideration that, with regard to these two great doctrines, there were various points of contact. On the one hand, personal defilement, in the majority of cases, necessitated the presentation of sacrifice; through this only could the purification be completed, and, on the other, only such as were legally clean, in addition to their peculiar consecration to the office, could offer the sacrifice. The sacrifices connected with cleansing such as were ceremonially unclean, thus unequivocally pointed to the relation between guilt and impurity, which alike prevented access to or communion with God.

In the restrictions above noticed, to which, in his several relations, the Israelite was subjected, some writers see only sanitary regulations, and other objects of a similar character. No doubt they were wisely adapted for such purposes;¹ but this only shows that they were not mere arbitrary appoint-

¹ Kitto: "We are unacquainted with any Oriental nations, ancient or modern, which had a sanatory code in the slightest degree comparable to this,

which is, indeed, scarcely equalled by the regulations of the best European lazarettos."—*Pict. Bible*, Note on Lev. xv.

ments, or gratuitous limitations of human action or choice, but that they were based on principles which contributed to the individual and social well-being, while inculcating the truths they were intended more especially to communicate. Others, again, discern here only a check upon idolatry, by preventing the Israelites from associating with the heathen. This certainly was one object contemplated by these ordinances. and some of them have been so considered in a preceding section. But this was by no means their only or principal end. The separation of the covenant people, and their conservation in the world as a distinct community, were conditional to their training in Divine truth, so as to fit them for being the medium of blessing to the world, from which, for this very purpose, they had been separated.

That it was the moral and spiritual training of Israel, to which the various provisions and ordinances of their law more directly pointed, must appear from this consideration alone, that this view will harmonize the whole system. It will not only bring the numerous verbal declarations contained, as well in the Decalogue, as interspersed in other portions of the law, but also the entire series of acts and institutions into complete correspondence. On any other supposition no explanation can be given of the fact already adverted to as a source of difficulty, if not of prejudice against the law, that matters destitute of all moral character are raised to the level of those which have really such. More especially, it is only upon this supposition a principle of unity is seen to pervade the ceremonial institutions themselves; and a satisfactory reason can be assigned for the lawgiver attaching so much importance to certain arrangements, which it does not appear externally greatly affected the State.

The ordinances regarding leprosy, for instance, cannot be sufficiently accounted for on the supposition that they were merely sanitary precautions. The exclusion of persons afflicted with this disease from the camp, and society in general, seems to have been peculiar to the Mosaic law. Among the Syrians, at least, lepers were not subjected to such disabilities, or disqualified for public employment, which brought them into the most intimate connexion with all classes of society (2 Kings v. 1). Nor does the disease appear to have been of an infec-

tious character,¹ or indeed to have been so regarded by the law. And again, the rites enjoined for the cleansing of the leper were evidently not designed as curative of the disease, for it was only after the patient was convalescent that these were applied, for the purpose of removing the legal defilement and restoring the individual to theocratic privileges. As a curative medium, indeed, such rites must appear utterly inapplicable; while, on the other hand, they are highly significant as symbolical of moral and spiritual truths. Than the leprosy, and its effects on the human frame, nothing could more appropriately exhibit the corrupting consequences of sin, while the exclusion from the camp and congregation relatively pure, indicated most forcibly exclusion, through sin, from communion with the absolutely Holy.

Similar remarks apply to the ordinance of circumcision, the fundamental rite of the Israelites' peculiar relation to Jehovah and the theocratic covenant. One object of this rite, it was remarked, was the external separation of the seed of Abraham from the world. Another end, however, was its serving as a token of moral purity; showing not only the necessity of such, but also how deep-seated in human nature was the impurity which had to be thus symbolically removed. That the rite was regarded, even by certain heathen nations unconnected with the family of Abraham, and who could not have adopted it from the patriarch, as symbolic of moral purity, appears from the fact that it was practised by the priests and others making claims to special sanctity. Moreover, the law itself was upon this point quite explicit. Thus, in Moses' charge to the people, when, after exhorting them to fear the Lord, to walk in His ways, to love Him, and serve Him with the whole heart and soul, he adds: "Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked" (Deut. x. 16). Again: "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live" (chap. xxx. 6). With this corresponds the view taken of the ordinance by Jeremiah, when, in the name of the Lord, he urges his people to reformation: "Circumcise yourself to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men

¹ Cyc. Bib. Lit., Art. *Leprosy*, ii. 338.

of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem, lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings" (Jer. iv. 4). It was upon this very interpretation, given as well in the law itself as by the prophets, St. Paul concluded: "He is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter" (Rom. ii. 29).

The principle exhibited in this ordinance is discernible throughout the whole law, for the various ablutions and sprinklings are in a manner only particular forms of this fundamental rite. The Israelites were called to be a holy nation in virtue of their covenant relation to Jehovah. This, which is specially assigned by Moses as a reason for certain of his laws, applies equally to the entire system. "For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth," (Deut. xiv. 2; comp. vii. 6; xxvi. 18.) It was on account of this peculiar relation, then, that Israel were laid under those various restrictions which distinguished their polity, and not simply because the things to be abstained from had, in themselves, an injurious character. Thus, although the Israelite was strictly interdicted from eating that which died of itself, he was permitted to dispose of it to the stranger or alien; and the reason for this distinction was: "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God," (Deut. xiv. 21.)

Might not, however—to recur to the objection already adverted to—a simple and less burdensome system, and more in accordance with man's moral constitution, or having greater regard to his sense of right and wrong, equally answer the same purposes? In reply to this, it is enough to remark that the system, if not the best in itself, may, nevertheless, have been the very best in the circumstances, and that, if more simple or more spiritual, it might proportionally fail in its result. In order to warrant the assumption that a less complicated contrivance might answer equally well, it will be necessary to determine precisely the force of every arrangement singly, and in the various combinations into which they entered, and the resistance which, on the other hand, they had to overcome, both as regards the individual and the community; not only at the period when the system was established, but through-

out the time needed for securing its ends. This is a condition which it is evident cannot be even approximately reached, and therefore, difficulties must always present themselves to such as would look at the matter in that light. It is possible, however, to suggest certain reasons deducible from the nature of the case, which contributed to impart to the Mosaic system a form so complex, and in many respects so dissimilar to that of the Gospel.

As in the early stages of education that method of communicating instruction is proved to be the most successful, which appeals chiefly to the outward senses, particularly the eye, its adoption at the commencement of the scheme of Divine revelation must appear exceedingly appropriate. In the earlier stages of revelation, and previous to the formation of a language which could suitably convey spiritual truths, the use of symbols was indeed indispensable. Symbols, however, though expressive, require to be used in great numbers in order to convey complex ideas, and also to be frequently presented in order to impress the mind with the particular truth to be conveyed. If, in addition to the communication of truth, it be desired to form habits of mind conformable to the doctrine, there is need of a system which calls for acts frequently repeated. For this purpose, the form, it must be evident, has a special importance, particularly when, whatever may be known of its precise import, the act is acknowledged to have the sanction of competent authority, and one in whose wisdom and goodness the mind can confidently rely.

The bearing of the Mosaic economy in this respect is well described by a recent writer¹—"It was a school of preparatory training, in which certain habits of thought and feeling were to be wrought into the national character by a forcible pressure from without; and under such a system the forms of religion are of paramount importance, for it is by these that the inner spirit is to be called into existence. The object aimed at is to hold human nature in a fixed mould until it has received the desired impression, and imbibed the spirit which lies latent or imprisoned in the form; the mould, therefore, must be of inflexible material, incapable of expansion and

¹ Litton, *Mosaic Dispensation*, p. 61.

contraction, and of elaborate finish ; and must press from without upon all parts of the religious life. The lawgiver will multiply rules, enjoin specific acts of religion, appoint ‘ days, and months, and times, and years ;’ instead of general principles, issue literal prescriptions ; in short, construct such a religious polity as, by the Divine wisdom, was imposed on the Jewish people.”

In addition to these general considerations, there were circumstances in the case of the Israelites, which made the system under which they were brought after leaving Egypt necessary and indeed suitable, apart entirely from the fact variously indicated in the law itself, and the mediatorial standing of the people, that it was provisional and preparatory to a better dispensation. These were the views and habits which they had formed in Egypt, and which were more or less common to heathenism ; but which must be now counteracted by truthful representations of God’s character and purposes, how He is to be approached, and what He requires of His people, and what He has at the same time provided for them.

§ 2. *The Mosaic System as related to Ancient Symbolism in General.*

Various observations in preceding chapters must have made it evident how closely the Mosaic system rested on patriarchal usages, both of a civil and religious character. In some instances the Mosaic legislation sought, it would appear, to check or regulate customs which, although they never had a Divine sanction, yet obtained countenance in patriarchal practices, and also such as had a Divine sanction, or at least were not explicitly disallowed, but were, nevertheless, open to abuse. Thus, the practice of polygamy, which, though so decidedly opposed to the law of creation, commenced as early as the time of the Cainite Lamech, was likely to be more favourably viewed by the Israelites, from the example of their ancestor Jacob. The propensity itself, however, while too strong to be at once eradicated, was yet by the law checked and discouraged. The Levirate law, and the institution of

the Goel or avenger of blood, had also, it was seen, a reference to patriarchal usages. So the laws which controlled the previously absolute power exercised by heads of families over their households and dependents, as may be inferred from the order given by Judah concerning his daughter-in-law, Tamar, (Gen. xxxviii. 24), and by Abraham in the case of Hagar (Gen. xvi. 6). In short, the whole civil administration was closely related to ancient precedent, being founded on the patriarchal government of elders, or the heads of tribes and families.¹

The connexion between the law and the usages of earlier times is still more apparent in the ritual ordinances. In this respect particularly the Mosaic economy is not so much a new system as the primeval and patriarchal mode of worship developed, and applied to new exigencies arising from the progress of Divine revelation, which thus sought utterance for its truths. This was sufficiently indicated with regard to sacrifice, which, from the beginning, was the only acknowledged mode of approaching God; even the place of primeval sacrifice before the cherubic presence, finding its counterpart in the Levitical sanctuary. The various unctions, too, as also the ablutions of the law, are referable to patriarchal practices (Gen. xxviii. 18; xxxv. 2); and so likewise with respect to various other ordinances. The rite of circumcision, on which, indeed, all the peculiarities and prerogatives of Judaism rested, was an institution of the patriarchal age. Of less important matters may be noticed the dedication of tithes to God, or His acknowledged ministers, which had its origin in those early times (Gen. xiv. 20; xxviii. 22; comp. Lev. xxvii. 30).

Other institutions of the same period, such as the priesthood, which had properly no place in the patriarchal system as recognised in Scripture, were likewise incorporated in the Mosaic economy; but in all these cases the connexion is so plain, the addition thus made so fully harmonises with the other provisions of the law, and is indeed so necessary to complete the system, as to occasion no difficulty in recognising it as only a modification of earlier practices, and a continuation of the same great principles. This, accordingly, is an important consideration to the defender of the supernatural origin of the Mosaic economy. Its close connexion with the

¹ See Winer, *Bib. Realwörterbuch*, Art. *Gesetz*, i. 416.

earliest form of religious worship, its adoption of those primeval truths and principles which are so clearly presented in the book of Genesis, and which in various distorted shapes appear in heathen traditions and mythologies, are decided evidences in favour of its Divine claims. Such a connexion with the past shows very clearly that Judaism was not an abrupt phenomenon, which, like Mohammedanism and other impostures, rose suddenly and unexpectedly on the world, but, on the contrary, followed in the course of a long previous preparation. In this respect Judaism derives from Patriarchism a testimony similar to that which itself yields to Christianity.

Besides those affinities which may be traced between the Mosaic ordinances, and earlier practices and modes of worship which had more or less a Divine sanction, the law presents also striking points of connexion with the usages of other ancient nations, particularly the Egyptians. This may at first sight be deemed prejudicial to the Divine origin of the former, on the ground that such a correspondence would seem to indicate somewhat of an eclectic character, incompatible with an independent supernatural source. Further examination shows, however, that these affinities, as well as those already noticed, are not only reconcilable with the claims of the law to a Divine origin, but that they also serve to confirm its accuracy, and illustrate its symbolic language. The correspondence, in particular, between the Mosaic and the Egyptian systems, to which partial reference has been made when considering the age of the Pentateuch,¹ is a point of much interest, not only in an apologetic aspect, as showing unmistakable traces in the work itself of the time and the other circumstances of its composition, and of the condition and tendencies of the people to whom it was addressed, through their long-continued connexion with Egypt, but also as explanatory of the symbolism which held so prominent a place in the Old Testament worship, and was, indeed, not peculiar to it, but formed a common feature of the religious systems of antiquity.

Before considering the various theories proposed to account for the resemblances between systems in their origin so

¹ See above, vol. i., pp. 287-290.

distinct, and in their internal character, especially in relation to the nature and unity of God, so antagonistic to one another, as those of the Hebrews and Egyptians, it will be advisable to notice some of the particulars with regard to which such resemblances are most marked. Notice has been already taken incidentally of the universal prevalence of some of the expressly sanctioned or ordained rites of Hebrew worship, as the fundamental ordinance of sacrifice, and the very common idea as to the necessity of purity and perfection of parts in the ministers of sacrifice, as also in the victims which they offered. Some further observations on these and kindred points will be made in the sequel, but it is not with these more general features that the question more immediately lies, but with the special affinities alleged between Judaism and Egyptian customs.

1. *Circumcision*.—This, the initiatory rite of Judaism, the neglect of which by a native exposed him to the penalty of excision from the Israelitish community, (Gen. xvii. 14; comp. Ex. iv. 24-26,) and compliance with which, on the part of a stranger,—who thus became bound to fulfil the whole law, (Gal. v. 3)—invested him with the privileges of the seed of Abraham, (Ex. xii. 48,) was not peculiar to the chosen community, but was practised by various other ancient nations, with some of which the Israelites had little or no connexion. That this rite should have been found among nations related to Abraham, who received it directly from Jehovah, as the Ishmaelites and other Arabian tribes, or the Edomites, a later branch of the same great family, would excite no surprise, but the fact that it was practised by others not so connected, presents some difficulty.

That the Egyptians, in particular, were a circumcised people, is proved by abundant testimony, although it is a disputed point whether the practice was universal, or confined to a certain class. There are some allusions in Scripture itself to this subject, but they are exceedingly obscure. Thus, in Jer. ix. 24, 25, [25, 26,] Egypt, Judah, Edom, and the children of Ammon and Moab, are specified in connexion with a threatened punishment of "the circumcised with the uncircumcised," or as Henderson¹ renders the expression, "cir-

¹ The Prophet Jeremiah, p. 64.

circumcised in circumcision;" that is, bearing the mark of the external rite, but destitute of true religion; but the further intimation, "all the nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart," would seem to deny this common participation in the external rite. The same ambiguity characterises other statements of this kind, as Ezek xxxi. 18; xxxii. 24, 29, 30, 32. Another passage, Josh. v. 9, frequently adduced in connexion with this question, has no bearing on it whatever. The "reproach of Egypt," which it is there stated was rolled away from the Israelites on their being circumcised by Joshua, gives no warrant whatever to conclude, "that as early as the period of the Exodus, the lack of circumcision had been held disreputable in Egypt."¹ It has no reference to circumcision at all, but only so far as that the cessation of this rite during the period of wandering indicated that the people were out of covenant with Jehovah, and exposed to destruction. The reproach endured by the Israelites from the Egyptians during this time, was that Jehovah had led them into the wilderness to destroy them.² Comp. Ex. xxxii. 12; Num. xiv. 13-16; Deut. ix. 28.

But whatever obscurity may attach to the testimony of Scripture with regard to this particular, it contains nothing strictly at variance with the numerous and express statements of classical antiquity as to the practice of this rite beyond the limits of the Abrahamic races—statements which, in so far as they regard the Egyptians, are incontrovertibly established by the evidence supplied by the mummies. Herodotus,³ in proof of the Colchians being an Egyptian race, remarks: "The Colchians, the Egyptians, and the Ethiopians, are the only nations who have practised circumcision from the earliest times. The Phœnicians, and the Syrians of Palestine themselves, confess that they learnt the custom of the Egyptians; and the Syrians who dwell about the rivers Thormôden and Parthenius, as well as their neighbours the Macronians, say that they have recently adopted it from the Colchians. Now these are the only nations who use circumcision, and it is plain that they all imitate herein the Egyptians. With respect to the Ethi-

¹ Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, Pt. iv., p. 106.

² Keil, *Commentar üb. das Buch Josua*, p. 76.

³ *Lib. ii.* 104.

opians, indeed, I cannot decide whether they learnt the practice of the Egyptians, or the Egyptians of them—it is undoubtedly of very ancient date in Ethiopia—but that the others derived their knowledge of it from Egypt is clear to me, from the fact that the Phœnicians, when they come to have commerce with the Greeks, cease to follow the Egyptians in this custom, and allow their children to remain uncircumcised.”

Without adopting all these statements of Herodotus, especially that which concerns the Phœnicians, if he included under that name the Philistines who, unquestionably, in the time of Saul, were an uncircumcised people (1 Sam. xviii. 25; 2 Sam. i. 20); or determining whether, by the Syrians of Palestine, he meant the Hebrews, there can be no question of the general accuracy of his account, and that at a very early period the Egyptians practised circumcision. Wilkinson¹ holds that the rite was common in Egypt, “at least as early as the fourth dynasty, and probably earlier, long before the birth of Abraham.” However this may be, it is no longer open to controversy that in the Mosaic age the practice was in use, though it was far from being universal. “From the examination of the mummies it appears that the practice was very limited, not extending to one in fifty; but it must be remembered that a large proportion of these are not of very high antiquity.”² It would appear, at all events, that if the rite had ever been universal, it gradually fell into disuse, and was latterly confined to the priestly caste or the learned.

The remote antiquity of the custom is further evinced by the fact that recent researches have shown that it embraced a wider area than that specified by ancient writers. Not only among the Ethiopians, as noticed by Herodotus, and, according to Diodorus,³ the Troglodytes on the Red Sea, who, it may be supposed, were exposed to Hebrew or Egyptian influences, have traces of it been discovered, but also among the Bechuana and Caffre tribes in the south of the African continent, among the distant isles of Oceanica, and also among some American tribes. These phenomena indisputably transfer the origin of

¹ Rawlinson's Herod., vol. ii. p. 171.

² Lib. iii. 32. Comp. Hardwick,

³ Kenrick, Anc. Egypt, vol. i. p. 450. Christ, and other Masters, Pt. iv. p. 106. Lond. 1850.

this usage to a period antecedent to the establishment of the law and even to the call of Abraham; so that on this ground alone, irrespective of other considerations, such as the improbability that a people like the Egyptians would imitate, in this respect, the despised nomades of Goshen, or even Abraham himself, there is a sufficient refutation of the view that the Egyptians borrowed the rite from the Hebrews.

While, however, it is thus no longer doubtful that whatever may have been the origin of circumcision among the Egyptians, it was independent of any Hebrew usage, there is, on the other hand, as little evidence to warrant the assumption that Abraham learned it from the Egyptians. This is an old objection, urged by such enemies of revelation as Celsus and Julian, and since frequently repeated.¹ To vindicate the Scriptural narrative of the institution of this rite as a seal of the Divine covenant with Abraham, it is not at all necessary to maintain that it was an ordinance altogether new or unknown to the patriarch. On the contrary, the very terms in which it is described, would favour the conclusion that it was a practice with which he might have been familiar (Gen. xvii. 10), and which, indeed, it is not at all improbable he may have witnessed in Egypt, where he had temporarily sojourned several years before (Gen. xii. 10). All that is intimated in the narrative of this institution is that it was by a Divine appointment applied to a specific purpose. It was in this, and not in the character of its being an entirely new or only an ancient symbol consecrated to a Divine ordinance, that the great distinction of the Hebrew circumcision consisted.

In its origin the rite may have been somehow associated with or suggested by the ideas of impurity, which even the natural conscience, witnessing to the disorder introduced by the Fall, connects with the generative principle (Gen. iii. 7; comp. ii. 25), and which, in a more enlightened condition, testifies of hereditary depravity, though it afterwards lost much of its significance, and, in many cases, was regarded chiefly in a physical aspect. The fact, however, that the Egyptian priesthood continued the practice after it had been discontinued by their countrymen in general, shows that it

¹ Winer, Bib. Realwörterbuch, Art. Beschneidung, i. 158.

was considered as peculiarly appropriate in those who engaged in religious services, and in whom was required, even by natural instincts, the absence of all moral impurity. As to its import in the scheme of revelation, there can be no doubt.

2. *The Ark of the Covenant and the Cherubim.*—The ark, or sacred chest, as the term אֲרֹן, LXX. and N.T. *κιβωτός* signifies, for it is the common designation of a mummy case (Gen. i. 26), or a coffer for money (2 Kings xii. 9, 10), was the central object of the Israelitish tabernacle; and it is remarkable that structures somewhat similar occupied a place in other religious systems of antiquity. The Egyptian monuments present numerous illustrations of these shrines borne in procession by the priests in the very way in which the Levites were directed to carry the ark of the covenant. "The shrines were of two kinds: the one a sort of canopy, the other an ark or sacred boat, which may be termed the great shrine. This was carried with great pomp by the priests, a certain number being selected for that duty, who supported it on their shoulders by means of long staves, passing through metal rings at the side of the sledge on which it stood, and brought it into the temple, where it was deposited upon a stand or table, in order that the prescribed ceremonies might be discharged before it."¹ Some of these structures bore a very close resemblance to the Hebrew ark; even the cherubim by which it was surmounted being represented by figures facing each other, having wings spreading inwards and meeting one another, and, in addition, a pair of hovering wings above in the form of a canopy.²

Still, the points of dissimilarity are very marked. In the Hebrew ark there was no trace of the boat, which usually formed an important feature of the Egyptian shrine, and which would seem to connect it somehow with the tradition of the Deluge and the Noachian ark, with which, judging from the fact that the Hebrew name of the latter is אֲרֹן (Gen. vi. 14), the Ark of the Covenant had no direct connexion.³ Another distinction was that the Hebrew ark was located in the tabernacle and temple, and not, like that of the Egyptians, only occasionally brought in, and was never exposed to view. When

¹ Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyp.*, v. 271.

² Kitto in *Cyc. Bib. Lit.*, i. 216.

³ See to the contrary, Harcourt, *Doct. of Deluge*, ii. 236.

transported during the march in the wilderness, it was carefully covered, and the only instances where it appeared in an unusual character were the passage of the Jordan and the procession round Jericho (Josh. iii. iv. 7, 10, &c.; vi. 4, &c). In the time of Eli, it was carried with the army in the war with the Philistines, from some expectation that its presence would secure them victory, which, however, the result disappointed (1 Sam. iv. 3-11).

This difference is still more apparent when the place of the ark in the Israelitish sanctuary is contrasted with the most holy region of the Egyptian temples. The distinction marked by outer courts, holy and most holy places, the latter the special residence of the Deity, was common to most of the temples of the ancient world, yet very different from the Hebrew sanctuary were all these adyta, in respect both to the mode of worship and the representations of Deity. In the temples of Egypt these were of the most grovelling kind, being one or other of the sacred animals to which that sensuous people paid adoration. If, in other cases, the object of worship was of a more exalted character, it was still immeasurably removed from all that the Israelites were taught to associate with the character of God.

In strict accordance with the doctrine of the Divine spirituality, the Jewish sanctuary contained nothing which could possibly be construed into a representation of the Godhead. The view sometimes entertained of the cherubic figures on the Ark of the Covenant, that they indicated some properties or perfections characteristic of Deity, is entirely unfounded; and not less so is the assumption that these symbols were derived by Moses from the Egyptians, as maintained by Spencer,¹ and by Hengstenberg² who connects them with the Egyptian Sphinx. Recent discoveries have, however, brought to light symbolic figures among other ancient nations, which have a closer correspondence with the Biblical description of the Cherubim than the Sphinx; and it is also known that such compound forms prevailed extensively in the ancient world;³ among the Persians, Babylonians, and Assyrians, as well as in Egypt.

¹ De Leg. Heb., L. iii., Dissert. v., cap. iv.

³ Bähr, Symbolik, i. 357, 358. Vaux, Nineveh and Persepolis, p. 32. Lond

² Egypt and BB. of Moses, p. 153.

1850.

The extensive prevalence of such representations is itself a strong confirmation of the first Biblical notice of the Cherubim in connexion with the garden of Eden, (Gen. iii. 24). The various forms given by different nations to the original Cherubic idea are owing probably to the modifications to which, in the course of time, the traditions connected with man's primeval state were subjected. No other supposition can so readily account for the origin of combinations, in many cases exceedingly incongruous, according as the uncouth tastes and fancies of heathenism, departed more and more from the simplicity of the original truth. Besides the modifications of form, as presented in the various systems of heathenism, showing the obscuration of the original idea, the place of these symbols in Egypt and elsewhere was different from that occupied by the Cherubim of Scripture. The usual position of the Sphinx was in front of the Egyptian temples,¹ sometimes arranged in rows on each side of the entrance, though occasionally, through a further corruption of the idea, they were placed in the vicinity of the royal throne for the purpose of attributing to the monarch the qualities thus symbolized.² The compound figures seen on the Assyrian and other monuments, were likewise the symbolic guardians of the temples, and the supporters of the throne; and similar ideas were variously set forth by the fables which assigned to creatures of this description the guardianship of hidden treasures. In all these cases the office assigned to these mystic figures was that of watchers, although it is probable that among some nations, the Egyptians and Assyrians in particular, the ideas represented by the several parts of the combination were to a considerable extent retained.

It can be easily shown how the idea of the Cherubim acting as watchers may have originated, and how, accordingly, from that first assumption, their place in heathenism was without the temple, while in Judaism, on the contrary, it was within the sanctuary, and in most intimate connexion with Jehovah's throne. It arose from a misapprehension of the functions discharged by the Cherubim in Eden after the Fall,

¹ Creuzer, *Symbolik*, ii. 219.

² Hengstenberg, *Egypt and BB of Moses*, p. 156.

being closely connected with, though still distinct from, the part assigned to "the flaming sword," some manifestation of the Divine glory, which "kept the way of the tree of life." The Cherubim, if watchers at all, were only so in the same sense as man himself had originally been the keeper of the garden; or rather, they are represented as alone enjoying access to the symbolic tree—a relation which these figures are also seen to occupy on some of the Assyrian sculptures. However this may be, the position of the Cherubim in the Biblical narrative was within the precincts of the sacred enclosure, and not without, and so they stood in a different position from that of man, just expelled from the garden. The attitude of these emblems in the tabernacle is also the same: they do not guard the entrance to the holy place, but are in the closest connexion with the throne of God himself—a truth abundantly illustrated by the visions of Ezekiel and the Apocalypse. In one of the visions of Ezekiel, indeed, the Cherubim are seen with the symbol of the divine glory, taking their departure from the temple, because forsaken by the Divine presence—a circumstance which shows clearly the intimate connexion which subsisted between these different emblems. The particular ideas which the cherubic figures represented in the scheme of Divine grace have been already considered, and the observations now made may suffice to show how little ground there is for referring their origin to Egypt, and also to confirm the Mosaic account of it.

3. *The Urim and Thummim*.—A connexion is also sought to be established by many writers between these mysterious symbols in the breastplate of the Jewish high priest, (Ex. xxviii. 30,) and certain badges worn by the chief judge in Egypt. Spencer¹ devotes a very large space to the establishment of this identity, and the view still finds favour with Hengstenberg,² who remarks that the connexion "is especially distinct and incontrovertible." The account of Diodorus, that the chief judge had suspended to his neck by a golden chain an image of precious stones which was named Truth, is confirmed not only by other ancient authors, but also by the

¹ De Leg. Heb., lib. iii., Dis. viii., cap. iv., § 2.

² Egypt and the BB. of Moses, p. 149.

monuments. Rosellini remarks: "Among the monuments of the tombs representations of persons are found who filled the office of chief judge, and who wore the common little image of Thmei suspended from the neck." This goddess, who sustained the twofold character of truth and justice, was represented with closed eyes. There is no difficulty in interpreting the purport of this Egyptian symbol. It evidently intimated that partiality must be excluded from the administration of justice—the closed eyes of the figure intimating the necessity of strict integrity, similarly with the representations of the judges without hands pictured in funeral rites at Thebes.

The symbols on the Jewish high priest's breastplate, whatever may have been their character or configuration, had an entirely different object; they were intended, on necessary occasions, to serve the purpose of an oracle, (Num. xxvii. 21,) and always constituted a necessary appendage of the official dress; and while it may be that the priests exercised judicial functions, though in Deut. xvii. 8, the judge would seem to be a distinct personage, the Aaronic breastplate, with its Urim and Thummim, was not worn in any human judicatory, or in deciding points of litigation between men, but only in the great priestly transactions with Jehovah. This circumstance alone is sufficient to disprove the connexion which is sought to be established between the Mosaic and Egyptian customs in this particular, even were it supported by more conclusive testimonies than the single fact adduced in its favour, that the LXX. rendered in Ex. xxviii. 30, Urim and Thummim by *ὁρήλωσις καὶ ἀληθεία*, "revelation and truth," but which, as regards the latter term in particular, is an entire abandonment of the Hebrew idea, which is more correctly rendered in Aquila by *τελειώσεως*, "perfections," as the former by *φωτισμοί*, "lights." Wilkinson¹ gives a drawing of a breastplate wherein Ra, the Sun, and Thmei, are represented together. This is certainly a closer resemblance to "lights" and "perfections" than the other symbol already alluded to. The subject, however, is exceedingly obscure, though, from the manner in which the Urim and Thummim are first introduced

¹ Anc. Egypt., vol. v., p. 28.

in Scripture, it would seem that they were well known to the Israelites, perhaps through patriarchal usage, and it is possible that they may have had some connexion with the oracle which Rebekah consulted, (Gen. xxv. 22, 23).

4. *Azazel, or the Scape-Goat.*—The ceremonial prescribed for the great Day of Atonement, (Lev. xvi.,) has been regarded as presenting a strong resemblance to certain Egyptian ideas. The symbolic transfer of guilt from the offerer to the head of the victim, seen in this ordinance, had unquestionably an analogy among the Egyptians, but it was by no means peculiar to them, but was more or less known among the other nations of antiquity, being, in fact, one of the ideas involved in sacrifice as a substitutionary or vicarious offering. But a more specific reference to the Egyptian ritual is supposed to be contained in the disposal of what is in the English version styled the “scape-goat,” but in the original *Azazel*.

The proper rendering of this term has been a subject of much discussion. Such as regarded Azazel as the designation of the goat itself, considered it to be formed from אָז, *capere*, or rather *capra*, and אָזִיז, *abiiit*, but this etymology has been long since abandoned, and that proposed by Bochart is now generally recognised, according to which the term means, “the removed,” or the separated. Another difficulty in the case is the manner in which Azazel is contrasted with Jehovah. The high priest is directed, after solemnly presenting the two goats before Jehovah to cast lots upon them; one lot (לְיְהוָה) for Jehovah, and the other lot (לְאִזָּזֵל) for Azazel, (ver. 8). Further, while the goat on which Jehovah’s lot fell was offered as a sin-offering, the one on which fell the lot for Azazel, אִזָּזֵל, was presented alive before Jehovah, and afterwards sent away, אִזָּזֵל, to or for Azazel into the wilderness, (ver. 10).

The manner in which Azazel is contrasted with Jehovah would seem to indicate in the former a personal existence equally with the latter; and this is rendered still more probable by the selection of the goats being regulated by lot, and the decision committed to Jehovah.¹ As Hengstenberg remarks: “The circumstance that lots are cast, implies that Jehovah is made the antagonist of a personal existence, with

¹ Spencer, De Leg. Heb., L. iii., Dissert. viii., cap. i., § 2.

respect to which it is designed to exalt the unlimited power of Jehovah, and exclude all equality of this being with Jehovah.”¹ The character of this being, and his relation to Jehovah, already though no doubt obscurely indicated by the name Azazel, the entirely separate, is further manifested by the locality assigned to him—the desert, (ver. 10,) and more expressly אֶל-אָזָזִיז בְּמִדְבָּר “into a land cut off,” that is, from the habitations of men; LXX. εἰς γῆν ἄβυστον, Vulg., in terram solitariam (ver. 22). There is at least a very strong analogy to this in other passages of Scripture, which assign desert and waste places as the peculiar abode of the evil principle. See Matt. xii. 43; Luke viii. 27; and more particularly the notice of the scene of our Lord's temptation, (Matt. iv. 1; Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1). Further, it may be added, that although the name Azazel does not again occur in Scripture, it was quite familiar to the later Jews, who applied it to the “evil spirit,” or “fallen angel,” and from them the term probably passed over to the Mohammedans, among whom it was also current.²

The objection that this view of the matter places God and the Evil Principle in so close a relation as to be in direct opposition to the spirit of the Mosaic religion, which aimed at the establishment of the Divine unity, would bear equally against that which recognises in the narrative of the Fall, the same principle under the symbol of the serpent. The only difference is, that in the transactions of the Day of Atonement, there is apparently a kind of propitiation of the enemy. On the other hand, this explanation places the present passage in remarkable relation with Zech. iii., and like that which exists between Zech. iv. and Ex. xxv. 31. “Here, as there, the Lord, Satan, and the high priest, appear. Satan wishes by his accusations to destroy the favourable relations between the Lord and his people. The high priest presents himself before the Lord, not with a claim of purity according to law, but laden with his own sins, and the sins of the people. Here Satan thinks to find the safest occasion for his attack, but he mistakes. Forgiveness baffles his designs; he is compelled

¹ Egypt and BB. of Moses, p. 161.

² Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, p. 125.

to retire in confusion. It is evident that the doctrinal import of both passages is substantially the same, and the one in Zechariah may be considered as the oldest commentary extant on the words of Moses. In substance we have the same scene also in the Apocalypse, (xii. 10, 11): 'The accuser of our brethren is cast down, who accuses them before our God day and night, and they overcome him by the blood of the Lamb.'¹

As just remarked, an objection to this view lies in the assumption that it implies some propitiation of the evil principle, if not the presentation of sacrifice. If such an idea be involved in the act of dismissing the goat, laden with the sins of the people, into the wilderness, it must certainly be fatal to any supposition which would connect Azazel with any demoniac agency, for nothing was more expressly forbidden in the Mosaic law than the offering of sacrifice to any other than Jehovah; and indeed in the very next chapter (Lev. xvii. 7) there is a distinct prohibition of sacrificing to demons. An examination, however, of the transactions prescribed in the case, will show that they involve no such objectionable idea, and that, on the contrary, they admit of being brought into intimate harmony with the other great features of revelation.

That no offering to Azazel was here intended, appears from the following considerations:—1. The two goats taken together constituted the sin-offering. "And he shall take of the congregation two goats for a sin-offering," (ver. 5,) and as such they are both presented before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle, which clearly imports that, though they are to be differently treated, the one presented on the altar, and the other sent away into the wilderness, they are nevertheless the Lord's property, as consecrated to him, (ver. 7). 2. But, again, the goat destined for Azazel is, after the sacrifice of his fellow, presented anew before the Lord, not, as in the English version, "to make an atonement with him," this had been already done by the sacrificed goat, but "to absolve him," לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו, after which he is sent away to Azazel in the desert. "The act by which the second goat is, as it were, identified with the first, to transfer to the living the nature which the

¹ Hengstenberg, *Egypt and BB. of Moses*, p. 162.

dead possessed, shows to what the phrase, 'for a sin-offering,' in verse 5, has reference, and what Spencer indeed perceived—the two goats, says he, are, as it were, one goat—that the duality of the goats rests only on the physical impossibility of making one example represent the different points to be exhibited. Had it been possible, in the circumstances, to restore life to the goat that was sacrificed, this would have been done. The two goats, in this connexion, stand in a relation entirely similar to that of the two birds in the purification of the leprous person in Lev. xiv. 4, of which the one let go was dipped in the blood of the one slain." ¹ 3. But the circumstance which, above all others, excludes the idea of offering in the case of the goat designated for Azazel, is that it is sent alive into the desert. No animal oblation could consist without the shedding of blood.

A difficulty, however, in this case is the confession of sins, and their symbolical transfer to the goat before sending him away, and the intimation, "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited," (ver. 21, 22). Hengstenberg characterises the sins thus charged upon the goat as "the already *forgiven* sins of Israel," and there is considerable evidence in favour of such a view in the circumstances wherein this imputation took place. It was after Aaron had made atonement for himself and for the people, and purified the sanctuary and the altar from all the uncleanness of the children of Israel, that confession of sin was made over the living goat. "And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat," &c., (ver. 20). But another question here arises. If, as above represented, the goat was absolved, or the sins laid upon him were forgiven, on what principle was the person who led him away treated as unclean; so that he was required, before re-admission into the camp, to wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water? (ver. 26). With regard to this, it may suffice to observe, that similar conditions were imposed on all who were concerned in the preparation of the ashes of the red heifer, (Num. xix.)—they were unclean, from coming into contact

¹ Hengstenberg, *Egypt and BB. of Moses*, p. 165.

with what, so far from being in itself unclean, was specially provided as the medium of purification for such as were so circumstanced.

Whatever view may be entertained of these minor points, the great truth which the solemn transactions of the day of atonement vividly presented to the Israelites was, that sins remitted by Jehovah were completely taken away—borne to a “land not inhabited” (ver. 22),—a circumstance which called for the renunciation of evil, and ‘of the Principle of evil, the apostate Spirit into whose sphere the sins had been symbolically remanded. Another object may have been, to correct any Dualistic errors which the Israelites may have contracted in Egypt, where that principle had taken very deep root. There may be thus, as Hengstenberg contends, in the transaction a reference to the Typhonian notions of the Egyptians.

In the Egyptian mythology Typhon was the abstract idea of evil, as his brother Osiris represented “goodness.” The fraternal relation of good and evil is fully illustrated on the early monuments; and it was only afterwards, as Wilkinson supposes, through Asiatic influence, that evil became confounded with sin, “the great serpent,” and so became the enemy of Osiris, whose death he at length brought about. “The sufferings and death of Osiris,” Wilkinson remarks, “were the great mystery of the Egyptian religion; and some traces of it are perceptible among other people of antiquity. His being the divine goodness, and the abstract idea of “good,” his manifestation upon earth (like an Indian god), his death and resurrection, and his office as judge of the dead in a future state, look like the early revelation of a future manifestation of the deity converted into a mythological fable, and are not less remarkable than that notion of the Egyptians mentioned by Plutarch, that a woman might conceive by the approach of some divine spirit.”¹ The desert was considered to be the peculiar domain of Typhon, whence he made incursions into the consecrated land, as the fertile soil of Egypt was regarded. “He is,” says Creuzer, “the lover of the degenerate Nephthys, the hostile Lybian desert, and of the sea-shore,—there is the kingdom of Typhon; on the contrary, Egypt the blessed, the

¹ Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. ii. p. 260.

Nile-valley glittering with fresh crops, is the land of Isis."¹ References to the same belief occur among nations far apart from one another, and even the very name of this evil principle is found, with but slight variations from the Egyptian form.² The correspondence between the destination of the goat sent to Azazel into the desert and the peculiar haunts of Typhon, affords some countenance to the view which finds here an Egyptian reference; but with this the whole analogy terminates; for in fact the Hebrew rite was intended directly to counteract an Egyptian practice. The Egyptians, while they feared and hated Typhon, sought sometimes to propitiate him by the offering of some of the sacred animals. But the Jewish ordinance was directly opposed to this. "In opposition to the Egyptian view, which implied the necessity of yielding respect to bad beings generally, if men would ensure themselves against them, it was intended by this rite to bring Israel to the deepest consciousness, that all trouble is the punishment of a just and holy God, whom they, through their sins, have offended, that they must reconcile themselves only with him; that when that is done, and the forgiveness of sins is obtained, the bad being can harm them no farther."³

5. *The Red Heifer.* Another particular in the Mosaic ordinances, wherein Spencer and others find a reference to Egyptian customs, is the provision ordered for the purifying of such as had been defiled by the dead. "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke" (Num. xix. 2). Without entering into any examination of the purposes to be subserved by the ashes of the heifer, prepared in the way which the law prescribed, or that peculiarity noticed in another connexion, that while the water in which the ashes were mixed purified the unclean, it, on the contrary, polluted any clean person who touched it, further than to notice the close connexion in which it presents death and uncleanness, there are various peculiarities, it must be remarked, which distinguish this from all the other ordinances

¹ Creuzer, *Symbolik*, ii. 328. The Persian ideas respecting the abode of Ahriman were precisely similar. *Ibid.* i. 223.

² Wilkinson, in Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii. 225.

³ Hengstenberg, *Egypt and BB. of Moses*, p. 171.

of the law. The victim was so far a sacrifice that part of the blood was sprinkled before the tabernacle of the congregation, but the residue thereof, as well as the entire animal, was burnt without the camp, no part of it being brought to the altar (ver. 4, 5). The chief peculiarities, however, are the express directions as to the sex and colour of the animal, more particularly the latter. As a general rule, males only were allowed to be offered, and in the sin-offerings of the congregation in particular bullocks were the only admissible victims, but here a heifer is expressly prescribed.

Various explanations have been given of this anomaly, but they are all exceedingly conjectural. The view of Spencer, though rejected by Bähr and Hengstenberg, who bring forward very arbitrary suppositions of their own, is at least as probable as any that has yet been submitted. According to this writer it was meant to counteract the Egyptian notions of the sacredness of the cow, which they scrupulously abstained from sacrificing. Thus, according to Herodotus,¹ "The male kine, if clean, and the male calves, are used for sacrifice by the Egyptians universally; but the female they are not allowed to sacrifice, since they are sacred to Isis." . . . "The Egyptians, one and all, venerate cows much more highly than any other animal." And, according to Porphyry,² the Phœnicians resembled the Egyptians in this respect: "The Egyptians and Phœnicians would rather eat human flesh than that of cows, on account of the value of the animal, though they both sacrifice and eat bulls." This may possibly have some connexion with the worship of the "calves of Beth-aven," (Hos. x. 5), into which the Israelites lapsed, through the sin of Jeroboam. And, indeed, it is noticed by ancient authors, that the Jews sacrificed without distinction, animals which by other nations were held as sacred. Thus, Tacitus: "Profana illis omnia, quæ apud nos sacra, . . . cæso ariete in contumeliam Ammonis: bos quoque immolatur, quem Ægyptii Apim colunt."³ And, still more express is the remark of Manetho, in relation to some ancient traditions that a priest of the Jews "first ordained that they should neither worship the gods, nor abstain from those animals which were worshipped by the Egyptians, but should

¹ Lib. ii. 41.

² De Abstin. Lib. ii. § 11.

³ See Spencer, De Leg. Heb., L. ii. cap. xv., § 2.

sacrifice (שְׂעִיר) and eat them all."¹ The antagonism which subsisted between the Israelitish sacrifices, even in their simpler and patriarchal form, and the Egyptian notions on that subject, sufficiently appears in the history of the preparation for the Exodus, when Moses refused to accede to Pharaoh's proposal to sacrifice in the land, instead of going forth for that purpose into the wilderness. "It is not meet so to do; for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God: lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us?" (Ex. viii. 26.)

Another and more specific reason why, in this particular case, the victim should be a female rather than a male, may be found in the circumstance noticed by Plutarch, that the Egyptians sacrificed *red* bullocks to Typhon. So particular were they, he adds, as to the colour, that they considered the animal unfit for sacrifice if there was found on it a single black or white hair. If, then, for special reasons, the animal prescribed in the Hebrew ordinance required to be of the same colour as the Typhonian sacrifice, there was the greater necessity for a distinction in other respects, lest any countenance should be given to the Egyptian rite.

What were the reasons, however, which, in this particular instance, dictated a specific colour, and red more than any other, it is difficult to determine. There were, it is well-known, distinctions of this kind in the various forms of ancient heathen worship—the several gods delighting, it was supposed, in the sacrifices of animals of appropriate colours—Neptune, for instance, in bulls entirely black, and such also was the colour of the bull which the Egyptians consecrated to the sun, to which the Persians again offered white horses,² while the Greeks offered to some of their deities white bulls. Indeed, as much attention was given to the colour as to the species of animal that was offered in any particular case. This must have originated in certain notions of congruity, some symbolic relation between the assumed character of the gods, or the specific character of the service rendered, or the favour sought, and particular colours which the mind had associated with certain corresponding qualities. That in the case of the red heifer the colour was

¹ Josephus con. Apion. I. 28.

² Creuzer. Symbolik, i. 223.

selected from any reference to the Typhonian sacrifice, is not at all probable, although it may be admitted that both among the Egyptians and the Hebrews, *red* was symbolical of evil, but how far there was any connexion as to this point does not appear. It is evident, however, from various passages of Scripture, as, for instance, Isa. i. 18, that *red* was to the ancient Hebrew symbolic of sin; and, as in this ordinance, whether it may be properly called a sin-offering or not, there was a vivid representation of sin, as defiling the Israelite and unfitting him for the society of the holy, especially of a holy God, and also a symbolic provision for the removal of defilement, there may have been presented by the red colour to the Hebrew mind, familiar with symbolic language, natural and ritual, a striking analogy, which is entirely lost to minds not so educated.

§ 3. *The Value of this Correspondence—The Theory of Spencer.*

The preceding are some of the more important examples adduced by Spencer of affinity between the Hebrew and the Egyptian rituals. It cannot be denied that there is some correspondence in a few of the particulars noticed; and this, indeed, is more apparent in various instances of a minor character not here considered; as, for instance, the similarity of the sacerdotal vestments both as to colour and material, particularly the latter. The white colour was common to the nations of antiquity, but so far as it can be ascertained, the use of linen, or byssus, in such garments, was peculiar to the Israelites and Egyptians. With the exception of this, and some other matters, traces more or less distinct of what are alleged as affinities with Egyptian practices, may be found in several other systems of antiquity. This was not denied even by Spencer himself, but various points of connexion between Egypt and the surrounding nations, unknown in the time of that writer, have since been brought to light.¹

¹ Hardwick: "The most conclusive testimony, flowing from late researches of Dr. Livingstone, may readily be brought to bear upon the affinity in thought and feeling and traditions between the natives of Central Africa and the primitive layer of human population, not in Egypt only, but in other and far distant countries."—Christ and other Masters, Pt. iv., p. 230.

It is not, however, necessary to dispute as to the amount of similarity between the Mosaic institutions and Egyptian customs, for even were it shown to be far greater than has yet been attempted, it would not militate against the character of the Hebrew legislator, or favour the views which Spencer with great learning endeavoured to establish. If, in treating this subject, Spencer finds points of resemblance where none really exist, or only very remotely, it must also be admitted that some of his opponents went to the opposite extreme in their denial of very plain analogies. It is the same still with writers on this subject. Thus Hengstenberg, who, though he can by no means be regarded as favouring the views of Spencer, but is, on the contrary, a decided opponent, often admits a correspondence in points which are exceedingly doubtful; while Bähr again errs on the opposite extreme.

The correspondence now indicated between the Hebrew and heathen systems was early recognised, and employed for polemic purposes, without calling forth any particular inquiry into the grounds on which it rested. The enemies of Christianity, as represented by Celsus and Julian, fully aware of the close relation between the Mosaic institutions and the Gospel, could devise no stronger argument against the latter than that the Jewish ordinances had been derived from, or modelled after, the systems of heathenism. And, indeed, some of the early Fathers themselves, and apologists for Christianity, in their zeal against Judaizing teachers, did not scruple to employ the same weapons, lavishing all manner of contempt on the peculiarly Jewish institutions. No doubt some of the expressions used by these writers may be accounted for on the same principle as that which justifies various apostolic statements on the same subject, but in many cases the language indicates anything but correct views of the proper character and design of the law. It was the same also with Jewish writers themselves. While the bulk of the nation was rejoicing in their exclusiveness, and the peculiarity of their law, the literary and philosophic, as Josephus and Philo, sought to commend it to the favourable consideration of the Gentiles by presenting its analogies with other ancient systems, or resolving its truths into an allegorical language common to the ancient world.

The course adopted by the defenders of the law was either to deny the existence of such correspondence,¹ or to maintain, in cases where the similarity was undeniable, that the heathen adopted, and more or less imitated, the Israelitish rite. On this latter point Josephus may be adduced. "The multitude of mankind itself have had a great inclination for a long time to follow our religious observances; for there is not any city of the Grecians, nor any of the barbarians, nor any nation whatsoever, whither our custom of resting on the seventh day hath not come, and by which our fasts and lighting up lamps, and many of our prohibitions as to our food, are not observed."²

Passing over the names of other earlier writers who held similar views, many of the Reformation period, and subsequently, resolved the resemblance noticeable between the Hebrew ritual, and the institutions of Egypt in particular, into the impression made on the Egyptians by Abraham on his visit thither, the priests having in this way derived much information regarding the patriarchal creed; and that this impression was afterwards greatly deepened by Joseph's close alliance with the priestly order, if he was not actually made a member of it.³ Others, however, without specifying the time or the manner of the transfer, contented themselves with simply holding that the Egyptians were the borrowers. Thus, it is on the supposition that the Egyptians imitated the Hebrews, that Bochart and Huet explain the peculiarity with respect to the sacerdotal garments being of linen among these two nations. In the same way, also, others accounted for the use of circumcision among the Egyptians.

In more recent times the whole subject has attracted much attention in connection with the theory propounded on the one hand by Spencer, to whom repeated reference has already been made, and on the other by the numerous opponents called forth by his work. Spencer has the merit of having fully and systematically discussed the subject, having

¹ Thus still Cox, (*Bib. Antiq.*, Lond. new, original," &c.--P. 210.

1852): "The only idea suited to the dignity of Jehovah, is, what is manifest in every institution of the Mosaic economy, that the whole was a system,

² *Cont. Apion.*, ii. 40.

³ Witsius, *Ægyptiaca*, Lib. iii. 12, §§ 5-9.

amassed, with much learning and industry, everything which could be found in classical authors, and elsewhere, to illustrate the ordinances of the Mosaic law; and in this way he has thrown considerable light on enactments, which, without this comparison of contemporary rites and usages in the nations bordering on the Israelites, must be exceedingly obscure. The principles, however, on which that writer proceeds, are decidedly erroneous, and even the relation which he seeks to establish between the Mosaic ordinances and Egypt, although this is a matter of minor importance, and does not essentially affect the purpose of the work, is not warranted either by the nature of the case or by the admissions which the writer himself makes of similar affinities between the Mosaic and institutions other than Egyptian.

It is in setting themselves to the refutation of this alleged connexion between the Mosaic and the Egyptian systems, to the neglect of the consideration of the principles and the primary object of the work, that the opponents of Spencer have erred. Even were the points of resemblance more marked and numerous than Spencer affirms them to be, a satisfactory account could be given of such a correspondence, and one confirmatory of the truthfulness of the Bible and illustrative of the wisdom and goodness of its Divine author, who, in his procedure, never deals arbitrarily with his people, but always considers their particular wants and circumstances and suits his revelations both to the times in general and to individuals in particular.

An explanation of the impression which Egypt may be thought to have communicated to the Mosaic economy, will be found in the circumstances narrated in the Pentateuch itself. Without entirely overlooking the fact, to which Warburton¹ attaches much importance, that Moses himself received his education at the Pharaonic court, and was, as stated by Stephen, "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians"—an acquisition made subservient in various ways to the furtherance of his calling, as St. Paul's Greek learning was made available for his mission, it is of more value for the present inquiry to consider the effects of Egyptian associations on the people

¹ Div. Leg., ii. 316, 317.

to whom the law was communicated. That the influence of their long sojourn in Egypt must have been varied and deep cannot be doubted, even were there no means for forming an accurate estimate on the subject. They entered that land as a small company of nomades—simple in their manners and habits—at all events presenting a very marked contrast with the civilised and artificial society of the country in which their lot was thus cast. Judging from the effects produced on the Israelites by the comparatively brief period of Babylonian exile, and after, as a nation, they had attained to considerable maturity, it would be difficult to limit the amount of influence exercised upon them in far different circumstances in Egypt. There is, however, no necessity for conjecture on the subject. There are numerous notices in the Pentateuch which contribute information, in addition to such statements as bear more directly on the point. There can be no question that the skill in setting and engraving precious stones, working in wood and metal, the various arts of dyeing, weaving and embroidery, and the preparation of perfumes, with various other matters, so largely employed in the structure of the tabernacle and its furniture, and in the sacerdotal vestments, must have been due entirely to an Egyptian education.¹ It must have been so also with regard to other acquirements; the art of writing, for instance, which, from an incident recorded in Num. xvii. 2-9, must have been pretty extensively known. There are more express testimonies as to the moral and religious effects of the Israelites' connexion with Egypt, and these, as might be anticipated by any one at all acquainted with the religious system of the Egyptians, of an exceedingly unfavourable character. The apostasy at Sinai, in the affair of the golden calf, is itself sufficient evidence of the views thus contracted; and, still more, those prohibitions of the law which have a direct reference to Egyptian practices, which should not be tolerated in the people of Jehovah.

Leaving out of view for the present the nature of the Egyptian ritual and its contrariety to the system introduced by Moses, it must, in various ways, have exerted an influence on the Israelitish sojourners in the land of Goshen, who, in

¹ See Hengstenberg, *Egypt and BB. of Moses*, pp. 133-143.

temperament and training must, but for the patriarchal faith and traditions still surviving amongst them, be much on a level with their neighbours. The Egyptian, like every other ancient religious system, was, to a large extent, symbolical; and these symbols, it is conclusively shown by modern research, were, as in almost every other case, greatly dependent on the physical peculiarities of the country, whilst there was a common substratum referable to earlier traditions of the yet undivided nations of the earth. It was impossible for a people circumstanced like the Israelites, not to learn this symbolic language, which spoke not to the ear but to the eye. Admitting that they had taken no part in those ceremonies, and indeed that they had no sympathy with such rites—a position far from being warranted by the known facts of the case, they would naturally adopt these signs as the expressions of religious truths, which might have, nevertheless, little essentially in common with the views of those who first used them. This is no mere assumption, for it is now fully recognised that the same sign or symbol often calls up the most diversified ideas according to the differences of national or individual association.

For the present object, however, and with a consideration merely of the ascertained facts of the case, rather than theoretical speculations, it is by no means necessary to assume such an extreme view of the dependence of the Mosaic symbolism on that of Egypt. As already noticed, the amount of coincidence is a question of utter indifference, for, on any supposition, a wise teacher will adopt that style of discourse which is comprehensible to his pupils, and, where description fails, he avails himself of illustrations and diagrams. Symbolic institutions formed, as it were, the illustrated books of antiquity,¹ and the ritual of any particular nation was minute, complicated and operose, in proportion as it endeavoured to give expression to the multitude and variety of thoughts which fancy or caprice as to the mode of propitiating the gods, or which convictions of sin, weighing down the human mind, sometimes breaking out in the most extravagant manner, may have suggested.

¹ Hardwick: "Symbol was a species of primeval language: the symbolic institutions were the illustrated and illuminated books, in which the early gene-

rations of the human family might learn the rudiments of true religion."—Christ and other Masters, pt. iv. p. 110.

The Mosaic ritual makes no claim to originality. It, indeed, professes to be of Divine origin, but it is just as explicitly narrated in the Mosaic writings that some of its fundamental ordinances are much older than the Hebrew legislator. The Sabbath, sacrifices, circumcision, and other particulars already noticed, date from primeval or patriarchal times. And of these it might be stated, with as much propriety as it is said of the initiatory rite of Judaism, that though given by Moses it was not of Moses but of the fathers (John vii. 22). Indeed, it is difficult to say how much of the Hebrew ordinances and ritual may not have been consecrated by patriarchal use. Certainly there is no warrant for limiting it to the particulars incidentally mentioned in Genesis, especially when it is considered that various matters, not so specified, are yet introduced in the Mosaic ordinances, as well known, or not needing explanation. This supposition will, at least, be deemed as probable, as the gratuitous conclusion that the familiarity of the Israelites, with respect to these matters, is to be ascribed to the use of them by the Egyptians. But whatever may have been the extent of the Israelites' acquaintance with primeval and patriarchal usages in the matter of Divine worship, or whatever may have been the degree to which these usages may have given form to some of the older systems of heathenism, and among others of this class, the Egyptian in particular, it is certain that there must have been a certain common substratum of truth in the systems both of the Israelites and the Egyptians.

Anyhow, when the Israelites first came into connexion with the rites practised in the valley of the Nile, they were not altogether unfamiliar with the language of symbol, and while, from the new associations into which they were now brought, such objects must, from their number and the circumstances in which they were presented, have made a very deep impression on the mind, they may have recognised in certain of these practices illustrations, though in a more general and formal relation, of their own patriarchal creed and ritual. It would not at all detract from the deep significance of the rite of circumcision, for instance, as a seal of the ancestral covenant, and a sign of the purity of such as occupy such a relation to Jehovah, to find that the Egyptian priesthood,

the special servants of the gods, and who, on that account, were expected to be patterns of purity, observed this rite, as well as that particular attention to cleanliness in their person and dress which arrested the attention of Herodotus¹ and other ancient writers. Indeed, looking at the rite of circumcision in this aspect, as distinct from that universal observance of it enjoined upon themselves, may have contributed to the formation of correct ideas of its symbolical character. Or, to take another case in which the Mosaic ordinance on the subject may be supposed to be derived from an Egyptian practice, the material constituting the priestly vestments. What, it may be asked, could be more suitable in the circumstances, than to adopt such a material as was in itself most promotive of cleanliness, and, from the use to which it had been already applied, was particularly suggestive of purity? The fact that it was in itself best suited for the purpose to which it was now to be applied, was of more importance than any danger to be apprehended from its previous association with heathen services. Its association with ideas of sanctity may have, in fact, given it a special fitness; but in all such arrangements the similarity or diversity of climatic and other circumstances require to be taken into account. The fact, also, that such materials were naturally in the possession of a people who had just quitted Egypt, the fine linen or byssus being a noted Egyptian manufacture, and so was easily procurable, is not without its value, just as the shittim wood, employed in the construction of the ark, was selected for that purpose, no doubt chiefly because of its being a production of the desert in which they were then encamping. What was suited for Egypt or Palestine, as an article of dress, would be found quite inappropriate in other latitudes, and this may partly account for the circumstance that, while the white colour was extensively employed in holy garments, the linen or byssus, as the material of which they were made, seems to have been confined to the Israelites and the Egyptians.

These considerations should vindicate the Mosaic institutions from objections on account of any formal correspondence between them and other observances of Gentile nations, or

¹ Lib. ii. 37.

from the more specific charge, that many of them were directly borrowed, or otherwise adopted from Egyptian customs. So far from such correspondence or adaptation being prejudicial to the character of the Mosaic economy, it will be found, when duly weighed, to be not only a necessity, but a wise provision for the exigencies of the case. If symbolic rites and ceremonies were a necessity of the early church, still in a state of minority, but subjected to a species of training to qualify it for the place destined for it in the earth, the same consideration called for a symbolism to which the Hebrew mind was not altogether a stranger, more particularly when it was addressed to the people at large, there being in the Mosaic institutions nothing of the mysteries or esoteric doctrines, which in other systems, the Egyptian in particular, were the peculiar privilege of the few. The ancient Hebrew "was far less capable than his remote descendants of all abstract and unearthly contemplation; he was living more than they in the impressions made on the eyesight; and accordingly it was the part of wisdom in obtaining from him the acceptance of a supersensuous truth to represent it, or, one might say, embody it in concrete shapes, to clothe it in more visible and sensuous drapery, and enforce it by suggestive actions and symbolical institutions."¹ These observations are as applicable still to such as have not a high mental development as to the case of the ancient Hebrew; and it is a fact well known to the preacher of the Gospel, how references to illustrations from the old Israelitish ordinances will command a sympathy and attention, unattainable by any exposition of plain abstract truth. And is it not sufficient evidence of the Divine wisdom, which prescribed and arranged the Israelitish ordinances, that they answered the purposes for which they were designed, and that they were instrumental in preparing proper recipients and expounders, in the persons of the Apostles, of the pure spiritual truths of Christianity?

Such considerations as these, however, have but little place in the scheme of Spencer, who, under the plea of vindicating the law, and pointing out its admirable adaptation to what he considers its chief purposes, endeavours, strange to say, to vilify it in every possible way, fortifying his positions, not only with the

¹ Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, Pt. iv. pp. 100, 101.

authority of the Fathers, but also, as he conceives, of Scripture itself, both of the Old and New Testaments. Setting out correctly enough with the refutation of the opinion, that the Hebrew laws are wholly, or in part, of an arbitrary character, dependent only on the will of their Divine author, and which he disproves by considerations drawn from the nature and perfections of God, and the evidences of design discernible in all His works; and further, showing that an inquiry into the design of those laws is not only lawful, but is attended with many advantages, in describing which he warmly expatiates on the character of the law, in terms which certainly furnish no pre-intimation of the highly contradictory estimate of the same system which is to follow in the course of his inquiry. Spencer states what he considers to be the primary end of the whole Mosaic legislation. This he finds to be the prevention of idolatry. To this nearly the whole of the first book is devoted.

To wean the people from idolatry, for which they acquired such a fondness in Egypt, was, according to Spencer, the chief end of circumcision, and the Sabbatical institution, the distinctions as to animals and food, the multiplicity of sacred rites, with the restrictions to certain places, persons, and times, and more particularly the restriction of those services to the honour of God. Another, but secondary end of at least some of the Mosaic ordinances, he admitted, was to represent spiritual and heavenly things, but there is an evident anxiety to reduce it as much as possible. Not only is this end assigned a subordinate place, but some of the reasons which Spencer assigns for these carnal ordinances being made to serve such a purpose show, more than anything else, that the writer was quite at a loss how to make the fact quadrate with his views of the character of these institutions. Thus, finding that there were deep truths, enigmas, or mysteries veiled under the religions, politics, and philosophies of the ancient Gentile world, particularly the Egyptians, it is but reasonable, he adds, to suppose that God delivered to the Jews a system carnal, indeed, in its exterior, but divine and wonderful in its core, that He might adapt his institutions to the taste and custom of the age, and that nothing should seem wanting to his law and

worship which wisdom would suggest.¹ Nor, after considering one of the reasons thus assigned for the introduction of mysteries into the Mosaic ordinances, will it be at all incredible that Spencer should regard them as having respect to philosophical as much as spiritual truth.²

With the low conceptions which Spencer entertained of the character of the ceremonial law, it is not at all surprising that he should assign a secondary place to it, as embodying spiritual and eternal truths, whether expressive of the Divine character and purposes, or of man's relation to God and the moral law; but it is a matter of astonishment that he failed to discern how utterly incompatible were his own views of the law, both with what he regarded as its primary end, and with any correct conceptions of the character of God. So far from serving as an antidote to idolatrous propensities, and binding the Israelites to the faith and worship of Jehovah, the whole system, contemplated from Spencer's point of view, could have no other effect than immersing its subjects still deeper in sensuousness and idolatry, and alienating the better disposed of the nation from the service of a Being so inconsiderate of the means, provided only they accomplished the desired end. Indeed, he holds that, in the case of such, the neglect of the ceremonial ordinances was not at all censurable,³ and that individuals noted for piety did not hesitate to disregard the law, when by so doing they gave no occasion to idolatry.

That this is no unfair estimate of the principles of Spencer, can be shown from the whole tenor of his book. He could discern in the law scarcely anything beyond a multiform apparatus of ceremonies having no agreement with the nature of God, and contrived for the general object of gratifying the childish tastes contracted by the people during their residence in Egypt; and though in one place⁴ he expresses a dissent from the view which regards it as a contrivance, to give them employment, innocent, though trifling, in order to prevent them recurring to their former gross practices, yet in other passages he intimates his approval of it; God taking little

¹ De Leg. Heb. L. i. 11, § 1. p. 157.

² *Ibid.* L. i. 11, § 3. p. 163.

³ De Leg. Heb., Lib. i. 1. § 2, p. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10; comp. p. 7.

concern how they were occupied, provided they rendered the appointed services solely to Himself. In short, the only justification of the law was its accommodation to the incorrigibly gross views of the people, and it was in order to justify this conclusion, that Spencer was anxious to multiply as much as possible the points of resemblance between the Hebrew and the heathen systems, God indulging them in the Egyptian practices so far as it could be done with safety to the great principles of monotheism, lest offended by too great a novelty, they should abandon the theocratic worship, and relapse into their former practices.¹

This theory of accommodation is essentially opposed to the Biblical teaching on the subject, which sees in this condescension to the wants and weaknesses, and to the actual state of the Hebrews at the time, (compare Acts xiii. 18,) evidence of Divine wisdom and goodness in thus providing a lower and symbolic form of true religion, which, though it differed formally from the system which it was intended to introduce, still had an internal fitness, and occupied a definite place in the scheme of redemption, and marked a far higher stage of development than the patriarchal scheme, between which and the Gospel it formed the connecting link.

The grounds on which Spencer rests his view of the character and design of the ceremonial law, are certain statements, as he interprets them, of Scripture itself, particularly that in Ezek. xx. 25; and the fact, as he alleges, that the ceremonial law was only an after-thought, something imposed as a yoke or a punishment on the people, after their apostasy in the case of the golden calf. Each of these points calls for a few remarks.

Referring to the period of Israel's sojourn in the wilderness, and to His experience of their manners, God says: "Wherefore I gave them statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live" (Ezek. xx. 25)—a statement which, from the earliest times, has caused great difficulties to the Biblical expositor.² It was early employed

¹ De Leg. Heb., Lib. iii. 2, § 1.

² Comp. Deyling, De Statutis non bonis: Obs. Sacræ ii. 300 ff. Kurtz, Geschichte, ii. 409-411.

by the Manichæans to justify their rejection of the Old Testament, and has since been frequently applied to the disparagement of Judaism.

Some, as Glassius, Rosenmüller, and others, understand the passage as referring to the threatenings and punishment announced to the Israelites by Moses in the name of God; but a fatal objection to this view is that the text expressly mentions statutes which cannot possibly be identical with threats. Others take it to be of the law in general, as contrasted with the Gospel, as in Luke xviii. 19; so Ambrose and Augustin; while Spencer and Marsham limit it to the ceremonial in contrast to the moral law. Either of these suppositions, however, would place the prophet in direct opposition not only to the Pentateuch (Deut. xxxii. 47) but also to himself, when he describes (ver. 11, 13, 21) the Mosaic statutes as conferring life on such as obeyed them. Calvin, Vitringa,¹ and Hävernäck find in the statement a reference to the customs and practices of heathenism to which Jehovah gave them over as a punishment for their ungodly disposition, as in Rom. i. 24; while Umbreit and others understand it of the liturgical laws which Jehovah prescribed, but which the people abused for heathen purposes; both these views recognising in the matter the exercise of Divine retribution.

Hävernäck² compares the statement of Ezekiel, that the statutes were given by Jehovah, with Acts vii. 42, "God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven;" and Rom. i. 24. To this Hitzig³ and Kurtz object: "These passages would only be parallel, if it were here meant, I gave them such statutes, as if another than Jehovah could be their author." But the third passage, 2 Thess. ii. 11, "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie," adduced by Hävernäck, is not open to the same objection. Fairbairn,⁴ agreeing with Hävernäck, remarks: "By a strong expression, God is said to have given these [polluted customs of heathenism] to the Israelites, when He saw their wayward and perverse behaviour in regard to the commandments and duties of his service; since, to punish their unfaithfulness. He

¹ *Observationes Sacrae*, L. ii. 1, § 17.

² *Com. üb. Ezechiel*, pp. 313-315.

³ *Der Prophet Ezechiel*, p. 136.

⁴ *Ezekiel, and the Book of his Prophecy*, p. 176. Edin. 1851.

subjected them to influences which carried them still farther astray, and brought on, first spiritual, then also, in due time, outward desolation and ruin."

Kurtz adopts the view of Umbreit, stated above, and for the following reasons:—First, because the analogy of the calf-worship at Sinai shows how, in the idolatrous disposition of Israel at that time, the tendency was not so much towards direct heathenism as to pervert the worship of Jehovah in its name and form into heathenish practices. Secondly, because Ezekiel himself illustrates his statement by an example of the untheocratic presentation of the first-born founded on Exod. xii. 12, 13. The presentation of the first-born was a law of Jehovah: as such it was good, when observed in the manner and sense prescribed. But it was not good, and did not serve for life or salvation, but, on the contrary, was destitute of all blessing, when performed in a heathenish sense or form. That such practices existed among the Israelites in the wilderness, the prophet expressly states. Notwithstanding, however, such misapplication of the statutes, they still remained the same, given of God; and now that they were misunderstood and abused, and so *polluted* the worshippers, they proceeded from Jehovah for effecting his punitive purposes regarding Israel.

Whatever may be the precise import of this confessedly difficult passage, it affords no warrant for the terms in which Spencer characterises the ceremonial law. Nor can anything more favourable to his view be deduced from the fact that some parts of the Mosaic ordinances were permissive rather than imperative—a concession, as our Lord terms the allowing of divorce, "because of the hardness of their hearts." These concessions, it should be remarked, were in matters belonging to the civil and not to the ceremonial law; although even here God had respect more to the spirit than the mere letter of the law, as appears from Moses expressing himself satisfied with the explanation of Aaron on his omitting to eat the sin-offering after the melancholy death of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 16-20). This circumstance alone, showing that the Lawgiver regarded not the form but the essential character of the act, is fatal to the whole scheme of Spencer.

The other principal argument of Spencer is, that the ritual or ceremonial law formed no part of the constitution intended

for the Israelitish people, but was superinduced on account of the gross and refractory disposition which they manifested so soon after their admission into covenant with Jehovah.¹ For such an assumption, however, there is not the vestige of authority. It is entirely at variance with the history of the transactions in the book of Exodus, while nothing is more remote from the other passages of Scripture adduced in support of it.

First, the ceremonial law was announced prior to the worship of the golden calf, to which, according to Spencer, it owed its origin.² It is plain from the history that the tabernacle and its furniture, the establishment of the Levitical priesthood, directions regarding their vestments and consecration, the altar and the stated offerings,—in a word, the entire foundation of the ceremonial law, were settled in the instructions given to Moses in the Mount (Exod. xxv.-xxxi.) prior to the act of apostasy, which is not narrated till Exod. xxxii. 7. Further, it is expressly stated that all the arrangements, when completed, accorded entirely with these prescriptions without any addition or modification whatever. It was the same also in respect to the promises that God would visibly dwell among his people, and that He would sanctify the tabernacle by his glory (Exod. xxix. 43), and which were fulfilled as soon as the tabernacle was erected (xl. 54). Indeed, any change in the original arrangements was confined to the substitution of tables of stone, prepared under the direction of Moses himself (xxx. 1, 4), for receiving the Decalogue, in the room of those originally provided by God, but which Moses broke on finding the people in a state of apostasy, and as a sign to them of their breach of the covenant into which they had solemnly entered, and the terms of which were inscribed by God himself on the tables (xxxii. 19).

Nor does the statement of St. Paul, that “the law was added because of transgressions” (Gal. iii. 19), lend any countenance to the view in support of which it is adduced.³ The apostle’s words are in reply to the question, “Wherefore, then, serveth the law?” called forth in the course of a discussion

¹ De Leg. Heb. L. i. 1, § 2.

³ De Leg. Heb. L. i. 1, § 2.

² Shuckford, Connexion, vol. ii. pp. 69, 70.

touching the nature and design of the law and its relation to the Divine promise made to Abraham long prior to its promulgation. It is quite evident from the whole discourse, especially from the statement regarding the relation of sinners to the law, and the impossibility of their securing salvation therefrom, that no distinction is intended between the moral and the ceremonial law, as if it was only the latter which the apostle intimated was added "because of transgressions."¹ Even were such a distinction admissible, there would still be no ground for the assumption that this passage had reference to the apostasy of the Israelites at Sinai. On the contrary, the only legitimate interpretation is that which takes the "law" to be descriptive of the whole Israelitish constitution, the object of such an arrangement being the separation of a people from the rest of mankind to be the depositaries of Divine truth, because of the corruption of the other nations of the earth, and which was intended to prepare for and to continue until the advent of the promised seed.²

Nor is the cause of Spencer any further advanced by an appeal to other Pauline statements, characterising the law more in its ceremonial aspect, as "carnal ordinances," "elements of this world," "weak and beggarly elements" (Heb. ix. 10; Gal. iv. 3, 9). These and other depreciating terms would not, it is alleged, have been used by the apostle in reference to institutions having really a Divine origin and sanction. After what has been already urged, it is unnecessary to discuss this point. Such descriptions of the law can occasion no difficulty to those who consider that they are used of it simply as contrasted with the Gospel, to which it was preparatory. It is no valid objection whatever that the rudimentary form does not exhibit the perfections and excellences of the fully deve-

¹ Baden Powell takes this to be "*in consideration to transgressions*, in a *favourable or indulging* sense, as regards transgressions." (J. S. L., Ap. 1848, p. 334. Christ. without Judaism. Essay iii.), which is an entire perversion of the apostle's meaning.

² Brown (Exposition of Galatians, pp. 150, 151) gives the sense correctly, but introduces some questionable state-

ments. Thus: "Had it not been for the transgressions of the Israelites, the *more spiritual* and less burdensome order of things under which Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob were placed, might have been continued, and the law as a distinct order of things *never have existed, because never needed.*" This view of the law, and its relation to patriarchy, appears exceedingly confused.

veloped organism. It is only where Judaism is viewed as complete in itself, or as antagonistic to Christianity, that objections to its imperfections, or to minute and multiform ordinances, have really any weight. The system was unquestionably imperfect; it was rigid and formal to a degree which presents an entire contrast with the New Testament economy, but it was thereby only the better adapted for the ends which its Author contemplated, and accomplishing those purposes so completely as it did by its introduction of a better dispensation, it gives undoubted testimony of its being a product of Divine wisdom.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RELATION OF THE PENTATEUCH AND THE MOSAIC INSTITUTIONS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE observations in the preceding chapter on the Mosaic economy, viewed as a medium for imparting religious instruction, had respect chiefly to one of its aspects. They were intended to show that, as a symbolic system, it came into contact at various points with the older systems of heathenism, and that such a relation might be unhesitatingly admitted without the least prejudice to its Divine character; nay, rather, that this itself indicated its special fitness in the circumstances. The contrasts, however, between Mosaism and those other systems were found to be much more forcible than the affinities. Both doctrinally and practically, there is indeed no room for comparison. There was a purity and propriety in everything connected with the Hebrew dispensation which raised it immeasurably above all the other religions of antiquity.

Viewed, however, as a mere symbolic system, complete in itself, or terminating with the people whose moral and religious life it was intended to form and develop, the Mosaic economy, particularly its ritual, cannot be shown to occupy that distinct and distinguished place which it might be presumed would characterise an economy of grace and redemption. Were its institutions nothing more than symbolical, it might still, with all its excellencies, be only a higher and more refined form of natural religion. Its services might be rendered to the one God, to the exclusion of all idolatrous ideas, and still it might be nothing better than an eclectic heathenism. And this, in fact, is the conclusion, however it may be expressed, to which such views necessarily lead.¹

¹ In proof of this, reference may be made to a recent Jewish work, *The Law of Sinai and its appointed Times*. By Moses Angel. Lond., 1858.

There is evidence, however, of another feature which gives to the Old Testament dispensation an entirely different character, showing that its ordinances did not terminate in themselves or with the people, for whom they were directly ordained. It was not simply symbolic, it was also typical; nor can it be other than a very erroneous idea that will be formed of its character, wherever this most important element is overlooked. The object of the present treatise would be very imperfectly attained without some inquiry, although necessarily of a brevity scarcely consistent with its importance, into the relation between Judaism and Christianity.

SECT. I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE PROVISIONAL AND PREPARATORY CHARACTER OF JUDAISM.

Berriman, *Gradual Revelation of the Gospel from the Time of Man's Apostasy*, vol. ii., pp. 112-255. Lond., 1733.—Graves, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, vol. ii., pp. 353-413.—Litton, *the Mosaic Dispensation considered as introductory to Christianity*. Lond., 1856.

The view maintained throughout the preceding discussion is, that the Israelites occupied a mediatory relation to the rest of mankind, and that their peculiar constitution and polity was intended not only to preserve the true religion among themselves, and diffuse it as circumstances allowed among their neighbours, but also to prepare for a universal and more spiritual system. As, however, this is a point warmly contested, on the ground that Judaism was of so exclusive a character and imperfect a type, and in other respects so opposed to the principles of Christianity, while it moreover claimed an eternal obligation, it will be necessary to consider the bearing of these objections, before noticing the special points of relation between the two systems. Some notice has been already taken of the exclusive character of the older economy; and it was further observed that whatever may be the imperfections attaching to it, they need occasion no difficulty wherever correct views of its purpose are entertained. The very exclusiveness, indeed, and the imperfections of Judaism, afford of themselves unequivocal testimony to its proper character and design; and instead of proving prejudicial to its claims to a Divine origin, contribute largely to establish them.

§ 1. *The Imperfections of the Theocracy in its Religious Aspect.*

What is fit enough as a means may be totally unsuited as an end. This was particularly the case with the Mosaic economy, and it was in mistaking it for another object than that for which God designed it, and which was fully implied, if not expressed in the Pentateuch itself, that the Jews so greatly erred, clinging to it the more tenaciously, as it was in process of being superseded. Even its civil enactments were undoubtedly imperfect if viewed as intended for perpetuity or any considerable duration. The very rigidity and unvarying character, save within narrow limits, of these Israelitish statutes, may, abstractly considered, be deemed imperfections, because retarding the growth of the nation and the individual mind, which requires the legislation to be continually conformed to every advancing stage of development. No doubt this characteristic of the Mosaic legislation, along with the compensatory provisions which it included, fitted it, as already shown, for its special ends, so that while in one aspect it manifested imperfections, in another it was pre-eminently adapted for the theocratic nation. It is chiefly, however, in its character of a religious system, that the imperfections of Judaism, with its various rites and ordinances, are most apparent.

1. Judaism, viewed simply in itself, was imperfect as regards the human family at large.

The covenant made with Abraham, with its accompanying promises, expressly included a blessing to all the nations and families of the earth, and yet the manner in which that covenant was confirmed with his posterity would at first sight appear to militate against the comprehensive character of the original declaration. The course of Divine Providence, as shown in a former section, conspired with the legislation to contract more and more the circle within which the direct participants in the blessing were confined. The exclusion of the collateral branches of Abraham's posterity, one after another, from the blessings of the covenant, not only retarded for a very lengthened period the fulfilment of the

promise of a numerous posterity to the patriarch, but seemed even to subvert its very foundation ; and though this exclusion ceased with the sons of Jacob, all of whom constituted members of the covenant family, and heads of tribes, and matters assumed a hopeful turn with the rapid multiplication of the people in Egypt, yet the peculiar constitution under which they were placed at Sinai, and to be continued in the land of their inheritance, might seem again, if viewed only in an external aspect, to be in antagonism with the purpose declared in the patriarchal blessings.

In strong contrast to the method adopted by Divine Providence with respect to Jacob and his descendants, were the fortunes of Esau and his posterity. Jacob, though declared the heir of the promise, was not allowed to settle in the land whither his ancestor had been expressly called, and in which he was duly infetted, and so must take up his residence in a country where his descendants were subjected to servitude and every species of oppression ; whereas contemporaneously Esau's posterity constitute an independent nation under kings of their own, exercising the authority which belongs to a powerful people. A similar course of development in the case of Israel might antecedently be supposed to offer the readiest realization of the terms of the Abrahamic covenant, by allowing that people directly to act upon the world ; but instead of this, the method chosen is seen to have been precisely the reverse.

It is perfectly evident that Judaism was not fitted or designed for a universal religion, but, on the contrary, was intended for a particular people in a secluded and limited locality. This, however, it should be observed, was not an after-thought, or a Mosaic modification, but was, like all the other purposes expressed in the record, contemplated from the first, for it was exhibited, even at the call of Abraham, by the designation of the locality to be assigned to his posterity. After Lot had separated from Abraham, the latter was told that all the land before him was destined for a possession to his seed, (Gen. xiii. 14, 15) ; and soon after its boundaries were distinctly specified, (xv. 18-21), comprehending what was by the Romans afterwards called Palestine. Although the limits here prophetically assigned are considerably larger

than those marked out in Numb. xxxiv., still the actual residence of Israel at its utmost extent was a strictly limited locality. There was thus at the very outset an obstacle to the indefinite increase of the population in relation to the land of their inheritance. Now, it was shown in another connexion, that one great end of the Mosaic institutions, social, civil, and religious, was to confine the people within the territories specially assigned to them. It hence appeared that the system was not intended for the rest of mankind, or even for any large acceptance. The conversion of the world to Judaism was neither designed nor desired by its Founder. Such a result would, in fact, entirely subvert the system; even a considerable accession to its ranks would be attended with great inconveniences. The principle on which the system was based was one which admitted of expansion only within certain limits; and therefore every competent check was given to the growth of the nation by foreign accessions of people or territories. Every precaution had, in fact, been taken in the constitution and polity to maintain the original equilibrium and isolation of the State, as well in its civil as in its religious relations.

2. The imperfect character of the Mosaic system, even as regarded the Israelitish community themselves, is no less discernible than in its general relation to the world.

It is sufficiently apparent that the institutions and ordinances of the law were adapted only for one particular nation; nor does it require much consideration to make it equally manifest that even in that single case they could operate satisfactorily only for a brief period. As soon as the natural increase of population demanded an enlargement of territory, leading to emigration or colonisation, in accordance with the constitution of creation, whereby man should multiply and replenish the earth, the principal exercises of religion must be in a great measure suspended, or, indeed, altogether cease, as regarded many members of the theocracy and the seed of Abraham. No system could be other than imperfect and provisional, in which all arrangements were a matter of such rigid enactment as in Judaism, particularly with respect to various points where the necessity of centralisation was absolute, and which could not more easily accommodate itself to altered

times and circumstances. This would be felt more especially if the character of the system were such that the very blessings of prosperity and increase which its observance conferred upon the nation, and upon all who might have been attracted within the sphere of its benign influences, included elements which necessarily contributed to its progressive relaxation and its eventual decay. If, indeed, it must be held that Judaism was intended to be of a lasting character, it would be extremely difficult to vindicate some of its provisions from sceptical objections as to the unsoundness and short-sightedness of its policy in matters so utterly suicidal to the system.

Further, the relation of God to Israel, as exhibited in the theocratic constitution, testified to the imperfection of the system. This relation, though more intimate than in the case of any other people, was still of a comparatively remote character. This fact was symbolically represented by the tabernacle, the dwelling-place of Jehovah, where He promised to meet with His people. God certainly dwelt among them as among no other people, but it was in the inmost recesses of a sanctuary to which only the High priest of the nation had access, and that only occasionally, and with much ceremony. And as in this, the very central point of theocratic worship, so also in all the subordinate arrangements there were abundant tokens of the circumscribed limits and imperfections of the theocracy. In particular, the separation of special officers to offer sacrifice and perform other Divine services, pointed to the same end—the imperfection of the system which required so complicated a service, and which, even in its highest form, allowed so little intercourse between the nation and its theocratic Ruler.

3. A more important aspect, however, wherein was manifested the imperfection of the Mosaic ordinances of religion, is that which had respect to the individual.

The Israelitish worshipper, even when placed in the most favourable circumstances for the due performance of the various requirements of the law, was subjected to various interruptions in the exercise and enjoyment of his theocratic privileges. No doubt, in accordance with the kindness and wise consideration of the Supreme Lawgiver, and with the character of the law as a dispensation of grace, provision was made,

even in this most formal of rituals, for the various grades of society and other circumstances. Thus, when a kid or a lamb surpassed the ability of the offerer, turtle doves or young pigeons were accepted as a sufficient equivalent, and, failing even these, a small portion of meal or flour was received instead, so that the offering of the poor was as acceptable upon God's altar as the more costly sacrifice of the richer Israelite. So, also, with regard to the provision for the removal of those ceremonial disqualifications created in such numbers by the law itself, or even such as were of a moral nature. It is not, however, so much in any of these points of view that the Mosaic institutions are to be regarded as chiefly defective or unsuited to the wants of the worshippers, but in their own intrinsic character. Assuming the worshippers' capacity to comply with the utmost demands of the law, and to present the noblest sacrifices on God's altar as an atonement for sin, or as an acknowledgment for mercies received, the feeling must, nevertheless, be one of unsatisfaction, as is clearly deducible, not only from the nature of the case, but also from the law itself, which clearly shows that the effects on the conscience were both imperfect in character and transitory in duration.

(1.) This is seen in the multiplicity and continued repetition of the sacrifices and other religious services. The matter is so regarded in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with the sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect: for then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have no more conscience of sin. But in these sacrifices there is a remembrance of sins every year" (Heb. x. 1-3). If these sacrifices, daily and yearly presented, and occasionally largely multiplied, proclaimed one truth more than another, it was their own imperfection and their entire inadequacy to effect reconciliation with God. They were properly rather "a remembrance of sin" than a satisfaction for it. There was, so far as these rites themselves were concerned, the absence of anything like satisfaction to the conscience. And, as if specially to stamp in the most formal manner upon the ordinary and usual sacri-

fices the character of insufficiency, there was annexed to them the complementary ordinances of the great annual Day of Atonement. "And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year" (Lev. xvi. 34). It would have been obviously a meaningless procedure if, in the first place, God had enjoined the repetition of a sacrifice which, already on its first offering, had really taken away guilt, whether as respected the individual or the Israelitish community; while the additional ordinances of the Day of Atonement would be equally meaningless, had not imperfection attached to the daily services. The very fact, then, of the repetition of the sacrifices, with the stated additions made to them, proclaimed in language most unmistakable their inefficiency for the attainment of the higher end proposed.

Should it be objected that the repetition of the sacrifices was owing not to any such inherent insufficiency but to the subsequently contracted guilt of the offerer requiring to be expiated anew, it is to be remarked that there are two distinct elements in the expiation of sin. First, the effects of the sacrifice towards God in atonement; secondly, the application of these effects to the sinner's conscience, which may, and, indeed, must be a matter of frequent repetition, just as faith and repentance must be exercised anew after repeated acts of sin. It is, however, as making or representing atonement, or in their bearing on God, the primary feature in sacrifice, that the repetition of the Levitical sacrifices showed them to be deficient when compared with the one sacrifice, "once for all" (Heb. x. 10), offered up under the Gospel.

Further, the imperfection of these sacrifices, and of the economy of which they constituted the very centre, and their inefficacy for the purposes of atonement, appear from the very nature of the sacrifices themselves. The blood of irrational animals could not possibly remove moral guilt. This must be apparent to every enlightened understanding, and it needed not apostolic authority to establish the proposition, that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin" (Heb. x. 4). The utter insufficiency of mere animal sacrifices to effect an absolute and lasting reconciliation with God, was felt by the more enlightened

of the Jewish worshippers themselves, however much the un-instructed might rely on the mere letter of the law. Thus the Psalmist: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened; burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required" (Ps. xl. 6). There is in these words an unconditional rejection of offerings: God did not desire them, notwithstanding that they were His own instituted ordinances—a declaration which, at first sight, may appear contradictory, but which is easily explained, as well as those still stronger terms in which God himself states His dissatisfaction with these rites (Isai. i. 11, 13; Jer. vii. 21-23), terms which would imply a denial of their Divine origin, but which only referred to the sinners' misinterpretation of the sign and misapplication of the ordinance. There was a better and more acceptable sacrifice referred to in the words, "mine ears hast thou opened;" and further explained, ver. 7, 8, "Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea thy law is within my heart." On this the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews remarks: "Above, when he said, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt-offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (which are offered by the law); then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second" (Heb. x. 8, 9). Obedience, it is thus declared, was put in the place of animal sacrifices, and was thereby declared to be a sacrifice, and, indeed, the true sacrifice. But this could not have been conceived of as the obedience of the sinner himself, for the convictions of the true worshipper enlightened as to the character of the law and the inadequacy of the legal sacrifices to meet the claims of Divine justice, would assuredly revolt against such an idea; and, if not his own obedience, then that of a proper substitute—a truth concurrently indicated, both in prophecy and in symbol.

Such testimonies as these clearly evince that God had, from the beginning, intimated to Israel that the sacrifices of the law were only provisional, and not the absolute or ultimate medium of atonement which His Wisdom contrived, and His Righteousness required and approved of. This intimation was contained partly in the nature of the sacrifices themselves

and in the requirements as to their constant repetition; and then in various declarations, more or less express, to the effect that they were appointed only for a season, God fully manifesting, however much the intimations may have been overlooked in a spirit of carnality, that He neither designed these rites, nor approved of them, for the end of expiating sin, but merely to prefigure the expiation reserved for a future period.

(2.) The same imperfection, as regards the individual, was also apparent in other arrangements as well as in the insufficiency of the sacrifices offered. It was manifest in the indirect and mediate dealing with and access to God, to which the worshipper must have recourse, and this was the more unsatisfactory when the medium of intercourse was sinful, fallible men, who themselves needed reconciliation before they could present the offerings of others (Heb. vii. 27). Still more, however, was it exhibited in the fact that sacrifice was limited to particular sins, chiefly such as resulted from the inadvertent neglect of ceremonial observances, and did not embrace the more aggravated cases, at least, of moral transgression. Thus, in a case such as that described in Ps. li., the legal sacrifices were felt to be utterly insufficient. Here the feeling of a soul deeply convinced of sin is: "For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt-offering" (ver. 16). These were wholly unsuitable in the circumstances; so that where atonement was, so to speak, most needed, the legal sacrifices altogether failed.

§ 2. *More Direct Evidence of the Provisional Character of the Theocracy.*

As this is a point largely considered in the Epistle to the Hebrews, forming, indeed, its fundamental idea, and is of great importance for a correct appreciation of the Levitical system, particularly with respect to the imperfections attaching to it, and no less of the Christian dispensation which sprung out of it, it will be advisable to show that the Apostolic arguments upon this subject directed against the notions entertained by the Jews of the perfection and permanency of their law, are fairly deducible from notices in the Old Testament itself.

These intimations are, indeed, more copious and express, as may naturally be supposed, in the later than in the earlier writings of the Old Testament, occurring more in the Prophets than in the books of Moses, although even here they are not altogether wanting. It is true that in this as in other important matters of doctrine, the notices furnished by the Pentateuch itself, as to the temporary character and eventual cessation of its peculiar institutions, appear but in their germ, and are more a matter of inference than of direct declaration. And in this there is discernible a special propriety; for at the very outset of the Mosaic legislation, to have given explicit intimations of its imperfections and its temporary character, would conduce greatly to defeat the ends for which it was established, by diminishing its importance, and, consequently, its hold on those who were subjected to its authority. It was, to all intents, enough that such hints should be given, which, however obscure for a time, would be sufficiently plain in the light of subsequent prophecy, and particularly of that dispensation which should follow.

The evidences of the temporary and provisional character of the Mosaic law are of two kinds: notices with respect to its abrogation, and such as intimate the rise of another dispensation. Disregarding this distinction, however, of intimations to this effect, furnished by the Pentateuch, reference may be made to various statements, already considered, which point out the place which Israel's own peculiar relation to God held with respect to that of the world in general (*e. g.* Exod. iv. 22; xix. 6), and which, consequently, affected the nature of their constitution. They were, in God's providence, set apart to be a channel of blessing to the rest of mankind, from whom, by their constitution and polity, they were separated. This, however, obviously implied relations and arrangements totally incompatible with the limited and local requirements of the Mosaic constitution, whose primary tendency was to separate and seclude Israel from all other communities rather than bring them to act beneficially on such. It is, therefore, evident that this separate standing, or, as some would term it, antagonistic relation, could only be temporary; and, further, as the theocratic constitution, in its more essential features, did not admit of expansion, so as to embrace the Gentile na-

tions, it follows that, to secure such a consummation, the peculiar constitution itself must be taken out of the way.

A more explicit testimony to the rise of a new constitution is contained in Moses' own prophecy of the coming of another prophet like himself (Deut. xviii. 15); but, as this has been already briefly considered, it will be almost unnecessary to do more than refer to the observations then made. Only, to render the matter more explicit, it may be added that, for a prophet to resemble Moses, he must have equal authority with that illustrious lawgiver, and by implication, that he be called to the discharge of an equally important commission, and that cannot be properly affirmed of one merely empowered to add to or simply modify the institutions and ordinances of the first legislator, but only of one entrusted with the formation of an entirely new constitution. Ideas to this effect are not obscurely expressed in this promise of the advent of the great Prophet,¹ and whatever might have been the views entertained of His person and the time of His appearance, the more thinking Israelites must, even from this prophecy alone, and at the outset of their history and constitution, be prepared in some measure for very important, if not fundamental changes; and such views must have been greatly promoted by other considerations, some of which have been already adduced, when showing the wants and imperfections of the system.

Not less worthy of notice, however, is a passage in the song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 43), where reference is made to a relation subsisting between the nations of the earth, the Gentiles (גוים), and the people of Jehovah, which furnishes them a ground for common joy. "Rejoice, O ye nations [with] His people: for He will avenge the blood of His servants, and will render vengeance to His adversaries, and will be merciful unto His land and to His people." This call to the nations to rejoice with the covenant people,² or, as it is sometimes understood, to praise them,³ is the more important, as occurring at the close of the legislation, and conveying the lawgiver's own

¹ See Berriman, Revelation of Gospel, ii. 229-232.

² Vitringa, Com. ad Canticum Mosis, p. 237. Harling, 1734.

³ Shultz, Das Deuteronomium erklärt, p. 679.

testimony of its friendly aspect, notwithstanding an apparent exclusiveness, towards the rest of mankind. Such is the view taken of this passage in Rom. xv. 10, where it is quoted after the LXX. in evidence of the participation of the Gentiles in the blessings of the Jews. The idea expressed is parallel to that in Psalm xlvii. 9. "The princes of the nations (*peoples*) are gathered together to the people of the God of Abraham;"¹ where the designation, "the God of Abraham," points to the promise of blessings to mankind as the cause of this course.

But, as might be expected, it is in the prophetic writings, more especially, of the times which witnessed the sad breaches of the covenant on the part of the people, and the inability of the Mosaic law and ordinances, to stem the current of corruption which had so powerfully set in, that the clearest intimations are met with of a new and better economy. Thus, for instance, the prophet Jeremiah announces: "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; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord; 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," &c. (Jer. xxxi. 31-33).

It is unnecessary for the present purpose to consider the nature of the covenant thus announced: it is enough to notice the fact that it is described as a new, in contradistinction to the old or original covenant, established with Israel through the mediation of Moses (Exod. xxiv. 8), and on which depended the theocratic standing of the nation with its peculiar enactments and ordinances. It may be further observed that one of the provisions of this new covenant was writing the law on the hearts of the people instead of on tables of stone, as in the earlier constitution. It is certainly a sound inference which is deduced by the Apostle from this promise when he remarks, "For if the first covenant had been faultless, then

¹ Venema. In Vitring. Com. *loc. cit.* Hengstenberg. Psalms ii. 158.

should no place have been sought for the second" (Heb. viii. 7); and it is a perfectly legitimate interpretation when he adds: "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" (ver. 13). It is God himself, observe, the Author of the covenant, that finds fault with it; not, certainly, because it was unwisely framed, or because it was inadequate for the purposes, for which it was designed, and which were, as already seen, temporary and provisional, but because it was imperfect and inadequate as regards other objects and ends, totally distinct from the proper ones, but for which human folly and perverseness judged it suitable. Now, as according to the Divine announcement, a new covenant was to be framed, and which, as the Apostle argues from the description given of it in the prophecy, "rests on better promises," it naturally follows that in due time the old covenant would no longer be merely relatively the old in opposition to the new, but also the absolutely weak through age (*γηράσκον*) in contrast to the new covenant coming into operation with the freshness of youth.¹ Waxing old is, in Ps. cii. 26, 27, absolutely opposed to an eternal duration.

Now, it is of importance to observe how God, in His providence, before the close of the Old Testament itself, gave various confirmations of His promise by gradually weakening the hold of the covenant which He had thus pronounced to be faulty on the hearts and consciences of the people, and so preparing for its abrogation. And first, in close sequence to this promise, followed the Babylonian exile, causing an entire interruption to the administration of the old covenant for seventy years, nothing similar to which had ever happened since its institution. During this trying period, when the songs of Zion ceased (Ps. xxxvii.), as well as its temple services, there was much to exercise the faith, and also to enlarge the conceptions of the faithful in Israel; and much to sever them from the mere external elements of the system amid which they had been reared. The period of exile was in various respects one of preparation, but in none more so than in the particular indicated. Further, at the restoration, when the people were distressed at the greatly diminished splendour both of the civil

¹ Ebrard. Exposition of Hebrews, p. 255.

order and the religious worship, and, indeed, all that concerned the theocratic administration, as compared with its pristine glory, God, instead of comforting them with any assurance of an improvement in this respect, intimated to them the coming of One who, as the "Desire of all nations," should terminate that order of things, and introduce an entire revolution. "I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts" (Hag. ii. 7). And, from that time forward, there were manifold and manifest tokens that the Mosaic system was fast approaching its dissolution.

Notwithstanding, however, the prophetic declarations as to the introduction of a new dispensation, and the evident marks of decay which providence continued to stamp upon the old, such was the national adherence to the Mosaic institutions, at a period when they were stripped of much of their original glory, that there was no surer method of exciting popular indignation than to charge one with predicting a change or cessation of the law (Acts vi. 11-14). Such was the charge which procured the condemnation of the Christian proto-martyr, Stephen: "This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law: for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us." It was the same from which Paul, too, judged it necessary to vindicate himself (Acts xxv. 8; xxviii. 17), of course only in the erroneous sense in which it was preferred by the Jews.

So firmly, indeed, did these views maintain their ground, that they were not wholly expelled from the minds of the Apostles themselves before the day of Pentecost, and not even then, for Peter needed further instruction upon some of these points, particularly as to his intercourse with the Gentiles, with whom, he felt, it had been "an unlawful thing for a Jew to keep company," (Acts x. 28.) These views as to the continued obligation of the Mosaic law, and the necessity of submission to it, even by the Gentiles, found zealous advocates in some of the early churches, where they struggled on, notwithstanding the Apostolic decree, (Acts xv. 23-29,) and the light which, by the Spirit of inspiration, St. Paul shed on

the interpretation of the Old Testament Scriptures. And even still in the Christian Church, parties are heard advocating a Jewish literalism, and looking for the restoration, with a Divine sanction, of the Mosaic rites and ceremonies, including altars, priests, and sacrifices.

If such a view have any support in Scripture, particularly in the Old Testament,—for it is by it the question must primarily be tried, seeing that it is virtually a denial of the correctness of the New Testament interpretation of the older Record,—it is so opposed to the whole preceding argument, that on that ground alone notice must be taken of the more important passages which are supposed to intimate the continuance,¹ or the revival of the peculiarities of the Mosaic economy, either in their original form, or with modifications suited to the altered circumstances.

It may be remarked, generally, that the passages supposed to favour the continuance of the Mosaic system, as interpreted by the advocates of this view, not only present strong contradictions to numerous other passages equally explicit, but also lead to conclusions in the highest degree improbable, and even involving natural impossibilities. Thus the notable passage, Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18, “For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel: neither shall the priests the Levites want a man to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually,” כָּל-הַיָּמִים, *all the days*, or in perpetuity. There certainly can be few statements stronger than this. But apart from the fact that it closely follows in order a passage, (chap. xxxi. 31.) which, above any other, predicts the abrogation of the system in operation by the introduction of a “new covenant,” and that it is also closely connected with predictions of a considerable suspension of all priestly functions through the deportation of Israel to Babylon, how, if literally understood, can it be reconciled with prophecies intimating that “the children of Israel shall abide many days, (יָמִים רַבִּים,) without

¹ It is unnecessary to refer to passages in the law itself which ascribe perpetuity to its statutes and ordinances, as the Passover, declared to be an “ordinance for ever,” (Ex. xii. 14. 7, 24,) and so also other matters, (Lev.

vi. 18. 22; vii. 34. 36; Num. x. 8; xix. 10, 21; Deut. xxix. 29; &c.) The course of providence, independently of exegetical canons, has explained all such predicates. Comp. Berriman, Revel. of Gospel, ii. 151-163.

a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim," (Hos. iii. 4,) and further, how does it accord with the historical fact of the cessation of the Israelitish sacrifices for eighteen centuries, and of the monarchy for a much longer period? So great indeed are the difficulties in respect to the literal acceptance of the absolute perpetuity of the Davidic and the Levitical successions, that many would regard the passage as spurious, simply because they wanted the key to its interpretation, which is provided in ver. 22. All difficulties and inconsistencies at once vanish when the promise is referred to the Messiah in his regal and sacerdotal offices, an application fully warranted both by the Old Testament and the New.¹

To the same purpose, all those prophecies which announce large accessions of Gentile converts to Israel, and their participation in the services and solemnities of the covenant people, (*e. g.*, Isai. lx. 7; lxvi. 32; Zech. xiv. 16-19,) intimations, which, understood in a spiritual sense, are in strict harmony with various other announcements, but if taken literally are not only inconsistent with other declarations, but lead to the strangest possible conclusions. What, for instance, can be made of such a prediction as regards the Gentile nations going up to Jerusalem "from year to year" to keep the feast of Tabernacles,—an annual convocation of "the families of the earth,"—the neglect of which entailed severe penalties? (Zech. xiv. 16.)² But not only these annual convocations, mention is made of others at much shorter intervals: "And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord," (Isai. lxvi. 23.) It is unnecessary to remark on the extravagance of any scheme of interpretation which would insist on this being understood literally, and of a resort to any earthly centre of worship, either collectively or by representatives, while it is, if so taken, in direct contradiction to another statement sometimes adduced in support of the view of the permanency or revival of the Jewish wor-

¹ Henderson, the Prophet Jeremiah, p. 186.

² See Cramer, Dissert. Typico-prop. ad Daehs Codex Sueca, p. 547. Traject. 1726.

ship, Mal. i. 11, "For from the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place, incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts." Should this passage be construed as favouring the idea of the continuance of Jewish offerings, and their adoption by the Gentiles, it should be noticed that it at the same time subverts one of the fundamental principles on which such offerings depended, by no longer confining them to one centre, but allowing their presentation in "every place." But taking all such intimations together, and viewing them in harmony with reason no less than revelation, they simply announced the catholicity and spirituality which should distinguish the Gospel worship.¹

Equally unwarranted are the conclusions of Jewish, and some Christian interpreters, from the closing visions of Ezekiel's prophecies (chap. xl.-xlviii.) as to the restored temple, with the rites and ordinances of the Mosaic economy. That the description of the restored temple, and the land portioned out among the twelve tribes, is of an ideal character, and not intended to be literally realized, appears from an examination of those very specific details which, at first sight, give a strong appearance of literality. Not to enter into particulars, it is enough to remark, first, that the prophet's measurements, according to the most exact calculations, involve a literal incongruity, greatly aggravated by the fact that the territories of five tribes (xlviii. 23-28), and of large extent, were assigned to a portion of the land previously marked, for the sacred allotment. The nature of the incongruity will appear from the fact that, as described, the limits of the temple exceed those of the ancient city of Jerusalem, while the portion assigned for the new city is nearly co-extensive with the whole of Canaan proper. The same insurmountable difficulties appear in allotting territories to the twelve tribes, which have now no separate existence. Other circumstances, also, preclude a literal application of this prophecy, but to these it is unnecessary further to allude.²

If no support can be found in the Old Testament for the

¹ Brown, *Second Advent*, p. 368. ² Fairbairn, *Ezekiel*, p. 392.
Edin. 1849.

views controverted, it is not likely that such will be discovered in the New. In order, however, to complete the Scriptural testimony to the imperfection and temporary character of the Mosaic economy, notice must be taken of the more important statements of the New Testament, exclusive of the Epistle to the Hebrews, professedly, and almost wholly, devoted to this subject. First, our Lord's announcement to the woman of Samaria, when referring to the proper place of worship (John iv. 21-23), plainly intimated that Jerusalem, the city of solemnities, was about to lose its peculiar character, and be for ever stript of its ceremonial sanctity, and with this the abolition of all services which, to be legally performed, were inseparably connected with that locality. So also Eph. ii. 14, 15, 19, where it is announced that the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile—"the law of commandments, contained in ordinances"—has been broken down, being taken out of the way in order to allow a new incorporation into one fellowship of parties, who for a season, and for the furtherance of the great ends of Divine Providence, had been secluded from one another. To the same purpose the various terms of disparagement, some of which have been already adduced, with which the New Testament writers, especially St. Paul, who, more than any other, came into contact with Judaizing zealots, who sought to complicate the simplicity of the Gospel, and so disturbed the peace of the early churches, characterise the ordinances and institutions of the law. Thus they are spoken of as "worldly rudiments," "beggarly elements," the proper discipline of minors, a "bondage" unsuitable to the liberty wherewith Christ hath made his people free (Gal. iv.); and it is plainly intimated that the observance of these ordinances, or at least making it a necessary obligation, was incompatible with a right belief in the Gospel, and appreciation of its character.

§ 3. *The Law preparatory to a better Dispensation.*

Having shown, both from the nature of the law itself, particularly in its religious bearing, and from various intimations of the Old Testament Scriptures, that the form of worship which it prescribed was defective, with respect to the

world at large, almost absolutely excluded from its privileges, and not less so with respect to the Israelitish community which it embraced, and the individual members thereof, and was moreover not designed for being a permanent institution, the question arises, what was the purpose, present or prospective, which it was intended to serve? That it was an object of considerable importance plainly appears from the consideration of the Divine origin and sanctions of the law and its comprehensive character, while on the other hand the very imperfections found to attach to the system, apart altogether from more direct intimations, pointed to some ulterior object beyond supplying the immediate wants of the Israelitish people. If the Mosaic institutions and ordinances were from God, and designed to constitute a medium for the revelation of His will to man, they may, and indeed must, notwithstanding their unfitness in one particular aspect, have served other ends in the dispensation of grace. The fact, indeed, is fully established by various express declarations of a connexion between the Mosaic economy, and another by which it should be followed and superseded; the only question that can arise is with regard to the nature of that connexion. or the extent to which the former served in preparing for the latter.

The Mosaic system occupied relatively an advanced position in the progressive scheme of Divine revelation. It is not as an independent and isolated phenomenon that it falls to be viewed, but in connexion with the patriarchal dispensation by which it was preceded, and whose sacrificial practice in particular continued to be one of its fundamental principles, and the Christian dispensation which followed it, and with which, though not so palpably as in the other case, it will be found no less essentially connected. For estimating correctly this medial relation, it will be necessary to consider first its connexion with the disclosures previously made regarding man's character and his relation to God: for that is the centre on which revelation turns.

The law found man a sinner, estranged from God, and instead of diminishing the feeling of guilt consequent on that relation, it did much to deepen it; just because of its fuller disclosures, both of the character of God and the nature of His claims, and also of the disposition of sinners when confronted

with the law which sanctioned such claims. In communicating His will to mankind respecting a remedy for a state of matters, the reality and nature of which was impressed even on the natural conscience, God from the beginning adopted verbal statements and various symbolical acts; and, in fact, it appeared that the complex and in part cumbrous ordinances of the law were only the development of primeval revelations and patriarchal worship. But while the past was thus brought forward, and Divine truth presented in a more complete form, the Mosaic dispensation, in certain aspects, presented an apparent retrogression in its imposing certain limits on the unfettered practice of primeval times, in various particulars already noticed, as in sacrifice, its mode and ministers, and the places where it might be offered. The retrogression, however, was only apparent, and not real. It arose entirely from the advance towards the realization of the scheme of redemption which, as already shown, required in its evolution the training of a people, constituted the medium of blessing to the rest of mankind, the modifications introduced naturally growing out of, or being a provision for the wants of a people so peculiarly circumstanced by so important a calling. Some of the arrangements are expressly referred to a feeling on the part of the people of their unfitness to transact for themselves directly with God, originating in the impressions made on them at the promulgation of the law; and the same with respect to other appointments, which, if not so much in answer to a feeling of want, were yet necessary for the expression of some Divine truth.

Notice has been already taken of the symbolical character of the Mosaic worship, of the primary truths which its varied ordinances severally expressed, and their appropriateness to these purposes. The truths so represented were summarily these: man's estrangement from and natural pollution in the sight of a holy God; Divine mercy finding a way to obviate the alienation and change the sinner's character; results however not to be accomplished without mediation and atonement. Nevertheless, if any impression deeper than another is made upon the reader, who carefully weighs the numerous and minute specifications of the law relative to sin and uncleanness, it is that they were more suited, as formerly remarked, to

awaken convictions of guilt and of unfitness to appear before God, than to afford satisfaction and peace to a troubled conscience. The same must, undoubtedly, to some extent have been the experience of the more enlightened Israelites themselves. But in this very circumstance consisted one of the chief characteristics of the law as a preparatory dispensation.

If, however, the imperfections of the Mosaic system, whether viewed as a restriction on man's access to God in the act of worship, or otherwise complicating the simplicity of earlier times, are, as compared with the preceding dispensation, more apparent than real, such is not the case when compared with the dispensation which succeeded. Between the patriarchal and Levitical dispensations there was a formal agreement, both being chiefly outward and literal, whereas between the Levitical and the Christian economies, there is no formal agreement, however much there may be of a substantial correspondence.

As a preparation for Christianity, the Mosaic dispensation operated in a twofold direction; it contributed both negatively and positively in making a way for the scheme to which all its arrangements pointed, and wherein all its deficiencies should be supplied.

i. Viewing it as a negative preparation, the following points deserve attention, although they have been for the most part already adverted to in various other connexions.

1. The Law announced purposes which it was inadequate to perform. Taking the whole preceding revelations of God as either embodied in the law, or introductory to it, and so brought prominently before the view of the covenant people, there must have been awakened in certain minds, when considering the subject, a feeling or suspicion of disparity between the announcement of several of the Divine purposes and their realization, if at all realized in the theocratic constitution. These purposes respected such objects as these: (1.) The blessing of the individual—his restoration from the ruin of the fall to Divine favour, and to the Divine image. (2.) The blessing of the world, all the nations and families of the earth, with the complete and final overthrow of evil, and the power of evil, as announced in the first promise of the seed of the woman, and repeated in the promises made to Abraham. Now these purposes, it is plain, were of a character and extent that

they could not be realized by Judaism, either as a religious system or civil institution. They contemplated ends for which that system made little or no direct provision, and embraced subjects for which there was absolutely no room within its narrow confines. In fact, their realization seemed to be indefinitely deferred, if not altogether frustrated, by this peculiarly exclusive system, for certainly they were incompatible with its maintenance in its strict integrity.

At the same time, however, Israel's mediate standing, their relation to God and to mankind, and by implication the purpose of their peculiar economy, was variously declared as well before the law as under it: in the promises to Abraham, in the order given to Pharaoh to liberate his captives, and in the statement of the issues of the Sinaitic covenant, (Ex. xix. 6.) These declarations show, that in the establishment of the theocracy, the more comprehensive purposes of God were not only not overlooked, but that, somehow, provision was made towards their accomplishment in due time.

2. The law made known wants which it was unable to supply. The particular already considered, was one which would present itself more or less as a matter of speculation to every contemplating mind. It would, of course, give rise to painful feelings, whenever a satisfactory explanation could not be found of the difficulties encountered; but such feelings are of a different order from those originating in the actings of the law on the conscience, and for the satisfying of which, it made no suitable provision. The law, moral and ceremonial, burdening the sinner's conscience, and awakening feelings of guilt, for in this particular, however they may have differed in others, especially as to the atoning institutions, the two forms of the law co-operated in requiring obedience or satisfaction, neither of which alternatives the sinner was able to render. There was thus everything to aggravate the disease without any present remedy beyond that contained in the prophetic word, and the representations made of the Divine purposes in the ceremonial observances. The disease was thus real and present, the remedy was at best typical, and as regards its full reality remote, so that the more effectually the law operated in enlightening the mind, the more it manifested its own weakness and insufficiency for any satisfactory ends. It thus contained

in itself elements of perishableness, for in proportion to its efficacy in one respect it proved its inferiority in another, and so weakened in its complex form its authority over the conscience. Just as the increase of the nation, and the prosperity which followed according to the promises, from a faithful observance of the theocratic conditions, naturally led to the weakening of the system, and would eventually, and of themselves, necessitate its subversion, so in the same way its operation on the individual conscience.

In these and other particulars in which the Mosaic economy exhibited its inherent weakness, it pointed to, prepared for, and gave promise of something better, more suited to the individual and the world, unless God's veracity and covenant faithfulness should fail. It is only, indeed, on the supposition of its being a provisional system, that the Divine origin of Judaism can be maintained consistently with the admission of a Divine revelation at all. That it was so, however, will more fully appear from a consideration of some particulars wherein it positively prepared for Christianity.

ii. The preparations for Christianity positively effected through the Levitical dispensation included the following among others.

1. The formation of a language for expressing spiritual truths and relations, particularly the several acts and offices of the divinely-appointed Redeemer, was one end secured by the Levitical system, and the symbolical ordinances in general.

The inadequacy of language to express spiritual ideas is a fact which there is no disputing. Nor, without entering into the general question, that all language consists, when reduced to its elements, of the signs of sensible ideas only, will it be denied that all words expressive, at least, of spiritual ideas, have had an external origin, and were used of outward and material things before they were applied to spiritual objects and relations. This is a circumstance which, apart entirely from Oriental influences, has made the language of Scripture more figurative than that of any other book, because there is none so occupied with spiritual truths. The use of figures must have been a thing of special necessity in the first ages of revelation, and, indeed, onwards to the promulgation of the Gospel. Not, however, so much on account of the rude

and sensuous character of the Israelites—the cause to which it is usually assigned—as of that particular stage of revelation. It entirely comports with this that the closing book of the New Testament, which points to future relations which have not entered into the heart of man (1 Cor. ii. 9), should be again distinguished for its large use of symbol. The doctrines of Christianity are reared on its facts, and until these became matters of history, the former could not be expressed or comprehended otherwise than by the aid of symbolical acts and ordinances which, addressed to the eye and frequently repeated, made a deep impression on the mind, and so prepared for more abstract conceptions. Thus, for instance, the ideas of propitiation and atonement were, however dimly apprehended, familiar to the Jewish mind, and woven into the very tissue of their Scriptures, and there was thus an admirable if not adequate preparation for the right application of the truth when the proper object was revealed. Even figures, taken from the practices of heathenism, which was, in fact, the perversion of nature and the corruption of truth, passing through the alembic of Judaism, were purged of their gross impurities, and fitted for the conveyance of spiritual truths. It is unnecessary to show how largely the language of the New Testament is borrowed from the Old, or how expressive and suitable the connexion is. As presented to the Old Testament worshippers, there was a definiteness in the ideas, expressed in the Gospel, arising from long usage and familiarity, unattainable in associations only newly formed.

It is, however, sometimes objected that the language of the New Testament is only an accommodation to the figurative style of the Old, formed from its more material objects, particularly its mode of worship, and therefore that it also must be taken in a metaphorical sense. This objection is frequently brought against those terms which ascribe a real sacrifice to Christ: the Jewish offerings, it is maintained, were real sacrifices, and that it is only in a figure such is affirmed of the sufferings and death of Christ. The case, however, as stated in the New Testament, is the reverse of this: the Old Testament sacrifices and priests were only figures of Christ, who is at the same time the true Sacrifice and the true Priest, and but for the relation in which they thus stood to Him, neither

sacrifice nor priest would have had any place in the appointments of the Old Testament worship.¹

Leaving such objections, however, to be disposed of by the New Testament Hermeneutist, it is of more importance at present to indicate how Divine providence was preparing, among a people by no means intellectually distinguished, and withal isolated from the world, a language so universal in its sympathies, that it is fitted for all nations and all times. At the first promulgation of the Gospel, its language proved intelligible to Jew and Gentile, to Greek and barbarian, so that a Jewish preacher could, without confusion or shame (Rom. i. 16), address himself to a Roman audience, or an Athenian Areopagus. Nor has it lost aught of that quality even to this day, for it is still penetrating among nations and tribes utterly unknown in apostolic times, and by the blessings which it conveys, raising some of the race from the lowest grade of barbarism, while it forms the great hope and solace of many of the wisest and most gifted of mankind.

First, as preparing for the universality of the Gospel language, may be noticed a peculiar adaptation in the Shemitic for this purpose. Thus, according to Schlegel, "The general characteristic of the Shemitic tongues, is their peculiar fitness for prophetic inspiration and for profound symbolical import—this is their special character. We speak here of the language itself, and of its internal structure, and not of the spirit which may direct it; and I shall only add, that the character we have here assigned to the Shemitic languages is, according to the declaration of many of the most competent judges, more uniformly perceptible in the Arabic than in the Hebrew, although the former has received a totally different application, and has undergone a very diversified culture. Thus the Hebrew tongue was eminently adapted to the high spiritual destination of the Hebrew people, and was a fit organ of the prophetic revelation and promises imparted to that nation."²

Again, it is important to note how the treasure hid for ages from the world in the old Shemitic tongue of Abraham and Moses, was in due time made accessible. Reference has been already made to the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek,

¹ See Magee, *Atonement*, i. 163-165.

² *Philosophy of History*, p. 195.

as marking an epoch in the preparation for Christianity. It is not, however, so much the fact as the form of that translation that calls for remark here. The Greek, more than any other language fitted for the communication of thought was, nevertheless, from its association with worldly objects, but imperfectly adapted as a vehicle for Scriptural and spiritual truths. It had accordingly to submit to a process which, if robbing it of Attic purity, prepared it for breathing the spirit of the Gospel. Every care was taken to preserve the old idioms and ideas, and in every other way to render the transition as easy as possible. The characteristics which thus strongly mark the New Testament, as well as the Greek version of the Old, are every way worthy of attention in estimating the relation of Judaism to Christianity.

2. The formation of a sacred literature, and the proper preservation of the Divine records, were also preparations of Judaism.

The revelations of God, the promises which He made to his people, and his declared purposes in general, as well as the memorial of his acts, were unquestionably for a time preserved only in tradition. There is no certain evidence of any documentary records previous to the Mosaic age. By that time the circumstances were so greatly changed that oral tradition, however it might have sufficed in the patriarchal ages, when the individuals embraced within the sphere of Divine teaching were few in number and attained to a great longevity, and when, moreover, the facts of revelation were comparatively few, would be no longer adequate. The very complex system of law and religion, under which Israel was placed, embracing so many specific ordinances, the neglect of which involved important consequences, was of itself a circumstance which made a written code absolutely necessary. Accordingly, Moses received instructions from God to record the various transactions of the Israelitish history, in which he himself had so direct a concern, in a Book which, while it was made a record of God's former revelations and dealings with mankind, should also serve as the basis of future communications.

It is to this the apostle refers when he states a distinguishing privilege of Israel to be that "unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2). This was an arrange-

ment particularly appropriate, from whatever point it may be contemplated. "There needed to exist somewhere a positive groundwork of religious knowledge, with which Christianity might connect itself; an outline, of which Christianity should be the filling up. Especially was it desirable, that such a foundation and such an outline should exist in the particular locality in which the promised Saviour was to be born, and where his earthly pilgrimage was to run its course: such a favoured spot would form a centre, whence the rays of Divine light might be disseminated throughout the world."¹ How this was provided for by the separation of the seed of Abraham and the Theocratic constitution, sufficiently appears from the preceding remarks, while the extent to which it was effectual is at once discernible from the Gospel history. But however it may have succeeded in diffusing a knowledge of Divine truth, often perverted through the prejudices and carnal views of the people to whose keeping it was entrusted, still the uncorrupted record was there, and it only needed an authoritative interpreter to expound and apply its statements.

For perpetuating the Divine record, and acquainting the people with its contents, no means could have been better adapted than that selected in this case. "As regards the safe custody and transmission of the sacred oracles, it is obvious that in no way so effectually as by incorporating the successive revelations in the public monuments of a state could their preservation be secured. Had they been scattered communications, given one here and another there, they would have been speedily lost or corrupted; confined to a particular nation, and enshrined in a political framework, they were kept together, and by being combined, furnished mutual illustration. But more than this; the Theocracy lent its aid directly to their preservation. For, in the volume of the law, civil and ceremonial, no inconsiderable portion of these prophetic intimations is imbedded, and, under the form of the types, cannot be separated from it; hence the national pride of the Jews became interested in maintaining them intact; with those contained in the Pentateuch at least they could not tamper, without mutilating the charter of their national existence. It is to be observed, too, that the prophecies respecting

¹ Litton, Mosaic Dispensation, p. 20.

the Gospel were mostly, so to speak, cast in a Jewish mould. From this favoured nation, Messiah, the Prince of the new era, was to spring. Zion was to enlarge her cords and strengthen her stakes; she was to break forth on the right hand and on the left, and her seed was to inherit the Gentiles; Jerusalem, desolate and trodden down of her enemies, was, under the rule of her exalted King, to attain a height of glory which she had never known, and become the joy of the whole earth (Isa. liv. 1, 4, &c.) It was the sin of the carnal part of the nation to interpret those prophecies in a carnal sense; but this, under the providence of God, materially tended to secure their safe transmission. Had the Jews in general discerned the spiritual sense which lay hid under these images, drawn from the earthly Zion, they would have felt but little interest in them, but little disposition to watch over their integrity; but, interpreting them in a sense most congenial to their sensual tastes, they clung with the greater tenacity to the hopes suggested by them, and faithfully handed down the documents, which at once condemn themselves, and furnish us with the evidences of our religion."¹

Certainly, as thus stated, no contrivance could be better adapted for the preservation of any documents than by incorporating in them the very charter of the national constitution and the laws which regulated and secured all public and private rights. Every interest was thus combined in watching over the integrity of records, which, if they had merely a spiritual aspect, would excite little concern at any time among the great mass of the nation, more especially during the times of deep spiritual degeneracy. And, not less remarkable, that this absence of spiritual discernment contributed in the manner just indicated, and in various other ways, to the realisation of the Divine purposes in, and through, the covenant people. To this St. Peter refers, when addressing the Jews on their rejection of Christ: "And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers. But these things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled" (Acts iii. 17, 18). And so, also, Paul: "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not,

¹ Litton, Mosaic Dispensation, pp. 28, 29.

nor yet the voices of the prophets, which are read every Sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him" (xiii. 27). This ignorance, it is here stated, was inexcusable, for, from the very first, provision was made for the instruction of Israel in the principles of their Scriptures: the law was to be read in the public assemblies of the people, while their attention was secured to its teaching as it concerned matters of daily life, affecting, through the theocratic constitution, temporal no less than spiritual interests. Parents, too, were charged to explain to their children the ordinances of worship. This is expressly stated in respect to the Passover (Exod. xii. 26, 27), and it probably embraced other matters as well; and the offspring of pious parents, as in the case of Timothy, would, from their earliest years, be instructed in the sacred Scriptures.¹

3. The result of this would be a soil prepared for the reception of Christianity, and also a living agency for its promulgation in the world.

"There needed," it has been remarked by an author more than once quoted, "to be present, when the Saviour should appear, not merely written oracles of prophecy, and a typical system, to which he might appeal as testifying of himself, but a people waiting for the consolation of Israel, hearts prepared to welcome his arrival: it was not enough that a theocratical institute should be erected to shadow forth Christian verities, but that elements of Christian sentiment, so far Christian as to enable us to recognise in the pious Israelite one with whom we can hold communion, should be at hand to coalesce with the distinctive work of the Spirit under the Christian economy."² That there were such, even in the darkest period of the nation's history—a true and spiritual Israel—in the midst of an external and carnal Israel, is fully borne out by the historical and prophetic Scriptures, and that these, through the Divine blessing, were fruits of the theocratic training, cannot be questioned. How individuals of this class, living in the time of our Saviour, welcomed his advent and his entrance on his

¹ The provisions of the law with respect to education were far more complete than Moses Stuart represents them. Old Testament Canon. p. 54.

² Litton, Mosaic Dispensation. p. 196.

ministerial work, appears from the rapturous emotions of the Simeons and Annas in the temple, and the joyful announcements of the Philips, "we have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write;" and when this simple statement sufficed to bring to Jesus Israelites in whom there was no guile, (John i. 45-49).

The preparation thus effected will further appear from the fact that the whole of the first heralds of the Gospel—the chosen disciples and apostles of the Lord—and the great and gifted Apostle subsequently added to make up the original complement, and whose labours, both missionary and literary, contributed so largely to the propagation of Christianity, were Jews by birth; and, further, that all the writers of the New Testament, with the exception of Luke (Col. iv. 11, 14), who was, probably, a proselyte, were also of the same nation, and brought up under the theocratic institutions.

It is thus seen that Judaism, though not an end—for which it was neither fitted nor designed, and was only perverted when so taken—was yet a very important means towards the realisation of the Divine purposes. It furnished not merely an historical foundation for Christianity, as will be shown in the subsequent section, but a people prepared for its reception, and instruments ready to carry on its work; and thus, though imperfect in itself, or regarded in any other than a provisional aspect, the Mosaic economy furnished various undoubted evidences of Divine contrivance, as a grand preparatory scheme "imposed until the time of reformation" (Heb. ix. 10). Its inherent weaknesses and imperfections, indeed, so far as they awakened in the members of the theocracy feelings of dissatisfaction, either with themselves or the spiritual provision therein furnished to them, served to procure a more ready reception for the announcement of the new dispensation. This was abundantly proved in the preaching of Christ and his apostles: "the fields" were, indeed, "white to harvest" (John iv. 35) when the Redeemer entered upon His work.

SECT. II. SPECIAL RELATION OF THE PENTATEUCH AND JUDAISM TO CHRISTIANITY.

Sykes, *Essay upon the Truth of the Christian Religion.* Lond. 1725.—Daubeny, *Connection between the Old and New Testaments.* Lond. 1802—Hartmann, *Enge Verbindung des Alt. Testaments mit dem Neuen.* Hamb. 1831.—Alexander, *Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Testaments.* Lond. 1853.—Alford, W., *The Old and New Testament Dispensations compared.* Lond. 1858.—Barrows, *The Indivisible Nature of Revelation: Biblioth. Sacra, July 1853, vol. x., pp. 764-788.*

Wherever the claims of the New Testament, as a divinely inspired record, are rejected, no great value will of course be attached to the fact, that it accords with, or expressly sanctions matters, whether of history or doctrine, in the earlier work; and yet, even in a mere literary point of view, apart entirely from any higher character, such is the connexion of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, that they have important bearings on one another. Though written in different languages, and at periods widely apart, the two volumes are seen at once to constitute consecutive parts of the literature of one people. In proof of this it is enough to advert to the fact, that the Greek of the New Testament is of a character which shows that it was philologically impossible that it could have been written by such as were unacquainted with Hebrew, and whose thoughts and expressions had not been formed in a Hebrew mould, independently of their training in the theocratic principle,—a fact clearly discernible throughout the work.

So closely connected, in this and other points, are the Old and New Testament writings, that their claims, it is not too much to assert, must stand or fall together. If there be nothing else there is accordingly at least a consistency in the scepticism, which rejects alike the claims of the two portions of the sacred volume. There is also some show of reason in the procedure of the Jew who accepts his own Scriptures, the productions of the national lawgiver, and of the subsequent prophets, to the exclusion of the Christian revelation and economy superinduced on the Old Testament foundation. The premises in this case are in part correct, though there be lacking the right exegesis needful for the proper interpretation of the

earlier record, and deducing correct views of the relation of Judaism to Christianity. The reception, however, on the other hand, of the New Testament Scriptures as a work of Divine authority, with the rejection of the older record, on which it professes to be based, is a course of procedure altogether inexplicable ; and yet there are not wanting persons who maintain such inconsistencies as, viewed even in the most favourable light, indicate almost total ignorance of the character of the New Testament, and its intimate and manifold relations to the Old. The Jew may at least with consistency, and some show of argument, admit the authority of Moses and of the prophets, while he disowns that of Christ and his apostles, preferring his own interpretation of the nature and design of the law to that of the New Testament writers ; but no intelligent believer in Christianity can hesitate as to the divine authority of the Mosaic law and institutions. In short, the older and the later dispensations, it may at least be consistently assumed, are alike false or alike true ; or, on another supposition, however it may be opposed to all evidence, the older may have had a divine origin, while the later is only a fraud, or some philosophical or other development of Judaism, through Persian¹ or Alexandrian² influences ; but it cannot be legitimately assumed that Christianity is a truth, if Judaism, from which it sprung, had not an antecedent authentication as a system, imperfect and preparatory, no doubt, but still, in every respect, as it most unequivocally professes to be, the very truth of God.

These remarks are rendered necessary, by the very confused ideas which appear to prevail at present with regard to this subject. Than the relation of the Old Testament to the New, nothing of a Biblical character seems, in certain quarters, to be less understood. This is fully indicated in the attempts to represent Christianity as distinct from and independent of Judaism, or any earlier economy, and in support of which recourse is had, not merely to the imperfection of these dispensations, but to allegations that they sanctioned what cannot be reconciled with moral right, or what is known to be truth and matter of fact.³ Such attempts at separating Christianity

¹ Donaldson, *Christian Orthodoxy*, pp. 137, 373. Lond. 1857.

² Bahrdr, *Briefe über die Bibel*, i. 367. Berl. 1784.

³ Baden Powell, *Christianity without Judaism*, p. 79.

from Judaism, when made, as sometimes avowed, in defence of the former, and for maintaining its spirituality, can only be compared to the process of sapping the foundation, with the view of adding to the strength and stability of the superstructure. Indeed, nothing is more fitted to undermine Christianity than the disparagement, either through ignorance or design, of the dispensation on which it not only rests, but which it, in every possible way, and in most express terms, sanctions and authenticates.

The connexion between the Old Testament and the New may be presented in a variety of aspects, each of which, it will be found, affords important evidence in support of their respective claims, and of their forming parts of one grand scheme, the object of which is the revelation of God, and particularly of His purposes respecting the redemption of sinners through Christ. The Pentateuch—for it is with regard to it the question is at present—may be shown to form the historical, doctrinal, and prophetic basis of the New Testament.

§ 1. *The Pentateuch as Historically related to the New Testament.*

Irrespective of the Divine character of the New Testament, and of the authority due to it on that account, and irrespective too of all dogmatic considerations, it may be viewed in the first instance as an independent historical testimony adducible in confirmation of the Mosaic record and the other Hebrew Scriptures. No doubt there is, as above remarked, a great distance in point of time between even the latest book of the Old Testament, and the earliest of the New; nevertheless the evidence of the latter is important as showing the continuous and current belief of the Jewish nation, regarding various incidents in their national history and legislation. Evidence of this kind is unquestionably not less, if it be not far more reliable than any similar attestation occurring in heathen or foreign works, to whose authority in such cases no objection is ever made. When duly considered, such foreign testimony is in fact of far less value than that of the New Testament, because the information, in such cases, considering the little intercourse between the Hebrews and strangers, could not be

so full and accurate as that of native writers. Now, all the more important transactions of the Pentateuch are referred to by the New Testament writers, and the historical credibility of the Mosaic narrative assumed without any doubt or qualification whatever. In confirmation merely of the historical credibility of the Pentateuch, a far higher value of course attaches to the references found in the Old Testament itself, considered in a literary point of view, and which, in an earlier part of this work, were adduced for that purpose. But the object at present is not so much to prove the credibility of the older volume as to show its connexion with the new, and the essential agreement among writers who lived amid circumstances, in various respects exceedingly different, as must be evident when the Mosaic is compared with the Gospel age.

There is, however, another aspect in which the testimony of the New Testament to the Pentateuch, apart still from the Divine authority of the former, possesses an historical importance superior to the testimony of any of the Old Testament writers. Christ and his apostles, whatever view may be entertained of their mission, occupied, it must be admitted, a place widely different from the authors of the Hebrew Scriptures, inasmuch as they were introducing a system which was expressly intended to supersede the old or Mosaic economy of which the prophets had been the great expounders and upholders; and yet in no single expression of the New Testament can aught be discovered fitted or intended to cast doubt on the credibility of a single statement, whether historical or doctrinal, of the Pentateuch, or on the Divine character of the law and ordinances which it prescribed and established. In no instance did the first promulgators of the Gospel seek to depreciate the character of Moses or of his law, in their endeavours to explain its object and restore it to what they deemed its true place, by the removal of those false glosses and interpretations which a carnal Judaism had imposed upon its original simplicity and its spirituality, and which tended so much to the frustration of its great end.

On the contrary, the teaching of Christ and his apostles manifests invariably the highest esteem for the Mosaic writings as of Divine authority, and as containing preintimations as well of the facts as of the doctrines of the Gospel. Thus,

in the authentic records of Christianity, the Mosaic ordinances are designated "the law of the Lord," (Luke ii. 22-24, 39); and Moses himself has the distinguished honour of being declared "faithful in all his house," (Heb. iii. 2), in reference to the manner in which he discharged the trust which God had committed to him. With respect especially to the evidence in favour of the Jewish Scriptures, and their sufficiency as regarded both doctrine and prophecy, our Lord remarked, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead," (Luke xvi. 31); and again: "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me," (John v. 46.) The same Divine Teacher further emphatically declared that His own mission had for its object not the abrogation, but the fulfilment of the law and the prophets. "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," (Matt. v. 17, 18.) In like manner, St. Paul averred that, in his public teaching, he propounded "none other things than those which Moses and the prophets did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles," (Acts xxvi. 22, 23.) Indeed, this Apostle expressly ascribes prescience to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, from a passage found in the Pentateuch, and thus unequivocally attributes to them a Divine origin, and at the same time identifies intimations therein made with the Gospel itself: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed," (Gal. iii. 8; comp. Gen. xii. 3.)

In marked contrast to this favourable testimony borne to Moses and his law by Christ and his apostles, are their strong denunciations against the Jewish teachers of the day, who, by their false expositions, had grievously obscured the great truths inculcated in the law (Matt. xxii. 16, 23; Luke xi. 52; Phil. iii. 2; Rom. ii. 17-24). In particular, our Lord clearly distinguished between the plain unqualified expositions of the law by the Scribes and their own frivolous and unauthorised

additions thereto: the former, he distinctly intimated, were to be received because of the official position of the parties as the recognised successors of Moses, the latter were to be unhesitatingly rejected. "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say and do not" (Matt. xxiii. 23). In so far as these public teachers enforced the law and precepts of Moses, they should be obeyed; but their conduct otherwise was by no means to be imitated. These bold invectives in the New Testament against all that was false in doctrine or practice show at least how little the speakers or writers in their censures or commendations were influenced by considerations arising from a desire to fall in with prejudices, or secure popular favour, and so utterly exclude the assumption of what is termed *accommodation*, by which Rationalistic writers would seek to account for the sanction of the New Testament to the Hebrew Scriptures and institutions.

More particularly, however, the historical connexion between the Pentateuch and the New Testament is of a kind which can be accounted for only on one or other of these two suppositions: either that its announcements were made in full view of the historical facts and other relations narrated in the Gospel regarding the Redeemer, or that a remarkable combination of circumstances, in some inexplicable manner, so concurred with the earlier statements, historical, doctrinal, and prophetic, as to convey the impression that the connexion, though in itself fortuitous, and an accordance with statements hazarded without due authority, does, nevertheless, seem to be of design, and of the character of providential arrangements for their realisation. This latter alternative, it is almost needless to say, is a supposition which cannot, for a moment, be maintained. Its acceptance would demand a credulity to which belief in the supernatural origin of Scripture offers no comparison.

The whole of the Old Testament history, more especially that of the origin and the peculiar form of the Israelitish constitution, the antecedent and prospective relation of that people to the other nations of the earth, or the particular place which they occupied in providence, were matters with which Chris-

tianity and the historical advent of its Founder were intimately involved. This is seen first in the notices as to the family or descent of the promised Redeemer. The promises made to the patriarchs flowed in a particular historical course, every stage of which was carefully marked; and although at the point where the Pentateuch terminates, the tribal division only was specified from which should issue the Seed of blessing, a distinct foundation was laid for the varied and more definite arrangements announced in the prophetic writings. As remarked by Neander,¹ "the history of the Jewish people was all preparatory to the appearance and ministry of Christ, who was to come forth out of their midst."

In connexion with that specific point marked in the Pentateuch, regarding the descent of the Seed of the woman and of Abraham, it is worthy of notice that it was a special object of the New Testament writers to show that Christ was of the tribe of Judah. In two of the Gospels this is formally presented by the insertion of his genealogy, in the one instance beginning with Abraham (Matt. i. 1), and, in the other, reaching back, through the same patriarch, to Adam, the father of the human race (Luke iii. 38). In several other passages, Christ's connexion with the tribe of Judah is incidentally noticed (Heb. vii. 14; Rev. v. 5). No specific intimation was, or indeed could be, given in the Pentateuch, either of the place or of the time of the Redeemer's appearance, but both of these particulars were made so dependent on the territorial and political relations of the tribe of Judah, depicted in the blessing of Jacob, as fully to prepare for the announcements which in due time followed. Limiting, however, at present the inquiry to the general intimations, that the Benefactor of the race should be descended from Abraham and of the tribe of Judah, has it been, it may be asked, entirely accidental that the Personage claiming to be such, and, in the estimation of all, who, it may be affirmed, have carefully and dispassionately examined the subject, fully entitled to that distinction, made his appearance not in Egypt, Greece, or Rome, the seats of wisdom, civilisation, and power, but in an obscure corner of the Roman empire, and among a poor and despised people? Or how happened it that those doctrines, which, from the

¹ Life of Jesus Christ, E. T., p. 20. Lond., 1851.

time of their first publication, have been revolutionising the world, and by their silent operation have been productive of wider and more permanent conquests than all other forces of a moral character ever effected, should have emanated from the Jewish synagogue rather than from the world-renowned schools of philosophy? There was a peculiar fitness in all these arrangements indicative in the highest degree of design, and which precludes all supposition of fortuitous coincidence. Should it, however, be replied that there was a general expectation abroad at the time of Christ's appearance, that some extraordinary person was to be manifested in Judæa, and that this circumstance favoured the claims of Christ to be the promised Redeemer, it must be obvious that this expectation, so far from accounting for the recognition of such claims, is itself an element in the case which requires an explanation, if not acknowledged to be the result of the predictions of the Hebrew Scriptures in this and various other ways preparing for the advent of the Redeemer—an event which Neander¹ justly characterises as “the centre of all things, and the aim of all preceding history.”

It is unnecessary to pursue this point further, although every succeeding step in the process would only bring out new relations. It is sufficiently apparent that there is an historical connexion between the Christ of the New Testament and the Messiah of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the want of which, in any important particular, would unquestionably conduce much to neutralise any other testimony however well authenticated.

Other important matters in which the Pentateuch serves as an historical basis to the New Testament, and is indispensable to a correct view of the Christian scheme, are its notices of creation, of the state of innocence, and of the introduction of sin, which necessitated a Deliverer; the original unity of the human race, notwithstanding the differences and distinctions subsequently introduced. A notice of these and other particulars, which it is needless to specify, was requisite for understanding in any degree the nature of the Redeemer's work and its bearing on mankind; for it is upon the incidents and relations, as recorded in the Pentateuch, and accepted in their full historical character, that not only the arguments but the main

¹ Life of Jesus Christ, p. 19.

facts of the New Testament rest. The apostle Paul especially makes great use of the historical facts of the Pentateuch in his discussions alike with Jews and Gentiles. This will sufficiently appear from the following examples, a few out of many which might be adduced. Thus, as to the introduction of sin and death, it is shown (Rom. v. 12-19; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22), that as these concomitants of man's present state are referable to Adam's transgression, so life has come through the obedience of Christ. The manner of justification, too, is illustrated from the example of Abraham (Rom. iv. 1-18), with an intimation that the particular adverted to in the patriarch's history was put upon record for the use of succeeding ages. "Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (ver. 23, 24.) The relation of the Jews and Gentiles to God and to one another is also alluded to in the apostolic discussions (Rom. xi. 15-32), with the purposes to be served by the constitution under which the former were placed (Gal. iii. 9-29; Eph. ii. 11-20; Col. ii. 11.)

One of the points just adverted to, the unity of the human race and their descent from Adam, calls, however, for some more extended notice, not for the purpose of establishing it, for upon this enough has been already advanced, but of showing the place which it holds in the New Testament, particularly in St. Paul's parallel between the first and second Adam, and the doctrine of headship and atonement founded on it (Rom. v. 12-19.) The sanction thus given by the New Testament to the narrative of man's creation in Genesis, has not escaped the notice of such writers as Newman and others of the same school who, viewing that narrative as untenable, and the race as originating in other circumstances, employ these allegations for the purpose of discrediting the New Testament. The remedy for this, however, is not to be found in dissociating the Christian from the Jewish Scriptures. It is really vain for any professing believer in the New Testament to try to eliminate from that volume these¹ or other historical facts of the older Scriptures, to which it lends so unequivocal a sanction. This sanction, however, it is obvious, does not extend to the question

¹ The Genesis of the Earth and of Man, pp. 54, 55. Lond. 1860.

of interpretation, and so does not preclude the exercise of a discriminating criticism, but it absolutely forbids professing believers in Christianity to characterise as merely accommodation the references in the New Testament to historical characters and transactions in the Old, or to resolve these records into myths and legends, modified in their transmission to the time when they were placed on record.

§ 2. *The Pentateuch in its doctrinal relation to the New Testament.*

The doctrines of the Bible, as regards alike the two parts of the volume, are founded on its facts; and in this itself there is discernible a method in Divine revelation; and an adaptation to man's mental constitution. It is no accidental coincidence, that both the Old and the New Testaments commence with historical narrations, to the facts of which constant reference is made throughout the subsequent writings, and which are assumed as incontrovertible statements. Nor should it be overlooked that the development of any particular doctrine keeps pace with, and is distinctly marked by the evolutions of providence according to its historical epochs. To this, it is owing, that of many important truths the germ only appears in the Pentateuch, yet so, as involving all the characteristics which belong to the several doctrines as matured in the New Testament. The same principles, though generally in a different state of development, whether stated in express terms or conveyed by symbol, pervade the two parts of the sacred volume. Yet in some cases, the doctrinal statements of the Pentateuch are as specific as in the New Testament itself.

Of the latter description are the doctrines respecting the unity, personality and perfections of God, which are as fully disclosed in the Mosaic writings as at any subsequent period; a circumstance, which, as remarked in another connexion, constitutes one of their distinguishing characteristics, and considering the circumstances of the times so utterly opposed to monotheistic ideas, one which affords indubitable evidence of their Divine inspiration. The doctrine of God's providential government of the world was another, which was placed in the clearest possible light by the history of Jacob and his son

Joseph. Now, with regard to these truths it is important to observe, not only, that they were presented so distinctly in the earliest portion of the Hebrew literature, at a time when the true knowledge of God had been almost entirely lost, but more particularly, that it was not until long afterwards that the Israelites themselves were weaned from their idolatrous practices, so as to manifest even an external consistency with the fundamental doctrines of their Scriptures. So fully however were these truths received among the Jews at the time of Christ's appearance, when other nations were still immersed in the grossest ignorance with respect to the Divine nature and character, that they are assumed throughout the New Testament as points which it was unnecessary to urge, (Mark xii. 29-33,) and it was only among the heathen, and to such audiences as were found at Ephesus and Athens, that it was needful to declare that "they be no gods which are made with hands," and also the nature of the service acceptable to God, the creator of all, and "not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device," (Acts xix. 26 ; xvii. 29.) There is indeed one formal statement in the New Testament, to the effect that there is "One God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus," (1 Tim. ii. 5.) The object of this statement, however, is not properly to inculcate the doctrine of the Divine unity, as is evident from the context; it is rather to urge the duty of intercessory prayer from the consideration of the unity of God, and His purpose, with respect to all men, and more especially to declare the character and person of the sole Mediator.

Further, in all that respects the Divine character, the doctrine of the Pentateuch is in strictest conformity with the teaching of the New Testament, the same holiness, righteousness, and truth, which belong to God, according to the fuller disclosures of the Gospel, no less distinguished the God of Israel and of the patriarchs. And yet, in conjunction with these attributes, there were clear indications from the beginning that through some arrangement, of which God was the sole author, the exercise of mercy was not inconsistent with the most unsullied righteousness. This was declared, not merely in words; it was manifested in the lives of believers, who, justified by faith in the promises, walked with God, and with whom

He entered into such a relation, that He styled Himself their God, thereby communicating to them an interest in all His fulness and perfections.

Various objections urged against the Divine character as exhibited in the Pentateuch, have been considered in the proper place; and although it must be felt, that in such cases the best explanations come far short of obviating difficulties which must ever be encountered when the finite, even with the best purpose, much more in an antagonistic spirit, comes to contemplate the infinite, and would judge of the ways and workings of God, still it is to be noticed, that the particulars complained of are not peculiar to the Pentateuch, but extend to Scripture in general, the New Testament no less than the Old. This extension of the ground, though it properly affords no answer to the objections, yet serves to mitigate their force as regards the Pentateuch, and should at least show how unwarrantable is the distinction sometimes insinuated, if not more broadly stated, between the God of Israel and the God of the New Testament, with a view to prejudice the Old Testament dispensation. With regard to the distinction thus instituted, it need only be remarked, that the evidence in its favour must be exceedingly feeble when it mainly consists in the ascription of what is deemed excessive severity and hatred of sin to the God of Israel, whereas the New Testament furnishes in reality clearer proofs of this disposition, than anything witnessed under the former dispensations, patriarchal or Levitical.

Not only the character of God, that of man also, as exhibited in the Pentateuch, is in strictest harmony with the teaching of the New Testament, the Mosaic history in this, as in other particulars, forming in fact the very ground of the whole apostolic reasoning on the subject. In proof, for instance, of the universal corruption of the race, St. Paul invariably appeals to these records. Thus, in Rom. iii. 10-18, he adduces, for this purpose, certain passages from the Psalms, and, what is more remarkable, quotes them as sayings or statements of the law: "We know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law" (ver. 19). This designation is given to these statements, because viewed as the direct promptings of the law, or the impressions which it made upon the conscience of the subjects of the theocracy. From

the use made of these passages by the apostle introductory to his notice of the provision made for man's wants in the Gospel, it is to be inferred that the nature of the disease was so fully described in the law that it formed a test whereby to discern at once the suitability of the remedy proffered in the Gospel, and so to determine whether it was of Divine appointment, and in reality that provision, of which there had been repeated intimations, gradually becoming more definite as the time of their fulfilment approached.

The references, whether to the law or the history of Moses, are, however, generally of a more direct character than that just noticed. Of this examples were given under the preceding head, one of which respected the circumstances in which sin was introduced, according to the authority of the book of Genesis. The narrative of the fall, on which the doctrine of the corruption of mankind ultimately rests, and to which there are numerous references in the New Testament, may be fitly described as a complete epitome of the Gospel, in all its more important relations. It contains, not merely the substance of the Gospel itself, but the grand fact on which that remedial provision rests. Man's original uprightness, as he came from the Creator's hand; his yielding to the power of evil through a temptation addressed to him from without; the misery which immediately resulted from disobedience; the Divine remedy provided for the emergency, with the immediate and ultimate consequences of the controversy announced to be henceforth waged with the power of Evil by the representative and avenger of man, as well as various other particulars, are all exhibited in the narrative; and though only in the merest outline, there is discernible the fullest harmony, with the same doctrines as expounded by the New Testament writers.

Another important topic in the earlier portion of the Pentateuch, and which forms, as it were, a new doctrinal epoch in the ever advancing scheme of revelation, is the account of the Abrahamic covenant. Here a new direction is given to the great principle of redemption announced after the fall. The peculiar constitution established with the Israelitish people, and founded on the covenant into which God had entered with their father Abraham, might seem at first sight to introduce a limitation not anticipated from anything contained in the ori-

ginal announcement of redemption, or deducible from the character and purposes of God as revealed in his other acts, and still more opposed to the universal aim of the Gospel. Looking at the theocratic constitution, which confined a knowledge of the true religion, and then at the Gospel in its diffusive character, apart from the design of the former, there may be an apparent disparity or change of purpose, in first limiting the blessings within a narrow compass by various arrangements, which clearly showed that they were intentionally so limited, and afterwards making them, by express declaration, co-extensive with the race. Any misconceptions on these points are found, however, to disappear on closer investigation. The Israelitish constitution, as explained by the Abrahamic covenant, as well as by various intimations which preceded the giving of the law, was, though an imperfect and provisional dispensation, yet preparatory to a universal one, in which the promises made prior to, as well as under the law, should be realized to their utmost extent.

The first noticeable feature of the Abrahamic covenant is its universality. Abraham, in this covenant, was declared blessed in himself, and was made the medium of blessing, not only to his own posterity, but to the world at large. It was hereby distinctly declared, that God's purposes regarding the seed of Abraham had an ulterior object, of extending through them blessing to the Gentiles; and of course it was only in accordance with this view that His special dealings with the former were to be interpreted. It is unnecessary to dwell upon this, or refer to further testimonies respecting the object of the Israelitish constitution, as this has been sufficiently considered already. Only it may be added, that the intimations given in the law itself, and more fully developed in the Psalms and prophetic writings, are adopted in Rom. xv. 9-12, as in entire accordance with the principles of the Gospel. It thus plainly appeared that the Mosaic economy had no less than the Gospel itself, in the purposes of God, a benevolent aspect to the whole human race, although circumstances rendered it necessary that for a time the covenant blessings should be limited to the Israelitish people. This was an arrangement which, instead of being objectionable, was, as the result has fully proved, pre-eminently suitable. Thus it has been well remarked:

“The man who objects to it as not in harmony with the catholic spirit of the Gospel, is bound to show how a universal religion, like Christianity, could have been wisely and successfully introduced without a previous work of preparation, or how any better method of preparation could have been devised than that of the Mosaic institutions.”¹

Another feature of the Abrahamic covenant is that its blessings were of a spiritual character and dependent only on faith. The object of the covenant, on God's part, is thus expressed: “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.*” Everything else is subordinate to this, and preparatory to God's assuming this relation to His people (Gen. xvii. 7, 8). It is also noticeable that, previous to the formal ratification of the covenant and Abraham's circumcision, which is described as the “seal of the covenant” (ver. 11), he is said to have “believed in the Lord,” and to have this “counted to him for righteousness” (xv. 6). The place which this statement occupies in the narrative is specially noticed by St. Paul when proving that the bestowal of the blessing was entirely through faith, and in nowise dependent on the observance of any carnal ordinance; and he hence concludes that the promise “was not through the law, but through the righteousness of faith” (Rom. iv. 10-13). Faith, the only condition of blessing under the Gospel, held an identical place, it is thus plainly stated, under the earlier dispensation.²

These views of the Mosaic economy and of the covenant on which it was based, as set forth in the New Testament, were quite opposed to the current Jewish interpretation; and it needed, indeed, a special training to bring the apostles themselves to recognise aright the nature of the dispensation under which they had been brought up. At first they largely participated in the carnal notions and narrow prejudices of their countrymen, and, accordingly, had but very inadequate conceptions of the character of the blessings to be enjoyed under the Messiah, and of the extent to which they could be shared in by such as were outside the Israelitish community. This cir-

¹ Barrows, *The Indivisible Nature of Revelation*: Bib. Sacr. x. 775.

² See Venema, *Dissert. Sacræ*, Lib. i. 4, § 18, p. 76. Harling., 1731.

circumstance, however, so far from weakening the present argument, only lends it additional support; for now that the Old Testament doctrines on these and other particulars have been put in the light represented in the New Testament, the legitimacy of the interpretation is at once apparent to every candid reader, so that, naturally, the only matter of surprise is how the Jewish community should be so blinded to the plainest intimations of their Scriptures as not to discern how completely they were fulfilled in the Gospel of Christ.

It is unnecessary to advert to other doctrines where the harmony between the Pentateuch and the New Testament is not less striking. Even the doctrine of a future state and its concomitant rewards and punishments, which many would exclude from the Pentateuch altogether, is, however, plainly discernible, and it afforded sufficient warrant for the statement so fully expressed in Heb. xi., that it constituted the great principle of endurance in the various trials to which the patriarchs had been subjected. This view, indeed, affords the only satisfactory explanation of the motives which led these men cheerfully to encounter so checkered a life as that which they spent in the land of promise, instead of returning, as the apostle intimates they might have done, to their ancestral home (ver. 15), when they found that there was no prospect of their being put into immediate possession of Palestine.

In these, and various other matters, the Pentateuch is the doctrinal basis of all subsequent revelation. Between the first disclosures and the last there cannot be detected the least symptom of discord. On the contrary, everything is in full harmony with the entire system, and so bears unequivocal testimony that the whole record is the production of the one eternal Mind who discerned the end from the beginning, and was fully cognisant of and had respect to all the evolutions of Providence in the affairs of men, and the diversified influences which affect the advancement of the race and of individuals in civilisation and knowledge. Even were the Scriptures the production of one age, and of a select number of writers, or, indeed, even of one, they could not possibly exhibit anything like the harmony for which, both as to matters of fact and doctrine, they are so distinguished, without the assumption that they were composed under the direction of some extra-

ordinary guidance. How much more, then, is such a conclusion necessitated when taking the Bible as it really is; or considering the different periods at which portions of it were composed, the diversities which must naturally have marked its several writers in the great interval which elapsed between the books of Genesis and the Apocalypse? These were circumstances assuredly fitted to impart to any composition of far less extent and varied character than the canonical Scriptures, the most opposite impressions with respect to historical and doctrinal questions on which men, and even the same individual, at different stages of life, have entertained the most varied opinions. That there is no discrepancy of this kind discernible in the Scriptures, notwithstanding decided indications of the most varied individuality in the several writers, is an incontrovertible proof that the whole is a product of Divine inspiration, for no agency short of this can account for such a phenomenon.

It is not, however, merely the harmony manifested in the various parts of Scripture that deserves notice, the gradual development of the doctrines in strict historical order is even more worthy of consideration in an argument in favour of its Divine origin. An able writer might, it is conceivable, produce a document in which the views set forth accorded with those propounded in preceding works and authoritatively received, and the closest imitation might in fact be looked for in a work having a fraudulent design; but a consistent advance in the doctrinal scheme is what no mere device or expertness could accomplish. Such an arrangement as that presented in Scripture is so dependent on numerous and even minute adaptations of parts, and on historical combinations only apparent on a close and comprehensive survey of the whole scheme in its various bearings, and at the same time extends over such a lengthened period, that the supposition of its being a human contrivance is altogether preposterous. The development of the Scriptural doctrine is so dependent on the historical course of the narrative as to evince that it could not possibly be effected by any agency short of Divine prescience, for it must be fully apparent from a comparison of the Old Testament with the New, the one containing the promises, and the other recording their fulfilment, that those

announcements commencing with that made in Eden, must from the very first have been made in view of the whole scheme to be afterwards unfolded, and the circumstances in which it was realized.

§ 3. *The Pentateuch in its Prophetical and Typical Relation to the New Testament.*

Some of the verbal prophecies relating to the person and lineage of the Redeemer, the character of his work, and the relation of the people from whom he should derive his descent, to the other nations of the earth, have been considered in connexion with the historical and doctrinal foundation which the Pentateuch furnishes to the New Testament, particularly with regard to the historical appearance of Christ. There are several others not less explicit; but on that very account they are not so suitable for the present purpose, as the predictions expressed not in words, but by types and figures, and the full import of which may have been exceedingly doubtful until the light of the New Testament brought out their hidden meaning in a way not to be mistaken. To these typical features of the Pentateuch, the following observations will accordingly be chiefly limited.

Whatever questions may be raised as to the extent of the typical matter in the Pentateuch, or the measure to which the subjects of the theocracy attained in apprehending the truths involved in their institutions and ordinances, with their bearing on the future, there can be little question that they had a prospective aspect. As foreshadowing more perfect arrangements, they were certainly recognised by many of the Old Testament worshippers themselves, as appears from various expressions in the Psalms and in the Prophets, and what is alone sufficient for the present purpose, by the New Testament writers, who not only regard the older services of the law as typical, but also show how they have attained their true significance under the Gospel in the person and kingdom of Christ. The only questions, taking the New Testament as guide, that can properly arise in such a case, are of an exegetical character. Thus, it may be necessary to inquire, what is the precise nature of the analogies there indicated between the

Mosaic and the Christian dispensations, and are there any indications in the facts and arrangements founded on for warranting the conclusion that these analogies have a real and preordained existence, and are not mere figurative expressions? Of the importance attached to this matter in the New Testament, sufficient evidence is afforded in the fact that not only are such analogies assumed incidentally in various passages, but more systematically discussed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the greater portion of which is devoted to the special object of proving that Christ, in his person and offices, was the end of the ceremonial law, just as it is the object of the Epistle to the Romans to show, that in His whole work, He is the end of the moral law, "for righteousness to every one that believeth," (Rom. x. 4.)

Now the circumstance that there is an observable historical progress in the scheme of Divine revelation, and that there are characteristics which, while distinguishing each particular epoch, and fitting it for existing wants, made it also preparatory to the succeeding period, is one of much importance to the present inquiry. This is the more deserving of notice, since it appears that similar principles pervade also the natural world, so that a remarkable analogy is thus presented between the works and the word of God. According to the most recent investigations of science, the several objects of creation correspond with the places they were designed to occupy, and the ends they were to serve; and further, these objects conform more or less to a particular pattern or type. Nor is this the case merely with any contemporaneous system in nature; the objects of successive systems or creations, as shown by geology, were also anticipative of those which followed at a later epoch, and in a higher order. The lowest animal organization was thus, it appears, prophetic of man, in whom, according both to Scripture and science, the end of creation was reached.¹

¹ Rich. Owen: "It must surely appear a most remarkable circumstance to one acquainted only with the osteology of the human frame, that so many bones should be, by the common consent of comparative anatomists, determinable in the skull of every animal down to the lowest osseous fish." *Archetype and Homologies of the vertebrate Skeleton*, p. 72, Lond. 1848. Again, "The recognition of an ideal Exemplar for the vertebrated animals proves

It is, however, where the typical in creation terminates, that the typical in revelation properly begins. As the typical system is of a higher order in the animal than in the vegetable kingdom, so, as might confidently be expected, in the sphere of mind it is still higher than in the world of matter. For if, as science indicates, the lower animal forms were framed after the human type, man himself, as Scripture declares, was made after "the image of God." Man, properly the archetype in the other cases, here becomes himself the type. And as the scheme of nature, read from the memorials of creation inscribed on the earth's crust, or recorded in the opening pages of Genesis, was progressive, and, from its very outset, prophetic; so also is it with that scheme of which man is the chief subject, and God is ever the ultimate end. From these considerations alone it might be rightly concluded, not only in general that the Old Testament was prophetic of the New, but more particularly, that the seminal principle contained in the first Divine announcement after the Fall, viewed in connexion with the purpose expressed in man's creation in the image of God, and thus constituted His highest representative on earth, was prophetic of all the glory, as well of righteousness as of grace brought to light in the later dispensation, or still further to be revealed in a future state of existence.

While, however, the announcement at the very outset of man's history, regarding his place in the creation and his relation to God, with the purposes thus indicated, constituted the fundamental evidence of the existence of such typical principles, there were other tokens even more specific. The various modes whereby, as shown in an early chapter of this work, God made Himself known, both as regards his character and his purposes towards man, may be divided into two classes,

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, under diverse such modifications, upon this planet, long prior to the existence of those animal species that actually exemplify it We learn from the

past history of our globe, that nature 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." *The Nature of Limbs*, p. 86, Lond. 1849.

words and things, the one explanatory and complementary of the other. Revelation by words respected both the present and the future ; what God is, and consequently requires of his moral creatures, under all circumstances, and also what He has promised to do for them. The same principles are indeed enunciated in the revelation by things, either historical characters and events in Providence illustrative of the nature and perfections of God, or ordinances of Divine appointment, indicative not merely of His nature, but also of His gracious purposes. The order, too, in which these several modes of conveying Divine instruction were employed, tends also to illustrate this subject. Although symbols were used extensively from the very outset of revelation, yet they were in general preceded or accompanied by verbal explanations. The command with respect to the forbidden fruit, and subsequently the promise regarding the seed of the woman, were antecedent to most of the symbolical institutions, the nature and purposes of which were continually rendered more manifest by the verbal prophecies.

Keeping in view the twofold purpose of symbols to express an absolute or present truth, and also a prospective relation or provision, will explain the distinction between symbols and types properly so called. Every type is a symbol ; it is a prophecy in action ; but every symbol is not a type ; inasmuch as it may be, and indeed, frequently is, expressive only of a present relation. Further consideration will presently be given to this point ; only it may be remarked, that this is what among other things chiefly distinguishes the symbology of heathenism from that which God was pleased to sanction in the ritual of the early Church. While the heathen world had its various forms of symbolism more or less expressive of the conceptions entertained of God, and what was due to Him from His worshippers, none of these contained of course any promise that God would satisfy those wants of humanity which these rites in many cases painfully expressed. It was only that system which God Himself established that embraced any provision of this kind, and it did so, solely because designed by God for this very purpose. In the Gentile religions expression was only given to the disease and man's own devices with respect to a remedy, often resulting in the most

unnatural extravagances ; in Judaism, on the other hand, were embodied God's description of the disease, and with it the remedy which He had in his grace provided.

With regard, however, to the difference just indicated between types and symbols, it may be necessary to remark that the distinction is of a relative, rather than an absolute kind. Such is the multiform aspect of Divine truth, that a matter, whether expressed in words or presented in action, which when looked at from one point of view has reference to a present truth, yet when regarded in another light, points to a principle to be realized in the future, so that what may in itself be simply symbolical, may, in certain circumstances, be also typical. Such, indeed, was the case with many of the Old Testament symbols, although some again had a more limited bearing. Thus, for instance, the Aaronic vestments, as indeed the whole process of the sanctification and consecration of the priests, were a symbol of the holiness of God, whose special servants or attendants, the ministers of sacrifice were represented to be. Viewed only in this light the various requisites of the priests, personal and official, were simply symbols ; but in another point of view, these qualifications indicated the provision which God would make for his priests, or his people under that character, in order that they might be duly fitted for their vocation. Accordingly, it is said of the Church in the Apocalypse, "To her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white : for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints," (Rev. xix. 8)—imagery altogether taken from the priestly attire. In a still higher sense, however, was there in those ordinances a reference to the only proper Minister of sacrifice, His character and qualification, and the Head of that order of priests only figuratively so termed, when they are made by Him "kings and priests unto God."

It is to be observed, however, that the prospective truths which thus found utterance, whether in the events of the history or the institutions of the law, were not deducible so much from the acts or symbols themselves, as from the place which they occupied in the system, and their connexion with its other doctrines and provisions, more particularly as completed in the New Testament. It might be difficult to such as only

witnessed the symbol, however familiar they might be with its language, to discern therein aught that was typical or prospective, although there were few cases indeed in which there was not some verbal prophecy or declaration which served to throw light on the subject; but there can be little difficulty to those who can compare the antitypical with the ancient symbol. As symbols, the old institutions subserved an important purpose; they were in their general and primary features recognizable by all. The typical import required a higher discernment, and so was a privilege enjoyed by the few, while to attain to its full significance belongs only to the Christian interpreter who examines the Old Testament in the light of the New.

Even with the aid there supplied, the application of these principles to the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures demands the greatest care; for in the hands of fanciful writers it has been carried to such an extravagant length as to excite a prejudice against every thing purporting to have a typical character. This again has led to a reaction tending to the opposite extreme, so much that some writers on the subject, as Marsh, Stuart, and others, would exclude from the typical everything not so termed in Scripture. It would be entirely out of place to enter here into any minute disquisition on the nature of types, or the canons of interpretation adopted by writers on this subject; and it might be sufficient to refer to the able work of Dr. Fairbairn, entitled "The Typology of Scripture," to which repeated reference has been made in the course of this treatise. As, however, there are particulars with regard to which the present writer is disposed to dissent from the views there entertained, it is proposed to offer a few general remarks on typology, before adverting to the more important points of a typical connexion between the Pentateuch and the New Testament.

1. A fundamental error with typological writers lies in their definition of the term *τύπος*, *Type*; taking it in a more restricted sense than its Biblical usage warrants.¹

The idea expressed by the term in the New Testament is

¹ See M'Cosh and Dickie, *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*, p. 509. Edin. 1856.

exceedingly variable, and must in every instance be determined from the context, and the nature of the case. In the majority of instances at least it is used in a very general sense; and only in one, or at the most two cases (Rom. v. 14; Heb. ix. 24), does it occur in a more restricted, or as it is termed, *theological* sense. Now, it may be asked, Why should the interpreter deduce his definition from the rarer sense of the term rather than from its general Biblical usage? The confusion which such a course introduces must be at once apparent. Thus, according to Dr. Fairbairn: "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." This principle, if consistently carried out, will obviously exclude from the number of the Types many circumstances that are expressly so named. Of course this was felt by the author, for he goes on to say: "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."¹ This is exemplified in the case of the Sabbath: "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.' But does not this additional meaning attached to the ordinance, at a period subsequent to its origin, conflict with what is considered to be essential in a type, that the resemblance between it and the thing foreshadowed must have been "designed in its original institution?"²

The necessary consequences of the adoption of too specific a definition, and so contracting the typical basis, will be either to diminish the subject-matter of types, or to constrain the interpreter to search for analogies in the subjects compared,

¹ Typology of Scripture, i. 203.

² Ibid., i. 60.

demanded only by the exigencies of the theory. An instance of this, as regards the one case, is witnessed in the extracts above given, while, with respect to the other, numerous examples may be produced, from the works even of the most judicious writers. It will be sufficient, however, to refer to the comparison sometimes instituted between the deluge and Baptism, because of the use of the word *ἀντίτυπον*, in Pet. iii. 21, which here, if anywhere, occurs in the most general sense.¹ Totally different is the resemblance in relations and circumstances expressed by *τύπος*, as applied to Adam (Rom. v. 14), when described as *τύπος τοῦ μελλόντος*, “the figure of the future one;” not “who was to come,” but spoken from the apostle’s own point of view, “who is to come.”² Again, in 1 Cor. x. 6, 11, the term occurs in another sense, indicating something more, however, than *an example* to be avoided, as it might at first sight appear, inasmuch as it is elsewhere repeatedly used of one to be imitated (Phil. iii. 17; 1 Thess. i. 7; 2 Thess. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 12; 1 Pet. v. 3). The explanation of the events in Israel’s history, recorded in ver 1-4, shows that the apostle instituted a parallel in the cases referred to, and that he regarded them, as Olshausen remarks, as “real images of subsequent occurrences.” This is confirmed by ver. 11, where the idea expressed in ver. 6 is repeated, and a reason assigned for those matters being put upon record.

2. There is another error closely associated with, and in a manner naturally springing from, that just noticed. This consists in imposing too narrow limits on the typical, or confining this character to one special aspect of things.

A very common procedure is, to exclude from the typical whatever is not so styled, or directly treated as such in Scripture. Others take a larger view, and embrace in the list various particulars, for which there is only some inferential authority, from their analogy to the cases treated of in the New Testament. Still the present tendency is to diminish the number; and this is, indeed, in a great measure required, as already noticed, by the definition of a type usually employed, and confining it to the more important bearings of redemption, especially the person and offices of the Redeemer. So

¹ Brown, Exposition of First Peter, ii. 214, 215. Edin. 1849.

² See Alford, Greek Testament, ii. 337.

far, however, from there being any clear necessity for this limitation, it would be more correct to regard the whole of Scripture as pervaded by typical principles; the Old Testament being prophetic of, and framed with special reference to the New, which in turn points to events and relations still future. The occurrences recorded in Scripture are distinguished from the common events of Providence, by the very fact that they have a place assigned to them in the sacred record. They had a purpose to serve in the economy under which man was placed, otherwise they would not have been selected from the innumerable facts which have been allowed to pass into oblivion, and many of which, in the view of a mere human historian, would, undoubtedly, be deemed more worthy of preservation than some of those recorded. It may surely be concluded, that every statement of Scripture has some significance of this kind, when its very silence or omissions are in certain cases so considered by the New Testament writers. The manner, for instance, in which Melchizedek is introduced in the history, and particularly the omission of his genealogy, are matters on which great stress is laid in Heb. vii. 1-3; as also on his name, and that of his seat of government.

More particularly, there is no reason whatever for confining the typical to the events and institutions subsequent to the fall. The cause of this arbitrary limitation lies in regarding as typical only what strictly prefigured redemption, instead of connecting it with God's manifestation of Himself and his purposes in all his acts and administration, which, however varied, had from the very first one specific and expressed object in view—His own glory through man at first created in the Divine image, and since the fall to be transformed into it, inasmuch as that moral disorder rendered such a change necessary. The whole of the Divine acts and arrangements from the beginning formed parts of one system, for as antecedent creations reached their end in man, so man himself in his original constitution prefigured a new and higher relation of the race to the Creator than the incipient place reached in creation. No doubt, at the fall there was an interruption in the original line of development, and even a retrogression, as in the sentence which doomed man to return to the dust out

of which he had been taken, but in reality, only another direction was given to it. Even after this, and in the new line, along which man's hopes and destinies were now directed, there are found several apparent interruptions, of course not of so striking a character as the original, yet bearing some analogy to it; as the death of Abel, the catastrophe of the flood by the almost universal prevalence of wickedness in the earth, and even the temporary limitation of the promises and the blessings of revelation to Abraham and his posterity; nevertheless the progress of the Divine scheme was all the while only rendered more discernible.

This exclusion of the period preceding the fall, with its various institutions, however it may be required by the definition of type, for which, as already remarked, there is no Scriptural warrant, is clearly opposed to various important considerations. It would subvert the continuity and essential unity of plan presented alike in creation and redemption, plainly implied in such references to Christ as "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," (Rev. xiii. 8,) and more expressly stated in the numerous analogies traced in the New Testament between acts and institutions in creation, and under the Paradiisical state, and others in the spiritual sphere. Thus the creation itself is contrasted with "the new heavens and the new earth," and the "new creation" in Christ, (2 Cor. v. 17.) So also with respect to various acts of creation, as that of light, which furnishes an analogy to spiritual illumination, (2 Cor. iv. 6,) and in its nature bearing a resemblance to "the true light," (John i. 9; comp. 1 John i. 5.) More deserving of notice, however, are the references to Adam's typical character. These are decisive against the view which would exclude the state preceding the fall from the typical domain. The typical relation of Adam, whether considered as to his creation in the Divine image, or as the "Son of God," (Luke iii. 38,) or again as the head of humanity, cannot certainly have commenced subsequent to the fall; but must have dated from the moment of his creation, or at least, from the time he was made to sustain a representative character in respect of his posterity. The same also holds true with regard to the ordinance of marriage, another institution of Paradise, which is affirmed by St. Paul, to have been typical of the union between

Christ and his Church, (Eph. v. 32,) a truth fully recognised in the Old Testament itself, in the numerous allusions to such a relation between God and Israel, (Isai. liv. 5 ; Jer. xxxi. 32.) So also with the Sabbath, which was a type of the Creator's own rest, and of that which He designed and prepared for man, (Heb. iv. 3-11.)

Writers on this subject, who in theory, as already remarked, deny to these and other matters connected with the original constitution of nature a proper typical character, practically regard them as possessed of it, by assuming that such an application commenced after the fall. But the case of Adam, who was indeed the only true personal type of the Lord from heaven, the true Son of God, and the express image of the Father's person, (1 Cor. xv. 47 ; Heb. i. 3,) alone sufficiently refutes such a supposition. If, however, any further evidence were wanting of the continuity, notwithstanding the moral disorder introduced by the fall, between the relation which Adam sustained before and after that event, it would be found in the fact, that in the narrative which properly begins the history of the seed of blessing, his name is introduced anew, with a notice of his creation in the image of God, (Gen. v. 1, 2.)

Denying to the first period of human history a proper typical character, further necessitates the exclusion of the state of glory, with its varied relations, from the anti-typical sphere ; and yet it is only on the consummation of the Divine scheme, that the types reach their true end and significance. In the progress of events, and the evolutions of Providence as recorded in Scripture, the types were continually increasing in numbers and in clearness, finding partial fulfilments during the Old Testament dispensation, but much more extensive, and of a far higher character under the New. But even this, occupied though it be with realities instead of mere promises, and those too of a spiritual nature as contrasted with the outward and material forms by which they had been previously expressed, is still but a preparatory realization. The New Testament itself is typical as well as the Old, and it is a remarkable circumstance, that the concluding statements of Scripture are couched in symbolical language taken from the history with which the volume opens ; thus giving inti-

mation of the completion of the great cycle of Providence which regarded man.

This extension of the field, and of the particulars which may be considered to possess a typical character, though at first sight it may seem to increase the difficulty of the subject, yet, in reality, greatly diminishes it. On this view, the question for the interpreter to determine, is not so much what historical characters or events, or what institutions are to be held as types, and in the settlement of which there has frequently been nothing better than conjecture, wherever the writers venture beyond the few examples quoted in the New Testament, but what is the specific truth expressed in any particular case—a point for the explication of which there are, in most instances, ample materials in the text itself or context. If, while occupying the platform laid in the New Testament, which is his proper point of view, the interpreter, instead of looking exclusively at the minute points of accordance or difference between the Old and the New Testament, the glory of which has, in various respects, and in none more than that under consideration, dimmed the lustre of the preceding economy (2 Cor. iii. 7-11), would consider the great palpable and fundamental principles of Divine truth, and trace them from their origin to their full development, he would discover many particulars which escape the eye long accustomed to the full light of revelation, but which were clearly discernible to the ancient worshippers, although living in comparative darkness.

At all events, there is need of a more systematic arrangement in matters of typology than that usually adopted, and particular attention should be devoted to the first principles presented in the primeval and patriarchal dispensations. Beginning with Adam, whose typical place should be carefully defined, the next two typical forms which present themselves are the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, after which Cain and Abel were respectively constituted. The opposite principles thus represented, and the contest instituted between them, are henceforward the theme of the Bible, having their several types in the characters and events which emerge in the course of Providence and find a place in the Scriptural record. There is thus a double stream, so that the types do not exclusively prefigure Christ; and even the better

class are more frequently applicable rather to His people than to Himself their Head. Such is evidently the case with the analogies discernible in Enoch, Abraham, and other historical characters.

In the record of the numerous acts of faith, on the one hand, and the proofs of unbelief on the other, exhibited in circumstances the most diversified, anterior to and under the law, there are abundant materials available for the present purpose. The offices which individuals discharged, the acts in which they engaged, the rewards or punishments with which they were visited, the hopes or fears which they entertained, the very names which they bestowed upon their children, and the occasional changes in their own names through a Divine promise or appointment, and various other matters, unite in furnishing contributions which the student of typology may turn to profitable account. Between the extremes represented by the first germ of a doctrine and its full development, the connexion may not always be apparent; the additional elements introduced in the interval may have so changed the outward forms and relations as to render their identification difficult or even impossible. Yet the progressive changes may be clearly traced, and the limits of the successive modifications correctly estimated, by a careful examination of the intermediate stages. Sometimes the new elements super-added may have the appearance of so complicating the subject as to give it an apparently retrogressive character. But attention to the precise circumstances of the case which required such an accession to the original principle, will at once correct misconceptions of this kind. The multiplication of sacrifices, and particularly the institution of a priesthood in the Levitical dispensation, as compared with the earlier and simpler ritual, and the more direct and personal presentation of the offerings, are examples in point. Here there was an important step in advance; the arrangements in question being required as a provision for the sense of guilt augmented by the law, and not, as sometimes assumed, in order to give the ritual a more formal or sumptuous character.

Often, indeed, it is only upon the addition of some new element that the matter is seen to be possessed of a typical character, as in the case of Melchizedek, where the Psalmist

supplements (Ps. cx. 4) the original notice, and so furnishes a basis for the reasoning of the apostle on this subject in Heb. v. 6; vii. 17, 21. It is the same, also, with the idea represented by the Sabbath rest of creation. The rest which God designed for Israel was not simply the possession of Canaan; it was something posterior to and of a higher character than this, as is argued in Heb. iv. 7-9, from the language of Ps. xcv. 7, where it is spoken of as a thing requiring to be secured, even in the time of the Psalmist, when Canaan had been long in their possession.

It is a characteristic of the proper typical element to repeat itself, and in proportion to the importance, as well relative as absolute, of the principles expressed in any particular case. Some truths, as those expressed by sacrifice, and other ordinances of the Levitical ritual, required to be continually repeated in order to answer their desired end; though, at an earlier stage, occasional expressions of the kind were sufficient. Others, again, were of a nature which allowed of their being repeated only at recurring intervals, varying from a week to seven, and even to fifty years. Arrangements of another character, some of which, as those connected with creation and the primeval constitution, did not allow of, or, indeed, require, a symbolical representation, are yet frequently alluded to with the view of exhibiting the truths which they were designed to express. Man's original connexion with Paradise is of this class. The river of Eden presented to the Psalmist a type of that stream of bliss with which God continues to refresh his people (Ps. xxxvi. 8; comp. xlvi. 4); and to Ezekiel it appeared issuing from the very temple of God, to revive the parched and desolate region around. In this scene trees of life are represented growing on its banks (Ezek. xlvii.), as also in the description of the heavenly Paradise (Rev. xxii. 12).

3. While, however, on the view here presented, the typical matter receives a great enlargement, care must be taken against the mistake of seeking a specific type in every single incident of a particular transaction, or in the separate prescriptions of a system or institution, instead of viewing them as subsidiary adjuncts.

To avoid errors of this kind, it should be observed, that not unfrequently a variety of details was necessary to express

one simple truth, or perhaps to serve as connecting links in the system, and adapt it to the circumstances of the case. An example of this is afforded in the numerous details as to measure and materials in the specifications of the Tabernacle, and with regard to each of which the older writers discerned various meanings; whereas the simple idea expressed by such regulations, leaving no part or arrangement, however minute, to be formed according to the taste or judgment of the artificers, was, that no human devices must mix in the services of God, or in anything typical of the way of salvation. It was probably for the same reason that the detailed specifications given to Noah for the construction of the ark, for "the saving of his house," have been placed upon record, while matters which might naturally be considered of far more importance have been passed over. But, however this may be, the purpose of the minute directions for the construction of the Levitical Tabernacle is fully expressed in the injunctions given to Moses: "Look that thou make them after the pattern which was shewed thee in the Mount" (Ex. xxv. 40; xxvi. 30, &c.) This, however, in no way excludes the fundamental truths which the tabernacle, by its particular structure, its furniture and arrangements, as also by the condition on which ingress to it was obtained, was designed to express. Yet, even in determining these, there is often a neglect of the fundamental principle which governs the whole; and, instead of this, attention is directed to some subordinate feature. Thus the connexion sometimes instituted between the tabernacle and the body of Christ¹ is so far partial, that it must be deemed erroneous; for upon this view there can be no consistent explanation of the stated services of the tabernacle, nor of the twofold division of the structure. The only correct view is that which can explain all the conditions of structure and of service, as well as the fact that the whole was made after the pattern of things in heaven.

It was the same with regard to many of the directions as to the service of the Tabernacle. Some of these had respect only to a principle of order, as the direction that in certain cases the victim should be slain on the north side of the altar (Lev. i. 11; vi. 25; vii. 2), an arrangement in which some

¹ Alexander, *Connexion*, pp. 328, 329. Fairbairn, *Typology*, ii. 238, 239.

writers detect various mysteries, but which had evidently no other purpose than to prevent confusion. Others had respect to various ends contemplated in the theocratic constitution, without any essential connexion with the idea of sacrifice; such was its limitation to one specific locality. However, all these directions showed, in addition to their own proper purposes, that the whole sacrificial service was of Divine arrangement, and that as such it must be distinctly conducted.

In the prosecution of such inquiries as these, and for distinguishing between the essential and that which is more or less adventitious, the interpreter will derive considerable advantage from observing the method and the principles of classification adopted in the natural sciences, especially the distinction between the properly *typical* and the *adaptive*, the former referring to the general rules of structure and functions, the latter to the modifications requisite to suit appointed habits of life,¹ and other circumstances, and which must be eliminated from those considerations which determine the proper typical forms. The example of the tabernacle just referred to will serve to illustrate this rule, and the distinction between the general and the particular in the doctrine of types. Various matters connected with the tabernacle were of a merely adaptive character, and not at all essential to the structure, as is proved by the fact, that they do not recur in the Temple substituted in its stead.² Thus its form, as a tent, corresponding with the dwellings of the people at the time, its size and proportions, so as to render it portable, its coverings as protective from the weather, and its wood-work formed from the Shittim tree, a production of the locality where it was constructed, and for which, in the Temple of Solomon, was substituted cedar.—these, and other particulars, in which fanciful writers detect almost endless mysteries, must obviously be excluded from those matters which have a proper typical character. Attention to this principle would remove much that is irrelevant to the subject, and at the sametime check various extravagancies, which must always accompany the attempt to find a meaning in every

¹ See Philips, *Life on the Earth*, p. 26. Camb. 1860. M'Cosh and Dickie, *Typical Forms*, p. 1.

² Hengstenberg: "In general, it may

be laid down as a rule, that every thing in the temple which differed from the tabernacle must have been accidental and external."—*Authentic*, E. T. ii. 523.

single incident or minute detail.¹ Nor, considering the various and ever advancing phases of that great economy embraced in revelation, need there be much difficulty in settling its fundamental principles, and their true typical import.

It only remains to add in a classified form the chief typical principles embraced in the Pentateuch, with the verbal explanations by which they were usually accompanied, and of which some notice has been taken in the preceding treatise, adding various matters not already adverted to.

i. THE SALVATION OR REDEMPTION PROVIDED FOR FALLEN MAN.

Under this head may be arranged such notices as respected the Author and the nature of man's restoration from the fall, and the method of effecting that deliverance.

1. The Author was declared to be God Himself—(1.) By express statements, as in the Edenic promise (Gen. iii. 14, 15), and the arrangements for the redemption from Egypt (Ex. iii. 7-10; &c.), which was itself typical of the higher spiritual redemption. (2.) By His prescribing the objects, rites, and institutions, which prefigured salvation; as the construction of the Noachian ark (comp. Heb. xi. 7), and the whole arrangements of the Mosaic law. (3.) He was so regarded by believers, by Jacob (Gen. xlviii. 15, 16; xlix. 18), and Moses (Ex. xiv. 13; Num. xiii. 16).

2. The nature of the blessing was variously set forth and apprehended. (1.) Adam viewed it as "life" from the dead (Gen. iii. 20); Lamech, as a deliverance from the curse pronounced upon the ground (v. 29); Jacob as a *redemption* from all evil (xlviii. 16), a character under which it became more specific at the Exodus. (2.) It was also represented as

¹ This is particularly apparent in most of the early writers, as Witsius (*De Tabernaculi Levitici Mysteriis: Miscel. Sac., Lib. ii. Dis. 1*); Lamy (*De Tabernaculo Fœderis, Paris, 1720*), and others: but not less so in some of the more recent, as Bähr (*Symbolik, i. 276-376*). In other matters, too, some moderns vie in extravagance with the older writers. Hengstenberg's

(*Egypt, p. 175*) view of the "cedar and hyssop," in Num. xix,—the former symbolizing God's majesty, the latter His lowliness—the Divine qualities exercised in the atonement—is an instance. Now the supposition on which this arbitrary analogy rests, that the *cedar* in this case was that of Lebanon, is itself exceedingly improbable. (See Smith's *Dict. of Bible, i. 286*).

a restoration to Divine favour and fellowship, indicated by such typical characters as Enoch (v. 25), Noah (vi. 9), Abraham (comp. Isa. xli. 8), and others.

3. The method of redemption indicated. (1.) The necessity of satisfaction to justice for the removal of the guilt contracted in the violation of the law. This was the great theme of sacrifice; the oblation of Abel, in contrast to the eucharistic offering of Cain, declaring that death as announced in the law (Gen. ii. 17), was the price of redemption (comp. Heb. ix. 22). (2.) The purification of the sinner's person, so as to fit him for the service of and communion with the Holy One. This was represented by the ablutions and sprinklings of the law which pointed to the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (Heb. xii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 2; 1 John i. 7).

ii. THE REDEEMER, HIS PERSON, CHARACTER, AND OFFICES.

1. Of the Redeemer's person there were—(1.) Various direct intimations, as also of his relation both to man and to God. With regard to the first, he was announced as the Seed of the Woman and of Abraham; while his relation to God was shown in the designations of the Angel of God and of Jehovah, and in the historical identification of JEHOVAH and ELOHIM. (2.) There were also typical indications of this twofold relation; of the former, the institution of the Goel, denoting the nearness of kindred and ties of blood between the Redeemer and those in whose behalf he interposed, was exceedingly expressive. Further, his peculiar position as the Image and the Son of God, as well as the Head of humanity, was represented by Adam, as already remarked, the only proper and personal type of Christ (Rom. v. 14).

2. The Redeemer's character and perfections were set forth in the notices of the qualifications indispensable in such as had any transactions with God, either on their own account or in behalf of others. The Mosaic economy was throughout a mediating arrangement, the promulgation of the Sinaitic law having made known to a larger extent than before (Rom. iii. 20), the need of a mediator between God and sinners (Ex. xx. 19). Such an Agent required the highest holiness and consecration. This was shown—(1.) In the character requisite in Israel as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," (Exod. xix. 5, 6; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 2.) (2.) In the priests, in whom

the sacerdotal character of Israel was concentrated, and who represented the New Testament Priest, "who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," (Heb. vii. 26.) And, (3.) In the sacrificial victims, which in their natural spotlessness and integrity were emblematic of the "Lamb without blemish and without spot," (1 Pet. i. 19), the only sacrifice that was effectual "to put away sin," (Heb. ix. 26.)

3. The Redeemer's offices were largely prefigured in the Israelitish history and institutions. Mediation, as already stated, was the great principle of that economy, the nation itself no less than their institutions representing it. It is also the fundamental principle of the Gospel (1 Tim. ii. 5), where, however, it is intrusted to "Jesus Christ the righteous," (1 John ii. 1.) More particularly—(1.) The priestly functions of Christ were prefigured by the Aaronic priesthood, and by Melchizedek, of a different order from that of Aaron. (2.) The prophetic office, as revealing the Invisible and making known the Divine purposes, was announced in the promise of the prophet like Moses; while (3.) The intimation of Shiloh, and of the Star and Sceptre out of Jacob, announced the kingly office of the Author of all good, and the Conqueror over evil. Accordingly, persons who provisionally discharged these several offices, or otherwise carried on outwardly the work specially assigned to the Redeemer may, in that respect, be said to be types of Him.

As, however, the principal types of Christ, both as to his person and undertaking, occur in the institution of the priesthood and the sacrificial ordinances which constituted the very foundation of the Old Testament worship, and the only means of access to God, it will be necessary before leaving this branch of the subject to be somewhat more specific.

That sacrifice, under both the patriarchal and Levitical economy, had professedly a piacular aspect, has, it is trusted, been clearly established; and it is certainly not less apparent that no mere animal oblations were possessed of any real efficacy in that respect, whether as regards the claims of justice on the one side, or the transgressor's own conscience on the other. These deductions, which, especially with regard to the latter point, are consonant alike with reason and the whole teaching of Scripture, form one of the great postulates of the

Gospel, the sacrifice of Christ being expressly declared to be the only real atonement. As such, it is found to correspond in all particulars with the conditions specified and prescribed in the law.

1st. *The Character of the Victim.*—"The Lamb of God," as he was styled by John the Baptist, and designated to "take away the sin of the world" (John i. 29), by his personal dignity and untainted moral character exhibited in reality those perfections symbolised by the requirements of the law in the victims which it was allowable to offer. Further, as these were in the closest relation to those who brought them to the altar—though only one of property and of the sympathies arising from a state of domestication, so the great Antitype occupies a still closer, even a personal relation to those in whose behalf he was offered as "a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour unto God" (Eph. v. 2). And so with the various other requirements of a sacrificial character; they were all duly implemented in the great sacrifice once offered up for all, and with regard to which the New Testament writers, without any hesitation, employ the sacrificial language of the law,¹ and with a naturalness of application which is at once apparent to every unprejudiced reader.

2ndly. *The Qualifications and Functions of the Priest.*—Under the law sacrifices could only be offered by the stated ministers of religion called and qualified for the purpose. This mediating class was instituted to meet a want of which the Israelites had been made sensible, as a personal matter, by the operation of the law on the conscience, and which is invariably found to be the case wherever man is convinced of his relation to God, as a sinner. The priestly office of Christ, accordingly, occupies a fundamental place in the scheme of atonement presented in the Gospel. And, indeed, if confidence be placed in the account given of Christ by the New Testament writers, it will at once appear not only how eminently he answered the various requisites in the typical priests of the law, but also how he is, in fact, the only priest properly entitled to the name.

For the discharge of his priestly and mediatorial functions

¹ See Pye Smith, *Sac. and Priesthood of Christ*, pp. 29, 30.

Christ possesses every qualification,¹ particularly on account of the union of the Divine and human in his mysterious person. Called to act on behalf of men, he is a real and proper man; free from that taint which places the race in a state of estrangement from God. "For, verily, he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God" (Heb. ii. 16, 17). "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners" (Heb. vii. 26), and yet so participating with them in troubles and temptations that he might have a sympathy with the distressed: "For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted" (Heb. ii. 18). If sufferings and temptations are capable of producing such qualifications, there were certainly enough of the kind in the history of Christ, as recorded in the Gospels. But the various qualifications, so far specified, had respect only to one aspect of the undertaking; there was another which regarded God, and as the object of Christ's priesthood was "to save them unto the uttermost that come unto God by him" (Heb. vii. 25), he must have also a Divine nature, inasmuch as salvation was, from the outset, represented, and by the faithful understood to be, a Divine work. Accordingly, the Epistle to the Hebrews, which discusses so largely the priestly character and functions of Christ, opens with various statements touching the dignity of his person, as the Son of God, the Creator of the worlds and Upholder of all, the Brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his Person.

These characteristics in the Priest have again an important bearing on the quality of the sacrifice. Christ being a priest, he must, according to the idea therein involved, "have somewhat to offer" (Heb. viii. 3). Now, it is but reasonable to conclude that the offering will be such as befits the occasion on which it is presented, and the dignity of Him who offers it. This was fully understood in the law of sacrifice, where there was also given some obscure intimation of the connexion

¹ See Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, Lib. ii. 1, § 4. Pye Smith, *Sac. and Priesthood of Christ*, pp. 85-125.

which must subsist between the priest and the victim. This, it would appear, was the object of the direction that the priest should eat the sin-offering. The identity thus represented, of course only inadequately in the Levitical ritual, was actually realised in the Christian sacrifice (Heb. vii. 27).

There is one particular, however, in the descent of this priest as distinct from the Levitical priests, to which the writer of that Epistle calls special attention. He is descended not from the tribe of Levi, but from that of Judah; "of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood" (Heb. vii. 14). But this peculiarity, which, at first sight, might appear to be somewhat opposed to the view which represents Christ as the great Priest whom the Aaronic ministers of sacrifice only typified, is, as the Apostle shows, one of its strongest confirmations. At a stage of doctrinal development, subsequent to that reached in the Pentateuch, an intimation occurs, giving a specific turn to an incident recorded in connexion with the history of Abraham in Genesis. "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. cx. 4).

Some remarks have been already made on this subject;¹ but it will be necessary to supplement them here rather from the New Testament point of view, noticing the leading features in the apostle's argument regarding Melchizedek, (Heb. vii.) First, the points in which the Levitical priests and Melchizedek are compared. They received tithes; but even here the superiority of the priest-king appears, (ver. 5, 6.) and still more by the fact of his blessing Abraham, already the object of promise, (ver. 6, 7.) According to the Apostle, the singular meeting of the patriarch and priest, gave a pre-intimation that the legal system was only mediate and temporary. Secondly, the comparison of Melchizedek and Christ, (ver. 11-22.) Here these two points are considered, (1.) The fact, that according to the Psalmist, another priest is appointed, after the order of Melchizedek, and not after the order of Aaron, suggests the insufficiency of the Levitical priesthood, (ver. 11.) A change in an institution so fundamental as that of the priesthood involves a change in the whole law, (ver. 12.)

¹ See above, vol. ii., pp. 259-262.

(2.) The priest thus to arise is priest for ever,¹ for he is constituted, "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Indeed, the carnal commandment, unable to bestow life, and in its entire nature, weak and unprofitable, is not simply changed, but is entirely abrogated. This is implied in the eternity of the Messiah's priesthood, (ver. 13-19.) (3.) He is constituted priest by a Divine oath. The institution of the Levitical priesthood was not confirmed by an oath of God, as is Christ's priesthood, as were also the Messianic promises, (Heb. vi. 13,) which were thus attested as having an abiding part in the kingdom of God in contradiction to legal ordinances, which had only a temporary character, (ver. 20-22.) This priesthood being confirmed by the oath of God, rendered Jesus the surety of a better covenant, (ver. 22.) From this point, the Apostle, proceeding entirely on New Testament ground, speaks more freely of the superior priesthood of Christ, who is shown to be the eternal, holy, heavenly High Priest.

3dly, *The nature of the work effected by Christ's death.* The typical relation between the legal sacrifices and the death, or as it is termed in the New Testament, the sacrifice of Christ, further appears from the fact, that the objects which the former symbolically represented, are really effected by the latter. That the representations of Christ's sufferings given throughout the New Testament bear that they were of a penal, and at the same time of a vicarious character, will not be questioned by any who have regard to the natural import of language in such plain testimonies as, "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," (2 Cor. v. 21;) and, "who his ownself bare our sins in his own body on the tree," (1 Pet. ii. 24.) And there can be as little question, that the sufferings of the Messiah were set forth from the first announcement on the subject in the Pentateuch, and more fully in the prophetic writings, under the aspect in which they are presented in the New Testament. There is thus at least a wonderful analogy between the predictions of a suffering Messiah and the actual history of Christ, whatever views may be en-

¹ Comp. Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, Lib. ii. 1, § 2.

tertained of the character of these sufferings, and of the results they have produced, or may have been designed to produce, while it is also worthy of notice that Christ's countrymen were so blinded to this particular in the Messial's character,¹ that even his disciples were offended when he alluded to suffering and death as things in prospect, (Matt. xvi. 21-23,) while with regard to his enemies, the Apostle Peter openly testified that it was their ignorance on this point which led them unwittingly to fulfil these predictions, (Acts iii. 17, 18.)

The great object of sacrifice as set forth in the Old Testament, was to produce reconciliation between an offended God and the transgressors of his law, by the vicarious endurance of the penalty denounced, justice requiring to be so honoured before God could again receive the sinner into favour. Now it is held as indubitable among Christians, whatever differences of opinion they may entertain as to the mode and other particulars, that this object has been fully attained by the death of Christ. Wherever this is denied, there is of course no common ground for discussing such questions as the present. But assuming that the doctrine of atonement was taught in the law, it will indeed be impossible to show how the purpose contemplated could be more effectually secured in another way than that recorded in the New Testament. Relying on the historical credibility of the Gospels, it is found that there concurred in the person and sufferings of Christ, all the conditions which may be deemed necessary for the accomplishment of such an undertaking as is there expressly ascribed to Him, while it must be further felt that no concurrence of qualifications of a more favourable character for the purpose than those found in Christ is at all conceivable. The discussion of such points however is foreign to the present subject, only it may be remarked, that owing it may be to difficulties of this sort, although other causes are doubtless co-operating, the present tendency of Jewish authors² is to deny that their

¹ See Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 188.

² *E. g.*, Moses Angel: "If it (Judaism) declines to recognise vicarious atonement, and the superior value of faith alone without works, it does so

because, not only does it find no warrant for such principles in the successive revelations through Moses and the prophets, but it finds a wiser and higher morality in believing man to be the only means to his own salvation, and

sacrifices had any atoning import whatever, in direct opposition to the most express statements of the ritual, and the teaching of the older Rabbinical writers.

iii. THE REDEEMED, THEIR RELATION TO GOD, TO THE REDEEMER, AND TO THE WORLD.

1. The relation of the redeemed to God was expressed, (1.) Verbally, by His designating Himself their God, the first trace of which appeared in Noah's blessing on Shem, (Gen. ix. 26,) but more fully manifested in the case of Abraham, (xxvi. 24,) and also their Father, (Deut. xxxii. 6;) and by their constituting His first-born and His peculiar treasure, (Ex. iv. 22; xix. 5.) (2.) Symbolically it was represented by the theocratic constitution with its various arrangements for the separation, conservation and training of the Israelites as the people of Jehovah. This relation subsisting between God and His people implies, that provision will be made for all their wants.

First, as regards food; this was indicated in the grant to Adam and to Noah, (Gen. ii. 16; ix. 3;) and in the supplies furnished to Israel in the wilderness. For the relation of the manna to Christ, and to the food of the blessed in glory, see John vi. 31-58; Rev. ii. 17. Secondly, the provision made for clothing man's moral nakedness was prefigured by the coats of skin, and by the sacerdotal garments of Aaron and his sons, the character of which was thus understood by the Psalmist: "Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness," (Ps. cxxxii. 9.) Thirdly, the residence of the redeemed was the dwelling-place of God, where *He met with His people*. The entrance of the High Priest into the sanctuary, though with much ceremony, and his stay there, though very brief, still gave promise of a permanent residence therein, and a nearness to God, (Ps. xxiii. 6,) conditional of course on the perfect sanctification of the person, and the removal of those other imperfections adhering to the first tabernacle, indicated by the separating veil, (Heb. ix. 8.) which was rent asunder both literally and symbolically at the death of Christ, (Matt. xxvii. 51.) Again, from the fact, that God was not ashamed

to be called the God of the patriarchs, it is inferred in Heb. xi. 16, that "He hath prepared for them a city;" nor is it without significance in a typical aspect, that the description of the heavenly residence in the Apocalypse, shows it to be only a higher form of the earthly Paradise.

2. The relation of the redeemed to their Deliverer, showed that (1.) Personally they were partakers with Him of the same nature and character. The creation of the woman, and her reunion in marriage to the man of whom she had been originally a part, typified the perfect oneness, which in point of law and other respects, should subsist between Christ and his people, (Gen. ii. 23, 24; Eph. v. 29-32.)¹ They too like Him are of the seed of the woman, (Gen. iv. 25,) in contrast to the reprobate, who like Cain are "of that wicked one," (1 John iii. 12.) They are also of the seed of Abraham by faith and by adoption, (Gal. iii. 29.) Further (2.) Experimentally the redeemed have communion with Christ in his joys and in his sorrows. They participate in his conquests, and though only partially and imperfectly they carry on the same work, and represent the same principles. In particular, as his great work was to bruise the Serpent's head, so his people likewise are assured that "the God of peace shall bruise Satan under their feet shortly," (Rom. xvi. 20.)

It is this unity that constitutes the typical connexion between the children of God under the Old Testament, from Abel downwards, and believers under the New, and pre-eminently their Head, the First-born among many brethren, (Rom. viii. 29.) The characteristics are common to the whole body, although in some cases they stood out more prominently on the ground, either of a stronger individuality, or other circumstances, which afforded greater room for contrast with those of an opposite character. It is this, it may be remarked, which makes the selection of typical persons entirely of an arbitrary character. The only absolute division recognised in Scripture is into two great classes, and with this the interpreter should be content. Of course the prominence above referred to, and which is common to the two classes, is not to be overlooked.

¹ See Alford, Greek Testament, iii. fully, the typical relation of these two passages, Schriftbeweis, II., ii. 120.

3. The relation of the redeemed to the world was exhibited in various ways, particularly by the theocratic constitution, (1.) Israel's election and separation to God, and from the world, was an arrangement which, when expressed in words, corresponded to Christ's language concerning his disciples: "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world," (John xvii. 16.) (2.) They are hated and persecuted by it, (John xvii. 14.) This was clearly announced in the first promise in the enmity instituted between the seed of the serpent and of the woman; and was actually exemplified in the contest waged between the first two brothers. It was again manifested in the family of Abraham. The conduct of Ishmael towards Isaac, the child of promise, was seen by St. Paul to be the effect of a principle in constant operation, "As then he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now," (Gal. iv. 29.) (3.) They shall however be victorious over it, both personally, and as the representatives of principles, which notwithstanding every apparent check, are destined to triumph, inasmuch as God has so engaged. This triumph was declared in the bruising of the serpent, in the degradation of Canaan, the son of Ham, and more directly in the announcements by Balaam, of the victorious career of the great Israelitish King, and was actually witnessed in the overthrow of Pharaoh. (4.) Finally they shall be delivered from the world's annoyances. As Noah was delivered from the violence which prevailed in his day, and Lot from the scenes which he witnessed in Sodom, and with which his soul was grieved, a deliverance in both cases through the destruction of the wicked, (2 Peter ii. 5-9,) as Isaac was freed from the persecutions of Ishmael by the expulsion of the latter from the house of Abraham, and Israel escaped the taskmasters of Egypt by the Exodus, and by their being put into possession of the promised land, so a deliverance complete and permanent is appointed for the people of God, with a full participation in all the promised blessings. This additional truth was also taught in the history of Ishmael and Isaac, already adverted to, "Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman," (Gal. iv. 30.)

It were easy to add further analogies, and of a more specific character, as also to trace the line along which the curse flowed, the consequences of transgression and its various relations, which are equally in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament as the points already considered. Enough, however, has been adduced to indicate the nature and extent of this connexion. If anything were wanting to evince the entire accordance between the earliest portion of the Jewish Scriptures and the Christian revelation, and to show that Judaism and Christianity, however formally different, are yet essentially one, the latter being only the advanced or perfected state of the preparatory dispensation, it would be found in the fact that the fruits, as manifested in the lives of the people of God, making allowance for the difference of development, were identical under the Old and New Testament. This is a criterion which serves to establish the unity of purpose and of principle in the sacred record, better than any critical or doctrinal examination. Let any one, looking at the 11th chapter of Hebrews, say, whether the examples of faith, as a trust in God and a desire to serve Him, there noted, do not show it to be of the same character, and as marked as under the Gospel dispensation. Or taking the Book of Psalms, and considering the intense delight in God and longing after Him, and again, the deep anguish of spirit which results from His withdrawing Himself, and other emotions awakened and sustained by meditation on the Divine law and testimonies, and which find utterance in these songs of Zion, let any one qualified to form an opinion on the subject say, wherein do such feelings differ from those of the Christian believer? This is a matter placed beyond dispute by the fact that the Church of God has, in all ages, found in the Psalmic poetry the most suitable exponent for its devotional feelings.¹

¹ Bishop Horne: "In the language of this divine book, the prayers and praises of the Church have been offered up to the throne of grace, from age to age. And it appears to have been the Manual of the Son of God, in the days of his flesh; who, at the conclusion of the last supper, is generally supposed,

and that upon good grounds, to have sung an hymn taken from it; who pronounced, on the cross, the beginning of the 22d Psalm: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' and expired with a part of the 31st Psalm in his mouth: 'Into thy hands I commend my spirit.' Thus He, who had not the

Enough, however, has been advanced on the relation, historical, doctrinal, and typical, between the Pentateuch and the New Testament. With regard to this last feature, in particular, the connexion is of such a kind as entirely precludes all ground for suspicion of its being a human contrivance. This was indeed the case with respect to the other points, but, if possible, it is more striking here; even the most sceptical are constrained to acknowledge it. De Wette himself, who will be the last to be accused of predilections in a matter of this kind, thus wrote in one of his latest works. "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. . . . 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."¹

To conclude, the results fairly deducible from the preceding inquiry may be thus briefly summed up.

1. The theology of the Pentateuch, apart from all other considerations, is itself of a character which precludes the supposition that it can have been the fruit of human discovery or speculation.

2. Again, the harmony of the work in doctrinal and other points with the New Testament, evinces a unity of purpose which can be referred only to the Divine mind. From the promulgation of the Sinaitic law to the publication of the Gospel, there had been mighty revolutions in the views and feelings of the Jewish community, yet Christ and His apostles announced no new doctrines different from those expressed or implied in the Mosaic writings.

Spirit by measure, in whom were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and who spake as never man spake, yet chose to conclude his life, to

See Fairbairn, *Typology*, i. 45.

solace himself in his greatest agony, and at last to breathe out his soul, in the Psalmist's form of words, rather than his own."—*Com. on Psalms, Pref.*

3. More especially the gradual development of doctrine as seen in the Pentateuch, is such that its very first announcements were a prophecy and pledge of all the announcements and arrangements which followed, or shall, so far as revealed, yet follow, in the scheme of Divine Providence. Moreover, it deserves notice that, in this development there is no rectification or appearance of improvement of any earlier doctrine, but only the maturing or bringing to light its latent principles.

4. The adaptation of the successive revelations to the wants of the time, and as preparatory to a more perfect economy, is also very marked. Christianity is a power which, however it may be viewed, is exerting incalculable influence on the world; and, as it is proved to be a direct product of Judaism and fundamentally of the Mosaic legislation, there must, it is evident, have been a wonderful adaptation of means to accomplish such a result, more especially considering the various counteracting principles in operation all the while.

And, finally, an incontrovertible inference from the above propositions, singly or collectively, is that the character and execution of the undertaking assumed by Moses as a lawgiver, and of which the Pentateuch forms his own authentic record, is such, that it must have had, in the most absolute sense, a Divine sanction. The success of the Mosaic mission considered at the close of the first volume, is seen in its true significance, only after a survey of his literary labours so to speak, the result of which is, a work in itself incomparably greater than all his other achievements in Egypt and the Wilderness, and affording more unmistakable indications that he was acting under Divine guidance than all the miracles recorded in the history, which thus, however, as well as all the other incidents narrated, obtain a new and incontestible sanction, not dependent on the intelligence or trustworthiness of the witnesses or other historical testimony, but on evidence as accessible to the modern reader, as it was to those Israelites who came out of Egypt, and is certainly more cumulative and convincing in every succeeding age, as the results of the Mosaic mission become more and more felt in and through the universal diffusion of the Gospel—the completion of the law, both as a revelation of God and the rule of the theocratic constitution.

INDEXES.

INDEX I.—PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

- Aaronic Priesthood, the, on what it rested, ii. 252; the qualifications necessary for the office, 253; the bodily qualifications, 254; their privileges, 255; how characterised as an everlasting priesthood, 257.
- Abel, death of, as bearing on a future state, ii. 105; offering of, 124; how distinguished from that of Cain, 132.
- Aben-Ezra, on the interpolations of the Pentateuch, i. 14.
- Abimelech, his visits to Abraham and Isaac, i. 199.
- Abraham, promise regarding the seed of, ii. 208; New Testament references thereto, 213.
- Adam, how a type of Christ, ii. 75; the sentence passed upon him, 81.
- Agag, the common title of the Amalekite kings, i. 328.
- Angel of God, or of Jehovah, ii. 33.
- Antediluvian period, traditions regarding, i. 400.
- Ark of the Covenant, what it signified, ii. 151; whether referable to Egypt, 371.
- Astruc, the first propounder of the Document-Hypothesis, i. 26; nature of his work, 138.
- Atonement, what signified by the term in Hebrew, ii. 176; ceremonies of day of, 380.
- Azazel, what denoted by the term, ii. 376; whether referable to Egypt, 380.
- Babel, etymology of the name, i. 417.
- Babylon, the Biblical account of, confirmed by recent discoveries, i. 416.
- Bähr, his view of sacrifice, ii. 172.
- Balaam, alleged different accounts of his death, i. 213; prophecy of, ii. 227; his wish to die the death of the righteous, ii. 112.
- Bearing Iniquity*, import of the expression, ii. 168.
- Bethel, alleged anachronism in the name of, i. 318.
- Blood, how applied in sacrifice, ii. 165; the atoning principle, 170.
- Blood-revenge, regulations with regard to, ii. 323.
- Borrowing from the Egyptians, ii. 57.
- Bunsen, on the unity of language, i. 396, *note*.
- Burnt-offering, its fundamental character, ii. 158.
- Cain, sparing the life of, ii. 38.
- Canaan, its adaptation to the purposes of the theocracy, ii. 287.
- Canaanites, the, alleged anachronism in notices of, i. 323; Hamitic origin of, 414; order for the extermination of, ii. 60.
- Carlstadt, his denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, i. 15.
- Celsus, his opposition to the Pentateuch, i. 13.
- Cherubim, the, character of, ii. 99; their relation to the "living creatures" of the Apocalypse, 103; whether connected with the Egyptian sphinx, 372.
- Chronology of Genesis, i. 66; of Exodus, 85; of Leviticus, 98; of Numbers, 108; of Deuteronomy, 123.
- Covenant, the, with Abraham, ii. 139; the Sinaitic, how ratified, 143; what it purported, 146.
- Creation, Mosaic history of the, i. 371.
- Cush, what countries denoted by the name, i. 413.
- Cuttings in the flesh, why prohibited, ii. 113.
- Dan, alleged anachronism in the name, i. 318.
- Day, unto this*, its relation to the date of the Pentateuch, i. 329.
- Death, what it meant in the primal threatening, ii. 83; the penalty of the law under all dispensations, 346.
- Decalogue, its promulgation, ii. 326; its names and design, 337; its perfection and spirituality, 332; its perpetuity, 339; its penalty, 345.
- Delitzsch, his view of the relation of Deuteronomy to the other books of the law, i. 357.
- Deluge, the, difficulties of the Scriptural account of, i. 389; its local character, 390; traditions regarding, 402.
- Deuteronomy, its name and contents, i. 111; its relation to the preceding books, 113; its prophetic announcements, 120; its chronology, 123.
- Dietary laws, intended for the separation of Israel, ii. 295.

- Divine names, the, their importance in Revelation, ii. 16; interchange of, i. 162; the ground of this, 178; relation of Elohim and Jehovah, 171.
- Divorce, only tolerated by the law, ii. 309; restrictions on, 320.
- Document-Hypothesis, the, review of, i. 136; not warranted by the interchange of the Divine names, 162; nor by peculiarities of expression, 189; nor by alleged repetitions in the history, 197; nor by alleged contradictions, 200.
- Edom, alleged anachronism with regard to the kings of, i. 324.
- Edomites, duration of their history according to Genesis, i. 325.
- Egypt, its Biblical name, i. 421; its condition in the time of Abraham, 422; of Joseph, 424; and of Moses, 430; author of the Pentateuch's connection with, 280; its influence on the language of the Pentateuch, 284; on the symbolism of the Pentateuch, 287; and on its enactments, 290.
- Egyptians, their Hamitic origin, i. 411.
- Eichhorn, his Document-Hypothesis, i. 27; its object, 138.
- Elohim, import of the name, i. 163.
- Enoch, his translation, as bearing on a future state, ii. 107; prophecy of, 194.
- Esau's wives, variation in the names of, i. 291.
- Eve, import of the name, ii. 101; sentence passed on her, 81; her exclamation at the birth of Cain, 186; her views at the birth of Seth, 192.
- Ewald, his views of the composition of the Pentateuch, i. 30, 147.
- Exodus, its name and contents, i. 71; its relation to Genesis, 72; its legislation, 83; its chronology, 85.
- Faber, object of his "Horræ Mosaicæ," i. 34.
- Fall, evidences in nature of a, i. 384; tokens of recovery from the, 386; Mosaic narrative of the, compared with tradition, 398; restoration of man from the, ii. 89.
- Gathered to his people, import of the expression, ii. 110.
- Geddes, character of his writings, i. 23.
- Genesis, its name and contents, i. 57; nature of its history, 59; its prophetic character, 64; its chronology, 66.
- Glass, his definition of the term *Goel*, ii. 246, *note*.
- God, unity and personality of, ii. 25; this doctrine not referable to Egypt, 28; plurality in the Divine essence, 31; angel of, 33; His holiness, 37; His righteousness, 37; His covenants with His people, 40; limited character of His revelation in the Pentateuch, 41; His alleged mutability in the case of Balaam, 54.
- Goel*, first occurrence of the term, ii. 241; character and duty of the, 242; on what the office was dependent, 245.
- Gramberg, his view of the compilation of Genesis, i. 140.
- Graves, object of his Lectures on the Pentateuch, i. 35.
- Hands, imposition of, on the victim, what it signified, ii. 161.
- Hävernick, his Introduction to the Pentateuch, i. 38.
- Havoth-Jair, alleged anachronism in the name, i. 320.
- Hebron, the names of, i. 317.
- Hengstenberg, on the relation of the Psalms to the Pentateuch, i. 5; character of his work on the Pentateuch, 37; his view of the name Jehovah, 167; objections to this, 179.
- Hermon, different names of, i. 322.
- Hobbes, his denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, i. 15.
- Hofmann, his view of sacrifice, ii. 172.
- Hormal, alleged anachronism in the name of, i. 319.
- Horne, Bp. on the devotional character of the Psalms, ii. 476, *note*.
- Human race, the period of creation of, i. 377; the unity of, 379.
- Hupfeld, his view of the composition of Genesis, i. 148.
- Idolatry, origin of, ii. 24.
- Igen, his modification of the Document-Hypothesis, i. 140.
- Isaac, the commanded sacrifice of, ii. 48, 140.
- Israel, their separation, how effected, ii. 277; provisionally, by the call of Abraham, 278; by the sojourn in Egypt, 279; by the sojourn in the Wilderness, 284; and settlement in Canaan, 285; by enactments, 290; their conservation, 304.
- Jacob, chronological difficulties regarding, i. 202; number of his family at the descent into Egypt, 203; his views of salvation, ii. 93.
- Jahn, character of his Introduction, i. 36.
- Jehovah, etymology of the name, i. 166; relation of the name to redemption, 170, 179.
- Jehovah-Elohim, import of this designation, i. 176.
- Jerome, on Ezra's connexion with the Pentateuch, i. 11.
- Jethro, diversity of his names, i. 206; his sacrifice to Jehovah, ii. 142.
- Joseph, his sale to the Ishmaelites, i. 204; his Egyptian name explained, 285.
- Joshua, import of the name, ii. 66, 94.
- Judaism, not absolutely exclusive, ii. 299; its provisional and preparatory character, 402; its relation to Christianity, 432.
- Keil, his view of sacrifice, ii. 173.

- Korah, alleged different accounts of his insurrection, i. 211.
- Kurtz, his view of the composition of the Pentateuch, i. 358.
- Laceration of the person prohibited, ii. 113.
- Lamech, his view of the promised blessing, ii. 92.
- Law, the, compensatory principles of, ii. 314; its provision against the alienation of landed property, 315; against the accumulation of debt, 317; imperfections of, in its religious aspect, 403; provisional character of, 410.
- Le Clerc, his view of the authorship of the Pentateuch, i. 16; character of his commentary on the Pentateuch, 19.
- Leviticus, its name and contents, i. 88; its relation to the preceding Books, 90; its legislation, 93; its chronology, 98.
- Levites, their age at commencement of service, i. 210.
- Liberty, personal, how provided for in the Law, ii. 308.
- Life, the tree of, ii. 97; human, its sacredness, 308.
- Man, his original state, ii. 68; his creation in the Divine image, 71; his Fall, 76.
- Manna, its continuance, i. 327.
- Marriage, what it intimated, ii. 75; laws regarding, 309.
- Masius, his denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, i. 15.
- Melchisedek, how typical, ii. 260; the nature of his priesthood, 261.
- Michaelis, J. D., character of his "Mosaisches Recht," i. 22.
- Moses, circumstances attending his birth and preservation, i. 338; circumstances in his life evincing him as the author of the Pentateuch, 340; notices of him in the Pentateuch not inconsistent with its Mosaic authorship, 346; his mission, difficulties of, 447; circumstances in which it was undertaken, 454; its success, 461; Egyptian origin of his name, 286.
- Nations, genealogical table of the, i. 406; Dispersion of the, 392.
- Nazarenes, impugners of the authenticity of the Pentateuch, i. 13.
- Nimrod, his connexion with Nineveh, i. 414, 418.
- Noah, his sacrifice, ii. 135; his drunkenness, 196; his curse on Canaan, 198; his blessing on Shem, 201; his blessing on Japheth, 205.
- Numbers, its name and contents, i. 99; its relation to the preceding Books, 101; its legislation, 105; its prophetic intimations, 107; its chronology, 108.
- Og, notice of his bedstead, i. 331.
- Omer, meaning of, i. 331.
- Ordeal, by the water of jealousy, ii. 322.
- Passover, alleged contradictions as to the time of its institution, i. 209; its purpose and peculiarities, ii. 268; its relation to Christ, 272.
- Patriarchs, deceased, their relation to God, ii. 115.
- Pentateuch, its importance in Judaism, i. 3; its influence on the later Hebrew writings, 4; exegetical value of its study, 10; earliest impugners of its authenticity, 13; grounds of opposition to it, 40; denial of its Mosaic authorship, what it involves, 45; its names, 54; its five-fold division, *ib.*; its sectional division, 55; literature of, 125; alleged contradictions of, 200; positive evidence of its unity, 214; its antiquity, 230; references to it in the historical books, 233; in the Poetical Books, 244; in the Prophets to its historical transactions, 251; to its enactments, 255; imitations of its language by the Prophets, 259; its composition anterior to the settlement in Canaan, 267; written during the growth of the Mosaic system, 272; its author's connexion with Egypt, 280; with the Arabian Desert—its geography, 293;—its natural productions, 297; the archaisms of the, 300; its grammatical peculiarities, 307; lexical peculiarities, 308; peculiar expressions and phrases of, 310; its alleged anachronisms,—geographical, 317; historical, 323;—and miscellaneous, 331; its authorship, indirect internal testimony to, 336; direct internal testimony to, 347; external evidence—the Hebrew Scriptures, 361; testimony of Christ and the Apostles to, 363; means for commemorating its transactions, 435; and for preserving the record itself, 439; its relation to the New Testament, ii. 432; its primary object, ii. 9.
- Peyrerius, his views of the Mosaic Books, i. 16.
- Pharaoh, meaning of the name, i. 286; the hardening of his heart, ii. 50.
- Plagues of Egypt, i. 77; their physical connexion with Egypt, 81.
- Polygamy, how viewed by the law, ii. 310.
- Poor, provision for the, ii. 317.
- Potiphar, his relation to the keeper of the prison, i. 205.
- Property, its security provided for by the Law, ii. 309.
- Prophet, occurrence of the term, i. 332, the, like Moses, promise of, ii. 235; Hengstenberg's view thereof, 236; bearing of that promise on the character of the Mosaic economy, 236.
- Ptolemy the Gnostic, his view of the Mosaic polity, i. 13.
- Punishment, temporal, not inconsistent with redemption, ii. 81.
- Purifications of the Law, what they purport.
- Red Heifer, whether referable to Egypt, ii. 382.

- Redemption, the idea of, how expressed by the Exodus, ii. 248.
- Retaliation, the principle of, ii. 324.
- Retribution, temporal, not the primary sanction of the Law, ii. 120; reason for its prominence therein, 119.
- Revelation, the methods of—by direct statements, ii. 14;—by Divine acts and dealings, 17;—by religious rites and ordinances, 20;—by manifestations of God in human form, 21.
- Ritter, C., on the adaptation of Palestine for the purposes of the Theocracy, ii. 289, 287, *note*.
- Sacrifice, origin of, ii. 130; its design, 160; its insufficiency, 171, 273; the various kinds of, 156; its efficacy not limited to Theocratic sins; 179.
- Salt, a necessary accompaniment of sacrifice, ii. 157.
- Scapè-goat, *See* Azazel.
- Schlegel, on the fitness of the Shemitic tongues for prophetic inspiration, ii. 426.
- Seth, hopes entertained regarding him by Eve, ii. 193.
- Sheol, import of the term, ii. 111.
- Shiloh, prophecy respecting, ii. 216; Messianic, but not personal view of this prophecy, 220; Messianic and personal view, 222; etymology of the term, 223.
- Sin, our first parents' views of its nature, ii. 83; its universal and hereditary character, 81; its germ in the history of the Fall analogous with the representation of its development in the New Testament, 88.
- Sins of fathers visited upon their children, ii. 53.
- Sin-offering, why to be eaten by the priests, ii. 167; Fairbairn's view of this, 169.
- Slavery, how viewed by the Law, ii. 321.
- Spencer, character of his work: i. 17; examination of his theory, ii. 384.
- Spinoza, his denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, i. 15.
- Stations in the wilderness, table of, i. 103.
- Tabernacle, the Levitical, its names, ii. 150; its designs, 151; its services, 154.
- Tabernacles, the Feast of, continued observance of, i. 437.
- Temptation of Adam, its relation to that of Christ, ii. 88.
- Tempter, the, his character, ii. 80; curse upon, 90, 163.
- Tertullian, on the connexion of Ezra with the Jewish literature, i. 14.
- Tuch, his Complement-Hypothesis, i. 29, 146.
- Types, in nature, Prof. Owen on, *note*, ii. 450; how differing from symbols, 452; principles to be observed in their interpretation, 454; synopsis of the more important of the Pentateuch, 465.
- Ur, of the Chaldees, recent discoveries connected with, i. 419.
- Urim and Thummim, whether referable to Egypt, ii. 374.
- Vater, his Fragment-Hypothesis, i. 27, 143.
- Victim, the sacrificial, slaying of, by whom performed, ii. 162; how made sin, 163; its uncleanness, 164; its necessary qualities, 157, 263; what these symbolized, 266; its skin the property of the priest, 166, 258.
- Vitringa, his views of the sources of Moses' information, i. 138.
- Warburton, character of his "Divine Legation of Moses," i. 21; his view of Balaam's prayer, ii. 112, *note*.
- Warfar, foreign, discouraged by the Law, ii. 311.
- Wars of the Lord, the Book of, what Document, i. 332.
- Wette, De, his views of the composition of the Pentateuch, i. 28, 144; his final views on that subject, 145; on the typical character of the Old Testament, ii. 477.
- Wilderness, period of sojourn in the, a difficulty to Rationalists, *note*, i. 463; its natural productions inadequate to the wants of the Israelites, 452, 463.
- Woman, the seed of the, ii. 182; the typical principle expressed in her creation, 474.

INDEX II.—PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE ILLUSTRATED.

	PAGE		PAGE
GENESIS.			
i. 27,	ii. 74	iii. 9,	322
ii. 15,	80	iii. 11,	331
ii. 18-22,	70	vi. 4,	ii. 27
iii. 15,	80, 182	xiv. 12,	113
iv. 1,	186	xviii. 15-18,	235, 412
iv. 17-22,	i. 197	xviii. 15-19,	i. 120
vi. 5,	ii. 85	xxxii. 39,	ii. 27
ix. 26, 27,	i. 186	xxxii. 43,	412
ix. 21,	408	xxxiii. 3,	i. 123
ix. 25-27,	ii. 196	JUDGES.	
xi. 27-29,	i. 70	xi. 30-40,	i. 237
xii. 14-20,	198	1 SAMUEL.	
xii. 8,	268	ii. 13,	i. 239
xv. 2,	303	ix. 9,	332
xx. 12,	70	x. 25,	239
xxi. 10-12,	ii. 46	2 SAMUEL.	
xxii.	46	vii. 18-25,	i. 181
xxii. 2,	i. 168	xii. 16,	14
xxv. 8-17,	196	1 CHRONICLES.	
xxvi. 26-33,	199	xvii. 16, 17,	184
xxxvi.	325	PSALMS.	
xxxvi. 2, 3, 24,	201	iv. 6,	i. 247
xxxvi. 31,	324	xvii. 16,	246
xli. 2, 18, 45,	285	xviii. 32,	176
xlix. 10,	ii. 216	xxix. 10,	244
EXODUS.			
ii. 10,	i. 287	xl. 6-8,	ii. 273
iii. 13-16,	166	lxxxi. 9, 10,	i. 248
v. 12,	282	cxxxv. 13,	180
vi. 2, 3,	167, 168	PROVERBS.	
vii. 15,	81	viii. 27,	i. 219
viii. 22,	79	xxii. 10,	249
ix. 19, 21,	282	xxix. 24,	249
ix. 30,	176	ECCLESIASTES.	
ix. 31, 32,	283	vii. 29,	ii. 76
xii. 36,	ii. 260	CANTICLES.	
xii. 40,	i. 85	vi. 13, [vii. 1],	i. 250
xviii. 11,	81	ISAIAH.	
xx. 5,	ii. 53	i. 9,	i. 252
xxxiii. 20, 23,	42	x. 24,	252
LEVITICUS.			
xvi.	ii. 376	xix. 1,	278
xvii. 7,	i. 291	xxiii. 12,	406
xvii. 11,	ii. 171	xlvi. 21,	253
NUMBERS.			
vi.	i. 106	li. 2,	ii. 279
xi. 5,	283	lviii. 6,	i. 257
xii. 3,	346	lxvi. 3,	257
xiii. 22,	284	lxvi. 23,	ii. 417
xix.	107	JEREMIAH.	
xx. 13,	199	iv. 23,	i. 264
xxi. 14,	332	xxxi. 31-33,	ii. 413
xxii. 12, 20,	ii. 54	xxxii. 17, 18,	ii. 416
xxiv. 17-19,	227	EZEKIEL.	
xxxiii. 1-49,	i. 277	xiv. 9,	i. 265
xxxiii. 10,	278	xx. 29,	ii. 395
DEUTERONOMY.			
i. 2,	i. 296		
ii. 12,	327		

		PAGE		PAGE
	HOSEA.		xvii. 8,	239
ii. 14, 15,	.	ii. 285	xx. 17,	42
iii. 4,	.	417		
viii. 12,	.	i. 256		ACTS.
xii. 9 [10],	.	256	vii. 6,	i. 86
			vii. 20,	338
	AMOS.		xv. 21,	56
i. 11,	.	i. 251		
ii. 8,	.	255		ROMANS.
vi. 1,	.	261	v. 14,	ii. 456
			ix. 17,	51
	OBADIAH.		xv. 10,	i. 122, ii. 413
ver. 4,	.	i. 259		
				2 CORINTHIANS.
	MICAH.		iii. 7-11,	ii. 44
ii. 5,	.	i. 263	v. 21,	133, 471
v. 5 [6],	.	253	vi. 17,	i. 107
	NAHUM.			GALATIANS.
i. 2,	.	i. 263	iii. 17,	i. 86, 87
			iii. 8, 14, 16,	ii. 214
	ZEPHANIAH		iv. 29, 30,	475
i. 13,	.	i. 263		
				2 TIMOTHY.
	HAGGAI.		i. 10,	ii. 119
ii. 7,	.	ii. 415		
				HEBREWS.
	ZECHARIAH.		ii. 14, 15,	ii. 249
xiv. 16,	.	417	vii.	470
			viii. 13,	414
	MALACHI.		x. 1-3,	ii. 407
i. 11,	.	418	x. 2,	i. 96
			x. 5-9,	ii. 274
	MATTHEW.		xi. 23,	i. 338
i. 1,	.	i. 57, 62		
ii. 15,	.	ii. 281		1 PETER,
v. 17, 18,	.	339	i. 11,	ii. 237
xxiii. 23,	.	437	i. 18, 19,	272
	MARK.			JUDE.
ix. 49,	.	ii. 157	vers. 14, 15,	ii. 194
xii. 26,	.	Note. i. 56	vers. 5, 16.	17
	LUKE.			REVELATION.
xxiv. 44,	.	i. 56	xii. 10, 11,	378
			xxii. 15,	ii. 80
	JOHN.			
viii. 56,	.	ii. 215		

Lately Published, by the same Author, Large 8vo, Price 12s.,

CREATION AND THE FALL:

A DEFENCE AND EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST THREE CHAPTERS OF
GENESIS.

“Displaying manifold tokens of ripe erudition, independent judgment in its applications, and a lively habit of full and consecutive research.”—*Evangelical Review*.

“It is altogether such a work as the present exigencies of the contest with the Rationalistic school have made an imperative necessity. While obviously the result of no ordinary breadth and patience of investigation, it exhibits very great ratiocinative clearness, independence, and power, and will, doubtless, we venture to predict, win for the author a high and commanding position amongst the best Biblical critics and theologians of the age.”—*Scottish Guardian*.

“We do not hesitate to designate this volume as the most complete examination of the literature and the exegesis of the Creation and the Fall which has appeared in England.”—*Journal of Sacred Literature*.

“Mr. Macdonald’s book is marked by the fruits of extensive reading and dispassionate thought on the various and intricate questions involved in the great topic it discusses; and both from the scholarship it manifests, and the tone of fairness and candour which characterizes both its critical and theological disquisitions, is well entitled to the attention of thoughtful inquirers.”—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

“Mr. Macdonald may truly say that he has not given to the public that which cost him little, for the work is intensely elaborated. He is at once a very able and a very studious man, and he has selected as the subject of his intellectual labours one of the greatest themes that the whole course of things can supply. . . . The discussion has been conducted in the right spirit, and with an unusual measure of ability.”—*British Standard*.

“One of the most important contributions which Scotland has recently given to theology.”—*Banner of Ulster*.

“The author, whom we sincerely desire to be better known, evidently thinks and writes for himself. No small share of learning, ingenuity, and industry, is evinced in his composition; and while he exercises an independent judgment, and affords copious evidence of being a sincere and earnest writer, is familiar with the most recent results of exegetical inquiry.”—*Aberdeen Herald*.

“Mr. Macdonald writes with perfect confidence in the correctness of his views, without misrepresenting those of his adversaries, and has, in fact, established for himself the character of a sound Biblical critic, both by his vindication and the exposition by which it is followed.”—*Critic*.

“A work which exhibits an extensive acquaintance both with literature and science, and proves the author to be possessed of considerable powers of mind. Nor should we be doing justice to this treatise, if we omitted to mention the calm, and logical, and unprejudiced tone which is its chief characteristic.”—*Literary Churchman*.

“We repeat our opinion that the industry and erudition of the work are highly creditable to the author—that he discovers intellectual powers of no mean order—that he has spared no pains and research—that his philology is sound and acute—that his style is generally clear and forcible, and that the entire production is a very useful and commendable contribution to our modern theology.”—*United Presbyterian Magazine*.

“Every page discovers the hand of a master—of one profoundly acquainted with his subject, and with the discussions to which it has given rise in ancient and modern times—of a writer qualified to state his case clearly, reason upon it acutely, and sum up the results with dexterity and candour.”—*Inverness Courier*.

“It is no mean service which is rendered to the cause of Revelation, when a survey is taken of the leading points at issue,—lucid, thorough, masterly, and comprehensive—which, while it tables the exact question for discussion, supplies the materials for a safe conclusion on most of the difficulties connected with it. The author before us well deserves the credit of favouring the literary world with such a production.”—*News of the Churches*.

Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARK. London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & Co.

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOUR LARGE VOLUMES IN DEMY 8vo, FOR ONE GUINEA PER ANNUM.

MESSRS CLARK beg respectfully to invite the attention of the clergy and intelligent laity to their FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY. They trust to receive a continuation of the support hitherto so liberally bestowed on them. The following works comprise the First Series, and Subscribers are still received on remitting EIGHT GUINEAS, which may be paid in instalments.

The Prices to NON-SUBSCRIBERS are placed within parentheses.

Twelve Volumes of this Series (only) will be supplied at the Subscription Price of Three Guineas (or a larger number at same ratio).

Dr E. W. Hengstenberg.—**Commentary on the PSALMS.** By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D., Professor of Theology in Berlin. In 3 vols. 8vo, (33s.)

Dr K. R. Hagenbach.—**Compendium of the History of DOCTRINES.** By K. R. HAGENBACH, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. In 2 vols. 8vo, (21s.)

Dr J. C. L. Gieseler.—**Compendium of Ecclesiastical HISTORY.** By J. C. L. GIESELER, D.D., Professor of Theology in Göttingen. 5 vols. 8vo, (L.2, 12s. 6d.)

Dr Hermann Olshausen.—**Biblical Commentary on the GOSPELS and ACTS,** adapted especially for Preachers and Students. By HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. In 4 vols. demy 8vo, (L.2, 2s.)

Biblical Commentary on the Romans, adapted especially for Preachers and Students. By HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. In 1 vol. 8vo, (10s. 6d.)

Biblical Commentary on St Paul's First and Second EPISTLES to the CORINTHIANS. By HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. In 1 vol. 8vo, (9s.)

Biblical Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, and THESSALONIANS. By HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. In 1 vol. 8vo, (10s. 6d.)

Biblical Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the PHILIPPIANS, to TITUS, and the FIRST to TIMOTHY; in Continuation of the Work of Olshausen. By LIC. AUGUST WIESINGER. In 1 vol. 8vo, (10s. 6d.)

Biblical Commentary on the Hebrews. By Dr EBRARD. In continuation of the Work of Olshausen. In one vol. 8vo, (10s. 6d.)

Dr Augustus Neander.—**General History of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION and CHURCH.** By AUGUSTUS NEANDER, D.D. Translated from the Second and Improved Edition. In 9 vols. 8vo, (L.2, 9s. 6d.)
This is the only Edition in a LIBRARY Size.

Dr C. J. Nitzsch.—**A System of Christian Doctrine.** By C. J. NITZSCH, D.D. Translated from the Fifth Revised and Enlarged German Edition. 1 vol. 8vo, (10s. 6d.)

Prof. H. A. Ch. Havernick.—**General Introduction TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.** By Professor HAVERNICK. 1 vol. 8vo, (10s. 6d.)

Dr Julius Muller.—**The Christian Doctrine of Sin.** By Dr JULIUS MULLER. 2 vols. 8vo, (21s.)

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

THE SECOND SERIES comprises the following Works. 20 Vols.
Subscribers' price, FIVE GUINEAS.

Dr E. W. Hengstenberg.—**Christology of the Old**
TESTAMENT, and a COMMENTARY ON THE MESSIANIC PREDICTIONS.
By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D., Professor of Theology, Berlin. Four vols. (L.2, 2s.)

Dr M. Baumgarten.—**The Acts of the Apostles; or,**
THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By M.
BAUMGARTEN, Ph.D., and Professor in the University of Rostock. Three vols.
(L.1, 7s.)

Dr Rudolph Stier.—**The Words of the Lord Jesus.**
By RUDOLPH STIER, D.D., Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Selkeuditz. In Eight
volumes 8vo, (L.1, 4s.)

Dr Carl Ullmann.—**Reformers before the Reforma-**
TION, Principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Translated by the Rev. R.
MENZIES. Two vols. 8vo, (L.1, 1s.)

Dr K. F. Keil.—**Commentary on the Book of Joshua.**
By K. F. KEIL, D.D., Ph.D., Professor, Dorpat. 8vo, (10s. 6d.)

Dr K. F. Keil.—**Commentary on the Books of Kings.**
By Professor KEIL, of Dorpat. Supplemented by Commentary on the BOOKS OF
CHRONICLES. By Professor BERTHEAU of Gottingen. Two vols. 8vo, (L.1, 1s.)

N.B.—A single Year's Books (except in the case of the current Year) cannot be supplied
separately.

The following is the order of Publication of the Second Series :—

1st Year (1854).

Hengstenberg's Christology, Vol. 1.
Baumgarten on the Acts, 3 Vols.

2d Year (1855).

Ullmann's Reformers. 2 Vols.
Stier's Words of Jesus, Vols. 1 and 2.

3d Year (1856).

Hengstenberg's Christology, Vol. 2.
Stier's Words of Jesus, Vols. 3, 4, 5

4th Year (1857).

Stier's Words of Jesus, Vol. 6.
Keil on Joshua.
Keil and Bertheau on Kings and
Chronicles, 2 Vols.

5th Year (1858).

Stier's Words of Jesus, Vols. 7 and 8.
Hengstenberg's Christology, Vols. 3
and 4.

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

A THIRD SERIES, in compliance with a very general desire, was commenced in 1859. The Volumes already published are as follow. Subscription 1859–1860, TWO GUINEAS.

The Subscription for 1861 is now due.

Professor Kurtz.—**History of the Old Covenant; or, OLD TESTAMENT DISPENSATION.** By Professor KURTZ of Dorpat. In three volumes, (L.1, 11s. 6d.)

Dr Rudolph Stier.—**The Words of the Risen Saviour,** and Commentary on the EPISTLE OF ST JAMES. By RUDOLPH STIER, D.D., Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkenditz. One volume, (10s. 6d.)

Professor Tholuck.—**Commentary on the Gospel of ST JOHN.** By Professor THOLUCK, of Halle. Translated from the Sixth Edition of the Original, by CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D. In one volume, (9s.)

Professor Tholuck.—**Commentary on the Sermon on THE MOUNT.** By Professor THOLUCK, of Halle. Translated from the Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition, by the Rev. R. LUNDIN BROWN, M.A. In one volume, (10s. 6d.)

Dr E. W. Hengstenberg.—**Commentary on the Book of ECCLESIASTES.** To which are appended: Treatises on the Song of Solomon; on the Book of Job; on the Prophet Isaiah; on the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture; and on the Jews and the Christian Church. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D. Translated by D. W. SIMON. In one volume, 8vo, (9s.)

Dr John H. A. Ebrard.—**Commentary on the Epistles of ST JOHN.** By Dr JOHN H. A. EBRARD, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated by the Rev. W. B. POPE. In one volume, (10s. 6d.)

N.B.—A single Year's Books (except in the case of the current Year) cannot be supplied separately.

The following is the order of Publication of the THIRD SERIES.

<i>1st Year (1859).</i>	<i>2d Year (1860).</i>
Kurtz on Old Covenant Dispensation, 3 Vols.	Hengstenberg on Ecclesiastes, 1 Vol.
Stier on the Risen Saviour, etc., 1 Vol.	Tholuck on St John, 1 Vol.
	Tholuck's Sermon on the Mount, 1 Vol.
	Ebrard on Epistles of John, 1 Vol.

MESSRS CLARK hope to publish two volumes of "Dorner on the Person of Christ," for 1861; and they have also in progress Lange's great work on the New Testament; Kostlin on Faith; and Martensen's System of Doctrine.

Annual Subscription, ONE GUINEA.

Subscribers' names received by all respectable Booksellers. (For non-Subscribers only) HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

BS1225.4 .M14 v.2
Introduction to the Pentateuch: an

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00040 3040